

2007

Public relations and political controversy: a case study of the Assembly of Turkish American Associations' public relations campaign regarding the Ottoman Empire's deportation of the Armenians

Tamar Grace Meguerditchian

Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses



Part of the [Mass Communication Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Meguerditchian, Tamar Grace, "Public relations and political controversy: a case study of the Assembly of Turkish American Associations' public relations campaign regarding the Ottoman Empire's deportation of the Armenians" (2007). *LSU Master's Theses*. 1411.

https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses/1411

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Master's Theses by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.

PUBLIC RELATIONS AND POLITICAL CONTROVERSY: A CASE STUDY OF THE
ASSEMBLY OF TURKISH AMERICAN ASSOCIATIONS' PUBLIC RELATIONS
CAMPAIGN REGARDING THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE'S DEPORTATION OF THE
ARMENIANS

A Thesis
Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Mass Communication
in
The Manship School of Mass Communication

by
Tamar Grace Meguerditchian
B.A., Loyola University New Orleans, 2004
May 2007

DEDICATION

This effort is dedicated to my parents Hagop and Grace Meguerditchian, both of whom instilled in me a love and respect for the opportunities an education offers. Their resilient efforts to prosper and provide for our family have made me want more out of my own life – both academically and professionally. Thank you, Mom and Dad.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my Thesis Committee – Dr. Eileen Meehan, Dr. Megan Sanders, and Dr. Margaret DeFleur. Dr. Meehan’s support for the past year-and-a-half has been both the guiding force in this project. Since I first approached her with the idea, she has shown an interest and commitment and has undoubtedly made me a stronger individual, researcher and thinker. I would also like to thank Dr. Sanders who has provided me with excellent feedback and support both stylistically and methodologically, no doubt increasing my sensitivity to avoiding researcher bias. Finally, to Dr. Margaret DeFleur I would like to express my gratitude not only for agreeing to serve on my committee on top of her duties as associate dean, but for being a continuous mentor and professor in my three years here at LSU.

This thesis is the culmination of my academic career and is undoubtedly the biggest challenge I has faced to date. It would not have been possible without the support of many individuals including my fellow colleagues, family and friends.

I would like to thank my parents Hagop and Grace Meguerditchian for their support, my friends Tiffany Anzalone and Sarah Dhane for their much-needed pep-talks, and Andrew Gregorian and Dr. Eddie Avedikian for their ability to make the impossible seem simple. Finally, I would like to thank Ara and Natalie Meguerditchian and my nephew Michael for making me smile.

Most importantly, I thank and praise God for His daily guidance and strength.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
ABSTRACT.....	vii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION AND JUSTIFICATION.....	1
The Assembly of Turkish American Associations.....	2
The Assembly of Turkish American Associations' Web Site.....	3
Justification: Public Relations and Ethics.....	6
Persuasive Communication.....	7
Public Relations.....	8
Propaganda.....	10
Statement of Purpose.....	11
2. HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF THE MODELS.....	13
Grunig and Hunt's Public Relations Models.....	13
Propaganda Models	19
Lasswell's Propaganda Model.....	19
Herman and Chomsky's Propaganda Model.....	23
3. MODELS FOR APPLICATION.....	30
Public Relations: Grunig and Hunt's Asymmetrical Model.....	30
Propaganda: Synthesized Propaganda Model.....	32
Persuasive Communication Campaigns and Ethics.....	34
4. RESEARCH QUESTIONS	37
Operational Definitions.....	37
Rationale and Research Questions.....	38
5. METHODOLOGY	40
ATAA and Sample Publications.....	40
Operational Definitions.....	43
Close Reading, the Synthesized Propaganda Model and Public Relations.....	44
6. ANALYSIS.....	51
The Armenian Allegation of Genocide: Facts.....	52
The First Shot.....	73
Hitler and the "Armenian Question".....	92
Perpetuating the Genocide Myth.....	106
Facts and Discussion Points in the Armenian Allegations.....	120
Let Historians Decide on the So-called Genocide.....	127
The U.S. Congress and Hitler on the Armenians.....	142

7. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	153
Discussion.....	153
Implications.....	162
Limitations of Discussion.....	164
Conclusion.....	166
REFERENCES	167
APPENDIX	
A GENOCIDE AND THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE.....	172
B THE HISTORY OF PUBLIC RELATIONS.....	174
C SINGLE PUBLICATION CODING SHEET.....	176
D PRE-TEST CODING SHEET.....	177
E SINGLE PUBLICATION CODING SHEET	179
F SINGLE PUBLICATION CODING SHEET.....	181
G SINGLE PUBLICATION CODING SHEET	183
H SINGLE PUBLICATION CODING SHEET.....	185
I SINGLE PUBLICATION CODING SHEET.....	186
J SINGLE PUBLICATION CODING SHEET.....	188
K SINGLE PUBLICATION CODING SHEET.....	190
L THE ARMENIAN ALLEGATION OF GENOCIDE: FACTS.....	191
M THE FIRST SHOT.....	197
N FACTS AND DISCUSSION POINTS IN THE ARMENIAN ALLEGATIONS	208
O HITLER AND THE “ARMENIAN QUESTION”.....	210
P PERPETUATING THE GENOCIDE MYTH.....	218
Q LET HISTORIANS DECIDE ON SO-CALLED GENOCIDE.....	227
R THE U.S. CONGRESS AND ADOLF HITLER ON THE ARMENIANS.....	239
VITA.....	257

LIST OF TABLES

1.1 Close Reading Publications, ATAA Web site Reference Library.....	41
--	----

ABSTRACT

An organization will almost always use persuasive communication tactics to influence public opinion. Persuasive communication tactics can be either public relations or propaganda. The definitions of both public relations and propaganda, as well as a study of the relevant models, reveals that neither practice heavily stresses the importance of social responsibility.

Using the importance of social responsibility in honest persuasive communication tactics, this qualitative case study of the Assembly of Turkish American Associations' (ATAA) determined that the efforts of the ATAA's persuasive communication efforts are in line with the methods of propaganda, as stated in the operational definition of propaganda and in the objectives of the synthesized propaganda model.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND JUSTIFICATION

From 1915 to 1923, the Ottoman Empire deported more than 2 million Ottoman Armenians living in the present-day Republic of Turkey. Beginning April 1915, Armenian religious, educational, intellectual and political leaders were arrested and deported. In following years, the other members of the Armenian population were also deported. Armenian resistance was sporadic and outside observers, such as former U.S. Ambassador to Turkey Henry Morgenthau, reported atrocities and deaths.

The deportation is at the center of a controversy that involves not only the Armenian and Turkish communities, but also historians, genocide scholars and foreign governments. In recent years, Armenians and Armenian-Americans have charged the Ottoman Empire with genocide – any act committed with the *intent* to destroy, in part or in whole, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group – as defined in 1948 at the U.N. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. Turkey describes the deportation as civil war and rejects the charge of genocide.

Also involved in this debate are non-governmental organizations including the Assembly of Turkish American Associations (ATAA) and the Armenian National Committee of America (ANCA). They participate in the debate through the creation of campaigns to seek congressional support or opposition for resolutions recognizing genocide and to influence public opinion using their respective Web sites. Thus, both organizations' actions raise the question of the whether their campaign Web sites' represent public relations efforts or propaganda. These are two very different organizations in terms of finances and resources. The ATAA's staff includes four full-time employees, a 15-member board of directors and regional staffers, as well as a 12-member board of trustees. The ANCA staff includes 4 full-time members and two regional directors; the

rest of the organization is comprised of volunteers because the ANCA is a grassroots organization. Therefore, I decided to focus on the A-TAA because it has the finances to create a complex campaign that could influence public opinion. Thus, this qualitative case study will focus on selected Assembly of Turkish American Associations' publications to assess whether the campaign's efforts are public relations or propaganda.

The remainder of this chapter will describe the ATAA and the structure of the organization's Web site. I will then justify the study of the organization's Web site and articles available in the ATAA Web site's reference library. Finally, the chapter will address the conceptual and operational definitions of public relations and propaganda, which are necessary to assess the ATAA's campaign efforts.

The Assembly of Turkish American Associations

The Assembly of Turkish American Associations describes itself as the home of the 54 social and cultural Turkish American organizations in the United States (Assembly of Turkish American Associations, 2005, ¶1). The organization states that its mission is to educate the American government, the media and the public about issues facing Turkey and Turkish Americans (Assembly of Turkish American Associations, 2005, ¶1). From this one can infer that the organization communicates with three levels of audiences: policy-makers and bureaucrats, journalists and media managers, and the general public (Assembly of Turkish American Associations, 2005, ¶3). The organization uses its Web site to discuss with its audiences the ongoing debate surrounding the Armenian issue through the various sections of the Web site, which I will now describe.

The Assembly of Turkish American Associations' Web Site

The ATAA's Web site is found at <http://www.ataa.org>. The home page is comprised of tables, bulleted lists and hyperlinks that allow the viewer to navigate through the site. The site is text-heavy and colorful, using mostly blue, red, white and black sans-serif typefaces¹. At the top of the home page is the ATAA's masthead that explains that the organization is comprised of the 54 Turkish American associations throughout the U.S., Canada and Turkey. Also on the top, far left-hand side of the page, is a quote from Mustafa Kemal Atatürk (the founder of the modern Republic of Turkey and its first president), which reads, "Büyük işler, mühim teşebbüsler ancak müşterek mesai ile mümkündür" (Assembly of Turkish American Associations, 2005, ¶1). The quote translates, "Great works, important enterprises are possible only with united endeavor."

Beneath the organization's masthead and to the right of the quote are four colored pictures, measuring 1x1.5 inches in size, with corresponding text regarding the ATAA President Vural Cengiz's letters to the *New York Times* and the *International Herald Tribune* about the Armenian deportation of 1915, Cengiz's address to the ATAA convention attendees, internship information and event information.² Underneath those four picture boxes are two links – one to *The Turkish American*, the ATAA's quarterly magazine, and another link to the ATAA lawsuit against the state of Massachusetts to reinstate censored sources on the Armenian allegation of genocide (Assembly of Turkish American Associations, 2005, ¶1). When viewers click on this link, they are directed to a new page with information about the lawsuit including a press release, links of related articles and Princeton University professor Bernard Lewis' statement that the

¹ Sans-serif typefaces do not have the small features at the end strokes of the letters. Most Web sites use sans-serif fonts because serifs tend to be less readable on a computer monitor. This is an example of a sans-serif font: Arial. This is an example of a serif font: Times New Roman.

² These four picture boxes change approximately every few months and promote topics of interest to the ATAA. In the beginning of this project, October 2005, topics included Cengiz's letter to the Fox Broadcasting Company regarding the Armenian deportation of 1915.

death of the Armenians was a response to the massive Armenian rebellion against the Turks (Assembly of Turkish American Associations, 2005, ¶1).³

On the left hand side of the home page is a blue navigation bar with white buttons labeled: Home Page, Türkçe [in Turkish], About Us, Membership, Component Associations, Calendar of Local Events, Reference, Past Events, Past News, Bookshop, Advertisement, Careers, Get News by Email, Contact Us, Search, Make a Donation to the ATAA, ATAA President Vural Cengiz, Board of Directors, Board of Trustees, and Staff (Assembly of Turkish American Associations, 2005, ¶1). The buttons on the navigation bar do not change colors when a viewer clicks from one page to another. Also, when a viewer goes from the home page to another page, a new window opens and the information is displayed in the new window. The only way to get back to the home page is to close or minimize the new window and return to the home page. However, the home page can remain open as long as the viewer does not exit out of the page.

To the right of the navigation bar are two columns – one white and one blue – with bulleted and hyperlinked lists of press releases, announcements and news, messages from the ATAA president, and seven other lists. These lists are: Turks & Friends Respond, Observer, Support ATAA, and a Window on Turkey. At the bottom of the Web page are the ATAA's contact information, copyright and three advertisements for *Hürriyet USA* (an online Turkish-American news source), *Mezun* (a calling card company), and *BonBon* (a monthly magazine for Turkish-American children) (Assembly of Turkish American Associations, 2005, ¶1). These two columns extend to the bottom of the Web page and are separated with the specific headings listed above.

³ Unlike the four picture boxes above these two text boxes, both the lawsuit link and the link to the ATAA magazine have remained on the site since I began this project in October 2005.

Overall, the site is text heavy, as the home page is covered in bulleted lists, pictures, sections and columns. The Web master has not made use of white space⁴ or any other visually enhancing techniques to make the site more reader friendly. The site is not built well as it is covered with text and an abundance of information, giving off the impression that the organization communicates its messages to the general public with no intention of focusing on a few key messages. I will now discuss the site's presentation of the materials surrounding the Armenian issue.

The ATAA's Web site has 29 total documents concerning the Armenian allegation of genocide. These articles can be found in the action corner and reference library sections of the site. Both sections can be accessed through the home page and are then opened up as separate windows. There are five action alerts regarding the Armenian issue in the action corner, which is the first section on the right-hand side of the site. It includes a hyper-linked list of action alerts prompting readers to oppose genocide resolutions, vote for a fair depiction of genocide on Public Service Broadcasting, as well as other items. On the same side, beneath the action corner, are the sections labeled: Turks & Friends Respond, Observer and the Reference Library.

The reference library can be accessed on the bottom-right hand side of the home page, but is also located on the blue navigation bar on the far-left hand side of the page. The section is divided into six sub-sections, which include a total of 89 articles, publications, letters and links. The first sub-section is labeled the So-Called Armenian Genocide with 24 articles. The remaining five sub-sections are labeled: the Armenian-Azerbaijan Conflict with nine articles, the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus sub-section with 12 articles, the PKK (Kurdistan Workers Party) and Terrorism sub-section with 26 articles, the Jewish & Turkish Friendship sub-section

⁴ White space is a graphic design term that refers to the areas on the page that are left blank, without pictures or text. This technique is used to guarantee a cleaner, more visually appealing online or print publication.

with one article, and the Other Issues sub-section with one article (Assembly of Turkish American Associations, 2005, ¶1).

After reviewing the ATAA Web site, I found that 29 of the 89 articles discuss political issues surrounding the Armenian genocide. The topic is important to the organization, as the Armenian issue takes up 71 percent of the action corner, 58 percent of the press releases, announcements and news sub-section, and 27 percent of the reference library. The prevalence and recurrence of the topic throughout the site suggests that the ATAA wants to inform and/or influence the public about the organization's stance on the Armenian genocide. Thus, the ATAA's focus on the issue raises the question: is this portion of the Web site propaganda or public relations? I am interested in assessing whether the ATAA's persuasive communication techniques representative of public relations strategies or propaganda strategies.

Justification: Public Relations and Ethics

As a public relations practitioner, I believe organizations, as advocates, must communicate ethically. I am interested in studying the ATAA's Web site about a politically charged and unsettled issue because I want and expect the truth. While it is true that practitioners are paid to be advocates, they are also supposed to be truthful. An increased focus on ethics led to establishment of the Public Relations Society of America Code of Ethics. The Public Relations Society of America (PRSA), the world's largest organization for public relations professionals, designed the code to be a useful guide for PRSA members as they anticipate and accommodate ethical challenges that may arise in the workplace (Public Relations Society of America, 2006, ¶3). Practitioners have a social responsibility and democratic duty to tell the truth. They must provide a two-way channel of communication between the organization and the publics. While this ethical conduct is expected of all practitioners, the code encourages

practitioners to adhere to powerful standards of performance, professionalism, and ethical conduct. In fact, I will use the PRSA Code of Ethics in the discussion and conclusion to assess the ATAA's persuasive communication campaign if it is, indeed, public relations. The code will be applicable to the ATAA's public relations campaign and can be used to assess the organization's ethical behavior and may help judge the degree to which the ATAA is socially responsible. This focus on ethical conduct introduces the notion that persuasive communication can be unethical. In order to differentiate the ethical and unethical methods of communication, I must first define persuasive communication.

Persuasive Communication

Persuasive communication is the process through which people attempt to influence the beliefs or actions of others (Britannica Online, 2006). When practitioners use persuasive communication methods, individuals must assess whether the attempts to influence their beliefs are ethical or unethical. Practitioners who use ethical persuasion methods present information in a straightforward manner. They respect their publics and allow them to make their decisions rationally. In contrast, unethical practitioners present misleading information and arguments that lead individuals to make irrational decisions based on emotion. While all practitioners are pursuing their goals as advocates, providing socially responsible information is the key to being an honest advocate.

Thus, if an organization acts responsibly and follows the guidelines that the PRSA Code of Ethics sets forth, the organization will be seen as ethical. I will call this ethical practice public relations. In contrast, I will refer to the unethical practice of persuasive communication as propaganda. Therefore, I will study both public relations and propaganda, respectively, as honest and dishonest persuasive communication methods because it is important for an advocate to be

honest with its publics. My expectation is that an organization will want to create an honest and open dialogue with its public and not attempt to influence the public opinion through dishonest methods. This study will discuss two forms of persuasive communication – public relations and propaganda. However, to differentiate between the two forms of persuasive communication, I must define the conceptual and operational definitions of public relations and propaganda.

Public Relations

There is a consensus among academics (Grunig and Hunt, 1984), textbook authors (Cutlip, Center and Broom, 2000) and professionals (Public Relations Society of America, 2006), as to the conceptual definition of public relations:

Public relations is the management of communication between an organization and its publics.

Public relations establishes and maintains a mutually beneficial relationship between an organization and the publics on whom its success or failure depends (Cutlip, Center & Broom, 2000, p. 6). Public relations is an essential management function (Public Relations Society of America, 2006; Cutlip, Center & Broom, 2000) which organizations use to anticipate and respond to public perceptions and opinions, new values and lifestyles, power shifts with the electorate and legislative bodies, and other changes in the environment (Cutlip, Center & Broom, 2000).

Practitioners have operationalized the conceptual definition of public relations in terms of four steps (Cutlip and Center, 1958). The first step, research-listening, is the probing of opinions, attitudes, ideas and reactions of the people concerned with the acts and policies of an organization. Research gives the practitioners the ability to evaluate the outcome of the campaign before it begins through the assessment of similar campaigns. Then, the practitioners do

preliminary focus groups or surveys with their publics in an attempt to figure out if their chosen course of action will work. While this does not guarantee that the campaign will be a success, it can help eliminate tactics that have not worked in the past (p. 91). The second phase of the process is the planning-decision making phase that brings the attitudes, opinions, ideas and reactions to the organization's table. In this step, the organization determines the mutual interests of the concerned parties, defines the problem and publics, and proceeds to make an action plan that includes a list of objectives, strategies and tactics (p. 91). The third step of the process, communication, is the explanation of the chosen course of action. This communication is directed from the organization to the organization's external publics – meaning those individuals not directly affiliated with the organization. This step explains the course of action the organization will take and the reasoning behind the decision. The final step, evaluation, measures the effectiveness of the organization's campaign (p. 91). While evaluation usually refers to the organization's assessment of whether it succeeded or not, evaluation can also include focus groups and surveys which assess whether the chosen course of action was successful in relation to the goals listed in the first phase (research-listening).

Thus, while the conceptual definition of public relations focuses on managing and establishing relationships, the operational definition describes the actual steps of public relations. The operational definition, however, leaves out the importance of ethics and social responsibility, which distinguishes public relations as the honest form of communication. In fact, none of the definitions of public relations mention ethics; but, through the implications of honest communication and the PRSA Code of Ethics, one can conclude that public relations falls into the ethical communication category. Thus, using the lens of ethics to dissect my operational definition of public relations –the management of ethical communication between an

organization and its publics – I will assess the ATAA’s campaign efforts for public relations. However, I must also present the conceptual and operational definitions of propaganda, as the campaign efforts may be public relations or propaganda.

Propaganda

The consensus among academics (Lasswell, 1927, Taylor, 1942; Lee, 1945; Fellows, 1959; Bobrakov, 1966; Herman and Chomsky, 1988; Pratkanis & Aronson, 1992, Ross 2002) produces the following conceptual definition of propaganda:

Propaganda is the dishonest dissemination of information or an opinion through the manipulation of words, symbols, ideas and events with the intention of attacking an interest, cause, project, institution or person to produce a certain emotional reaction based on the viewpoint of the disseminator.

Political parties, social groups and governments have been in pursuit of their political and economic aims for years. Some suggest this means that they have used propaganda (Fellows, 1959; Bobrakov, 1966; Ross 2002). While the current definition of propaganda has a negative connotation, this was not always the case. When the Catholic Church coined the term in the early 1800s, they defined the term as the propagation of the faith (Fellows, 1959). The propagation of the faith meant that the Catholic Church was committed to spreading its religion through missionary services. It was not until the 1920s and 1930s that there began to exist an unfavorable attitude toward the term. This was a result of the association of the word with wartime activities (Fellows, 1959). Propaganda, in its current definition, increased in use after World War I. During this time, participating governments organized oratory and literary campaigns to convince the world of the importance of their cause, to gain support of nonbelligerent nations and lessen the morale of the enemy (Fellows, 1959). Thus, this method of persuasive communication was not

ethical or socially responsible. The government propaganda was an attempt to control and manipulate individuals through an emotional campaign, which spread misleading and opinionated information. Also, this persuasive communication method did not allow for much dialogue between the sender and receiver. Thus, this persuasive communication kept the public in the dark about what the propagandist chose to exclude from the campaign. This definition of propaganda still applies today.

The manipulative nature of propaganda, as well as the withholding of socially responsible information with the intention of influencing the public, alarms me. Since organizations still use dishonest methods of communication to persuade their publics, I must question whether the ATAA's persuasive communication methods are honest or dishonest. Thus, using the lens of ethics to dissect my definitions of propaganda, I will assess the ATAA's campaign efforts. Much like the operational definition of public relations, the operational definition of propaganda also deals with social responsibility and ethical conduct. In regard to public relations, the truth, social responsibility and ethical conduct are the key elements. With propaganda, the truth and "socially valuable information" (Taylor, 1942) are purposely withheld in an attempt to influence the public. These operational definitions of public relations and propaganda will be used to assess whether the ATAA's campaign efforts are public relations or propaganda.

Statement of Purpose

Now that I have addressed the conceptual and operational definitions of public relations and propaganda, I will discuss the public relations and propaganda models that will be used to assess the ATAA's campaign. Remember that this thesis will assess the ATAA's efforts as either public relations or propaganda using the method of discourse analysis, which will then be applied to selected ATAA documents. The themes, format and discourse compiled from the

discourse analysis will be tested against a public relations model, which borrows from the works of Grunig and Hunt, and a propaganda model which borrows work from Lasswell and Herman and Chomsky. In order to distinguish an organization's efforts between public relations and propaganda, I must examine the organization's persuasive communication tactics and use of ethical and socially responsible information.

CHAPTER 2

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF THE MODELS

In the previous chapter, I provided the operational definitions of public relations and propaganda. Now, I am going to review the most widely used models of public relations and propaganda – Grunig and Hunt’s (1984) four models of public relations, and Lasswell’s (1972) and Herman and Chomsky’s (1988) propaganda models. While, these are some of the most highly regarded models in public relations and propaganda, they must be adapted to accommodate the ATAA’s relationship with the media. Aspects of the models will be synthesized to create a public relations and propaganda model. Those models will then be used to assess the ATAA’s campaign efforts as public relations or propaganda.

Grunig and Hunt’s Public Relations Models

Public relations has made significant contributions to society because of its sophistication, ethics and focus on social responsibility. Public relations practitioners serve the public interest through the creation of a public forum that increases the public’s knowledge through the media – the conduit to the public. Thus, as the operational definition states public relations manages the communication and relationships between an organization and its publics with specific attention to social responsibility and leadership (Grunig & Hunt, 1984; Cutlip, Center and Broom, 2000; Public Relations Society of America, 2006).

Grunig and Hunt’s (1984) four models of public relations are the press agency/publicity model, the public information model, and the two-way asymmetric and two-way symmetric models (Grunig and Hunt, 1984, p. 21). Although public relations is a persuasive communication method, not all of the models use persuasive communication techniques (Grunig and Hunt, 1984, p. 21). Therefore, I will go through each model and discuss its strengths and weaknesses,

ultimately choosing the model I believe will be the best fit to assess the ATAA's persuasive communication campaign.

The press agency/publicity model came into existence during the last decade of the 19th century (Grunig and Hunt, 1984, p. 25). Practitioners of this model communicate the organization's goals to the target audience through the use of incomplete, distorted and/or half-true information (Grunig and Hunt, 1984, p. 21). While these characteristics are reminiscent of those of propaganda, Grunig and Hunt define the press-agency and publicity models as the introduction or transition into the modern-day definition of public relations. Although they see the two practices – press agency and publicity – as the same, practitioners of this model such as Amos Kendall and P.T. Barnum suggest that these are two different practices. Amos Kendall, Andrew Jackson's U.S. Postmaster General, served as one of the most important members of Jackson's Kitchen Cabinet – a group of intimate advisors to President Jackson. Kendall served as Jackson's press secretary in the 1900s, helping draft many of Jackson's state papers, serving as his chief counselor, and defending administration policies in the media (p. 21). Kendall's actions suggest that he was more of a press agent, trying to garner public awareness through the media. On the other hand, practitioners such as P.T. Barnum used the publicity model. Barnum was a self-promoter, self-publishing several editions of his autobiography, which he created to promote himself and his interests. He is remembered for his entertaining hoaxes and promotion of the circus that eventually became Ringling Brothers and Barnum and Bailey Circus. Both Kendall and Barnum garnered public awareness, but while Barnum focused more on publicity and self-promotion, Kendall served Jackson as a press agent, interacting with the media on a regular basis (p. 21).

The second model – the public information model – was created in the early 1900s to disseminate information. The intention of this model, however, was not to persuade, but to provide objective information to the public (Grunig and Hunt, 1984, p. 21). This model of public relations resulted in a one-way, top-down approach to communication. The agency creates a message and sends it out to the public and that is where the communication stops. Scientific organizations and sports organizations frequently use this model to communicate straightforward information, leaving little room for interpretation and feedback (p. 21). However, this model does not provide persuasive tactics to influence public opinion; therefore, the asymmetric model developed in the early 1990s.

The asymmetric model developed in the 1920s, as propaganda played a major role in World War I. After a major British propaganda effort, the U.S. entered the war on the side of the Allies and, as a result, President Wilson formed the Creel Committee to run the national propaganda machine to create U.S. support for the war (Grunig and Hunt, 1984, p. 37). Edward Bernays (1981), a well-known member of the Creel Committee, began to believe that mass persuasion of the public was possible. Bernays (1981) wanted to engineer the public's consent and is, therefore, considered an early proponent of the asymmetric model (Bernays, 1981; Lasswell, 1984). Bernays believed that the engineering of consent was part of the democratic process, that he was free to persuade the public (Bernays, 1891). But, as the asymmetric model grew in popularity, the issue of change and persuasion came into question because the asymmetric model shapes public opinion only.

While the two-way asymmetric model introduces the idea of feedback or two-way communication, the intended change is in the audience's attitudes or behavior. The change is not expected in the organization's practices (Fawkes, 2001, p. 10). Therefore, this model is used in

persuasive campaigns that require an understanding of the attitudes and behavior of the targeted publics. This means that research and planning are important steps in ensuring success (p. 10). For example, public health campaigns use the asymmetric model. These campaigns, which are designed to reduce smoking or encourage safe driving habits, require the use of persuasion theories and audience research because practitioners must understand their target audience. Audiences are bombarded with anti-smoking or safe driving messages all the time, therefore, practitioners must research messages that will resonate with their publics. This model allows all concerned parties to be involved and affected by the campaign's messages, which allows for a mutually beneficial relationship. The government or an organization can benefit from reduced health care costs while the person changing his/her habits can live a healthier and longer life (Fawkes, 2001, p. 11).

Although the asymmetric model is effective in serving the public interest, the model is primarily used to retain the group's position in society. Also, the model is used to advocate the public's view inside the organization, informing the management with what the public will accept. However, the model does not allow the practitioners to tell the organization how to change to please the public [ideal feedback] (Grunig, 1933; Grunig and Hunt, 1984; Fawkes, 2001). Thus, problems exist when the organization and public disagree that there exists a conflict or problem (Grunig, 1933; Grunig and Hunt, 1984; Fawkes, 2001).

The two-way symmetrical model was introduced in the 1960s to make up for the asymmetric model's inability to create change within the organization (Grunig, 1933; Grunig and Hunt, 1984; Fawkes, 2001). The two-way symmetric model of public relations allows the practitioner to serve as the mediator between the organization and its publics. The goal is to obtain a mutual understanding between the organization and its publics. Thus, practitioners of

the two-way symmetric model use social science theory and methods instead of theories of persuasion when planning and evaluating steps of campaigns because the goal of this model is for the publics to understand and not necessarily be persuaded (Grunig and Hunt, 1984, p. 22). This model, although underutilized, is seen to be the most mutually beneficial model for organizations and its publics. Organizations, such as long-distance telephone companies, use this model most often because they are expected to adhere to government regulations. For example, a long-distance telephone company will use the symmetric model because the organization must lobby, communicate and negotiate with the federal government in order to obtain legislation in favor of the organization's goals (Jackowski, 2006).

While the four models demonstrate the nature of communication between an organization and its publics, some models are more applicable to the ATAA campaign than others. With the first two models, communication is one-way, from the organization to public. The difference between the press agency/publicity and public information model is that while the press agents/publicists do not always feel obliged to present the complete picture, the public information officers feel they must present a complete picture whether it means good or bad publicity for the organization (Grunig and Hunt, 1984, p. 22). The two-way asymmetric and two-way symmetric models allow communication to flow to and from the publics. However, they are distinct in the nature of communication (p. 23). The two-way asymmetric model gives the organization more power and attempts to change the public's attitudes and behavior (Grunig and Hunt, p. 23). The practitioners of this model provide communication to the public and receive feedback from the public, with no intention of changing their message (p. 23). The two-way symmetric model, on the other hand, allows for a dialogue with the public. With this model, persuasion is capable of affecting both the public and the organization. While the organization

may be able to change the public's attitudes or behavior, the public may also be able to persuade the organization's management to change its attitudes, behavior or message to contain more than one point-of-view (p. 23). Neither the organization nor the public will change their behavior frequently, but agree that the purpose of the two-way symmetrical model is the ideal model, which can create change on both sides (p. 23).

After carefully reviewing the four models in relation to the ATAA, I believe that the asymmetric model is most applicable to the ATAA; therefore, the asymmetric model is the best one to use to analyze the ATAA site from a public relations point-of-view. The asymmetric model uses social science theory to persuade publics toward the organization's point-of-view (p. 22). While some practitioners of this model believe it can be effective in serving the public interest, most use the model to retain their group's position in society (p. 41). This model represents the top-down approach the ATAA takes with its publics. Also, this model seems to serve the ATAA because the model introduces the idea of feedback, but is imbalanced because the intended change is in the audience's attitudes or behavior. The ATAA does allow two-way communication in the form of questions and answers, but does not provide for feedback in the ideal sense. Ideal feedback is the re-evaluation of goals from the start of the campaign to the end of the campaign. This type of feedback does not simply measure success, but it also measures whether the preliminary goals were met along the course of the campaign. The ATAA focuses on its stance against the Armenian allegation of genocide and states that the other side involves accusations and lies. Thus, because the ATAA uses persuasive communication tactics that represent one side, are top-down in approach and seem to want to change only the audience's opinion, it seems that their model of choice is the asymmetric model of public relations.

After reviewing Grunig and Hunt's (1984) four public relations models, the next step will be to look at the strengths and weaknesses of Lasswell (1972) and Herman and Chomsky's (1988) propaganda models. This is a necessary step as this thesis attempts to assess the ATAA's campaign efforts as public relations or propaganda.

Propaganda Models

I have discussed the two-way asymmetric model of public relations (Grunig and Hunt, 1984) and I will now introduce two models of propaganda. The first model of propaganda is Lasswell's (1972) propaganda model, which although a wartime propaganda model, discusses the prospects of gaining neutral nations' support and preserving friendships through propaganda. The second model I will introduce is Herman and Chomsky's (1988) propaganda model, which focuses on media bias. I must present both of these models before I can form a synthesized propaganda model to use in assessing the ATAA's campaign efforts as public relations or propaganda.

Lasswell's Propaganda Model

Lasswell's pioneering work as contributor to the field of propaganda analysis focuses on the world arena and interactions between the individual and nation-state. He dedicated his career to perfecting, developing and applying his comprehensive communication theory and content analysis to his research interests. While many of his prewar books were written for academic professionals and educated laymen, he began to worry about propagandists' ability to manipulate the public. He saw propaganda as a "threat to human dignity" and feared that society would drift toward garrison police states (Marvick, 1980, p. 225). In 1927, he defined propaganda as the management of collective attitudes by the manipulation of significant symbols (Lasswell, 1927). In the following years, he became concerned with the overt and covert use of government

propaganda. In 1972, in his book *Propaganda Technique in the World War*, he states that there are four major objectives or aims in propaganda: 1) mobilize hatred against the enemy, 2) preserve the friendship of allies, 3) procure the co-operation of neutrals, and 4) demoralize the enemy (Lasswell, 1972, p. 195).

To mobilize hatred against the enemy, the propagandist must portray the opposing nation as a “menacing” and “murderous aggressor” who starts the war and is against a peaceful resolution (p. 77). The nation then presents its war aims, allowing its citizens to see how the enemy is obstructing the nation’s goals. Thus, the enemy is shown as the obstacle to the ideals and dreams of the nation. The enemy is seen violating all moral standards, establishing a hatred for the enemy. Once this hatred is established, it must be maintained to ensure victory (p. 196). Therefore, the propagandist must continue to provide examples of the enemy’s disrespect for the propagandist’s nation. Simultaneously, the propagandist must also capitalize on the fighting zeal of the nation, which then feeds upon the conviction that it has a chance to win (p. 102). The propagandist must use emotional and symbolic appeals on the propagandist’s nation so that the people understand that the enemy is holding the nation back from achieving victory and a peaceful resolution to the problem. The guilt associated with war, as well as the consequences, must be placed solely on the enemy (p. 47). This is a psychological attack in which the propagandist calls for unity among the people and victory for all (p. 57).

However, propagandists must not only call for unity and victory because some people will still disagree with the war due to the history and past consequences of other wars. Thus the propagandists must study history so that they do not use examples that will trigger bad memories. Instead, the propagandist must provide these people with “highly rationalized and idealistic” war aims so that they may support the war and have no reason to doubt the

propagandist (p. 60). On the other hand, members of the working class are more likely to support the war because war usually deals with economic sanctions, which affect the working class, as well as the middle class (p. 64). The nation must understand that the war must be an attempt to save the nation. While the nation is comprised of various groups, the propagandist must appeal to the nation's emotions, stating that the war is an attempt to save business, family and church and add to prosperity, security and faith. Also, since religion is such an emotional appeal, it must be used to create a spiritual and ecclesiastical interpretation of the war. The use of religion can also appeal to the entire nation, as one united group (p. 71). Finally, the propagandist must then formulate war aims and point to the enemy as the enemy of them all (p. 70). These emotional appeals will no doubt create hatred for the enemy; however, cordial relations among allies are also important in portraying a solid front against the enemy, which leads to the second objective in Lasswell's model (p. 115).

In order to preserve friendly relations with its allies, the propagandist must constantly remind the allies of the propagandist nation's respect. One way to do this is to host ally-led demonstrations to show respect and approval for the nation and the ally (p. 196). For example, during World War I, the Allies observed the July 4th holiday because the celebration re-enforced the themes concurrent with the propaganda back home. The celebration and emotional propaganda persuaded the war's proponents that the enemy must be removed because their interests were being threatened (Lasswell, 1972, p. 119). However, the propagandist must also show that the allies are on the propagandist's side through the reinforcement of the propagandist's themes in the allies' campaigns. The propagandist's nations must realize their ideals, as well as the allies ideals, are being threatened (p. 119). There must be an obvious bond between nations, a unification of interests and ideals (p. 125). Thus, the propagandist must

establish a visible friendship between the allies with similar attitudes and hatred for the enemy (p. 124). While friendly relations are needed to continue to fight the war, the attitudes of the neutral nations are also needed to win the war (p. 126).

In order to accomplish the third objective – the procurement of the cooperation of neutrals – the propagandist must lead the neutral nation and its government to identify your enemy as the shared enemy and thus bring about the neutral nations own interests in defeating the enemy (p. 126). The neutral nation must want to become active in the cooperation, even if it is in a non-military capacity. If needed, the propagandist can also portray the horrors of war and the unwillingness of the enemy to allow for a peaceful resolution to the war (p. 196). This can be seen in the ATAA's goal to stifle the opposition's goals for recognition of the deportation as genocide. The vilification of the enemy must continue with the neutral nations, but the propagandist must also attack the enemy's morale through the spread of discouragement and defeat.

This attack of the enemy's morale is Lasswell's fourth objective, which he refers to as the demoralization of the enemy. The propagandist must spread discouragement and instigate defeat, which can be accomplished with the divergence of the hatred of the enemy from the aggressor nation (p. 161). When the propagandist continuously attacks the enemy with the theme of the impossibility of victory, the enemy is more likely to be discouraged and lose the fight (p. 184).

All war propaganda is meant to mobilize home, allied and neutral opinions towards support of the country's cause. All war propaganda is also meant to demoralize the enemy. Propaganda increases the national fighting zeal, influences neutral nations, and introduces the cause and aim of the belligerent. This is the reason governments, during World War I, allowed propaganda to coincide with policy, as it was an attempt at social control and political union

(Lutz, 1933; Lasswell, 1972). While Lasswell's (1972) propaganda model is highly regarded, its historical context/focus on propaganda means that it cannot be applied directly to this study's focus on a non-governmental organization's handling of a debatable event in history. However, parts of Lasswell's model can be applied to the ATAA campaign, as specific elements seem to fit the ATAA's campaign including the desire to preserve the friendship of allies and procure the cooperation of neutrals. These objectives of Lasswell's model are evident in the ATAA's efforts to direct their campaign toward the general public through their Web site.

I have introduced the pioneering propaganda work of Harold Lasswell, now I will discuss a different approach to propaganda analysis – the 1988 work of Edward Herman and Noam Chomsky, propaganda analysts and authors of *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. Herman and Chomsky's five-filtered model of media bias will provide a basis for the synthesized propaganda model because it can be inferred that the ATAA communicates with journalists and media managers. This model will aid in the explanation of the ATAA's work to shape the general public's opinion through the use of the media [journalists and media managers].

Herman and Chomsky's Propaganda Model

Herman and Chomsky (1988) agree to Lasswell's definition of propaganda as the dishonest dissemination of information through the manipulation of words, symbols, ideas and events. They also agree that propaganda is intent on attacking an interest, cause, project, institution or person to produce a certain emotional reaction based on the viewpoint of the disseminator. They explain their propaganda model in their book, *Manufacturing Consent*, and apply it to the performance of the U.S. media because they see the media serving "to mobilize support for the special interests that dominate the state and private activity" (Herman and

Chomsky, 1988, p. xi). While the “democratic postulate” of the model suggests that the media are independent and committed to learn and report the truth, Herman and Chomsky worry that the media are not as unbiased as they report. Instead, they write that in countries where the power is in the hands of the elite, the media serve the elite. Thus, money and power filter out the news fit to print (p. 2). Herman and Chomsky’s documentation of systematic media bias both explains media behavior as an abstract function, but also propose a propaganda model that specifies concrete and verifiable mechanisms that account for systematic media bias (Goodwin, 1994, p. 104). The model serves to filter out the news that is fit to print. Often times, this news is a product of the attempts of government and private entities who want to spread their messages to the public (Herman and Chomsky, 1988; Goodwin, 1994).

The media serve to mobilize support for the special interest of groups and organizations, and are independent and committed to discovering and reporting the truth (Herman and Chomsky, 1988, p xi-xii). The propaganda model suggests that the inequality of wealth and power has multilevel effects on the mass media and their decisions. According to Herman and Chomsky (1988), news filters depend upon the following five aspects: 1) the size, concentrated ownership, owner wealth, and profit orientation of the dominant mass-media firms; 2) advertising as the primary income source of the mass media; 3) the reliance of the media on information provided by government, business and “experts” funded and approved by these primary sources and agents of power; 4) “flak” as a means of disciplining the media, and, finally, 5) the “anticommunism” [now possibly anti-terrorism] as a national religion and control mechanism (p. 2).

The first filter focuses on the large-scale, concentrated ownership and profit orientation of the mass media (Herman and Chomsky, 1988; Goodwin, 1994). They write that the media has

always been tiered, the top tier being the most prestigious, resourceful and thus the most effective. This top tier ultimately defines the news agenda and supplies national and international news to the lower tiers and the general public (Herman and Chomsky, 1988, p. 4-5). Thus, the concentrated ownership of news has two principal effects. One of the effects is that the investment capital needed to establish a new media outlet is beyond the reach of most companies or individuals who manage the media. The second principal effect is that media managers are hired and fired by wealthy individuals, families or corporate boards who have a vested interest in the current economic status quo (Herman and Chomsky, 1988; Goodwin, 1994). The giant media companies, controlled by wealthy people or news managers, have a profit-oriented focus, which ties them to major corporations. Thus this filter's focus on profit, advertising and big business, Herman and Chomsky write, will affect news choices and lead to the model's second filter – the advertising license to do business.

The second filter examines the media's dependence on advertising revenue. Before advertising became prominent in newspapers, production costs were covered in subscription prices. When newspapers began selling space to advertisers, they were able to lower their selling costs and still cover the production costs. However, papers that lacked advertising revenue were put at a serious disadvantage. Therefore, the advertising-based system drove out or marginalized media companies that depended upon revenue alone (Herman and Chomsky, 1988, p. 14-15). As revenue providers, the advertisers influenced content. Advertisers also began selecting media they believed would ultimately make them the most money. They targeted the media that catered to the wealthier audience or, more importantly, the consumerist caste. On the other hand, working-class and radical newspapers targeted the average to poorer audiences (p. 14-18). Thus, the media bias lies with the media's target of wealthier audiences. This media bias raises the

question of source credibility and whether the information the sources provide are serving their own interests or that of the publics (Herman and Chomsky, 1988; Goodwin, 1994). This question then leads to the third filter which discusses the media's sources of the information.

In the third filter, Herman and Chomsky (1988) write that the mass media are in a “symbiotic relationship with powerful sources of information” because they need a steady flow of news (p. 18). The media have deadlines to meet and pressure from their media managers to meet the deadlines and the economic goals the managers have set (p. 18). While official news sources, such as the government and corporations, are used for their objective nature, the media's dependence upon these self-interested sources results in biased news coverage. Governments, corporations, and elite-sponsored experts who provide the media with information, as well as other resources such as press releases, copies of speeches, reports and press conferences, save the reporters and media personnel from having to spend money and time researching for an article or story. However, the economic gain of the media can result in the biased information the experts and agencies provide. These private organizations and government agencies are given special access to the media, often setting their own agenda through the media, as a result of their ability to reduce the media's cost and efforts in acquiring the information themselves (Herman and Chomsky, 1988; Goodwin, 1994).

The fourth filter discusses the media's responsiveness to flak or negative public responses. Flak is a targeted effort to discredit organizations and can include letters, telegrams, phone calls, petitions, lawsuits, speeches and bills. Flak is produced on a large or small scale and can be costly and uncomfortable for the media organization. As a result of flak, the media organization may have to defend its position before legislatures and, at times, courts. In turn, advertisers can withdraw their patronage due to the possibility of offending the constituencies

that may produce flak (Herman and Chomsky, 1988). Flak can be either direct or indirect and is related to power. But, while flak producers attack the media, the media treat them well in return. Flak producers are often given weekly Op-Ed column space, and regular spots as experts on talk shows. Thus, powerful groups are able to bring more information to the media than other less powerful groups. This, ultimately, can result in biased media information (Herman and Chomsky, 1988; Goodwin, 1994).

The first four filters build upon one another to discuss the inequality of wealth and power on the mass media. The filters discuss the conflict of interest between the news media's journalistic and economic desires. While the news media has a journalistic responsibility to report the truth, the news media also has a desire and need for profit. Herman and Chomsky definitely describe them as separate processes, but as I went through each filter I saw how they fit together cohesively. But, with any model, all or parts of the steps, objectives, or filters can be used and applied to different scenarios. The ability of the filters to stand alone will be shown in the synthesized propaganda model I will develop in the next chapter. While the four models fit together well, we cannot forget the fifth filter, which is discussed in a historical context. Although this filter's historical context is not relevant today, I do think the larger point they make is important to the discussion of propaganda.

The fifth filter discusses the ideology of anti-Communism. This filter examines the hostility of the media toward Communist regimes or parties and the media's hostility toward government or political parties that threaten the status quo (Herman and Chomsky, 1988; Goodwin, 1994). The anti-Communist control has had a profound influence on the mass media, which identify and "push into the limelight" persons like Joseph McCarthy. However, since anti-Communism is no longer a threat, the larger point is not made. If Herman and Chomsky were

writing today, they would probably focus this filter on anti-terrorism because, like the Anti-Communist filter, it too introduces the notion that ideologies can be also be demonized. Anti-communism or anti-terrorism is used to demonize the belief systems of the time. In this filter, the enemy is the ideology, and not necessarily the nation. Remember that in Lasswell's model, the enemy is the nation. While Herman and Chomsky do not go into much detail about this filter, they do leave us with the thought that an ideology can also be the enemy.

These five factors, Herman and Chomsky claim, interact and reinforce one another as the raw materials [news] are passed through the filters. After this process takes place it leaves behind the "cleansed residue fit to print" (Herman & Chomsky, 1988, p. 2). The propagandists, in the end, set the premise of discourse, interpretation and definition of what is newsworthy (Herman & Chomsky, 1988; Goodwin, 1994). While this model is also highly regarded in propaganda studies, it does not explain media performance outside of the U.S. More specifically, it does not examine the characteristics that the U.S. media has in common with other capitalist democracies (Goodwin, 1994). While all five filters cannot be applied to the ATAA's campaign, the model's third filter, which focuses on the media's reliance on expert information funded through government, business or other agents of power, seems to parallel the ATAA's use of experts and historians. The ATAA uses historians, university professors and other sources, which assign credibility to their one-sided messages. Thus, the third filter's application to the ATAA's campaign makes it a wise choice to include in the synthesized propaganda model.

Now that I have explained Lasswell (1972) and Herman and Chomsky's (1988) propaganda models, and introduced the notion of a synthesized propaganda model, I will continue with the explanation of the synthesized propaganda model. However, I also want to return to my discussion of public relations models in the beginning of this chapter. After I

reviewed Grunig and Hunt's (1984) four models of public relations – press agency/publicity, public information, asymmetrical and symmetrical, I came to the conclusion that the asymmetric model seems to be most applicable to the ATAA. Thus, the asymmetric model is best to use when analyzing the ATAA site from a public relations point-of-view because this model represents the top-down approach the ATAA takes with its publics. Also, this model seems to serve the ATAA because the model introduces the idea of feedback, but is imbalanced because the intended change is in the audience's attitudes or behavior. The ATAA seems to focus only on its stance against the Armenian allegation of genocide and states that the other side involves accusations and lies. Thus, because the ATAA uses persuasive communication tactics that represent one side, are top-down in approach and seem to want to change only the audience's opinion, the asymmetric model of public relations seems the most applicable.

However, neither the public relations nor the propaganda models are directly applicable to the situational context of the ATAA messages. Thus, I have proposed using one of the four public relations models and a synthesized propaganda model to apply to the ATAA's efforts of public relations or propaganda.

CHAPTER 3

MODELS FOR APPLICATION

In this chapter, I will present Grunig and Hunt's (1984) asymmetric model of public relations, as well as a synthesis of Lasswell (1972) and Herman and Chomsky's (1988) propaganda models, which will be used to assess the ATAA's persuasive communication tactics. Persuasive communication tactics can be either public relations or propaganda. I will refer to public relations as the honest and ethical form of persuasive communication because public relations attempts to persuade and influence public opinion through rational and clear messages. On the other hand, I will refer to propaganda as the dishonest and unethical form of persuasive communication because it attempts to persuade and influence public opinion through emotional and irrational appeals. Remember that I am concerned with the ethics and social responsibility of persuasive communication campaigns and while neither model discusses the importance of ethics, it is presumed that persuasive communication campaigns will be ethical and socially responsible. Thus, I will now explain why I chose to use specific aspects from each model. These models were chosen because they will provide a fair assessment of the ATAA's persuasive communication efforts as being public relations or propaganda.

Public Relations: Grunig and Hunt's Asymmetric Model

In order to properly assess the ATAA's persuasive communication efforts as public relations or propaganda, I reviewed Grunig and Hunt's (1984) four models of public relations. The four models are the press agency/publicity, public information, asymmetric and symmetric models. To choose a model that will be applicable to the ATAA, I must remember that the ATAA communicates with its publics through a top-down approach. The organization presents an enormous amount of information on its Web site and only allows for minimal feedback and the presentation of one side. While accusations of genocide are highly politicized and debated, as

an advocate, the ATAA should present two sides or offer neutral information. Thus, my preliminary examination of the ATAA site suggests that it uses university professors and historians for face credibility. Finally, the ATAA uses persuasion to influence public opinion and behavior, with no intention of creating change internally.

Thus, the persuasive tactics of the ATAA's campaign limits the applicability of the models to either the asymmetric or symmetric models because the other two models (press-agentry/publicity and public information) do not offer two-way communication or feedback. Also, these two models do not produce the type of persuasive communication tactics that the asymmetric and symmetric models provide. While it is true that both the asymmetric and symmetric models of public relations use persuasion to influence public opinion, Grunig and Hunt write that the symmetric model of public relations encourages change externally, with the public, and internally, within the organization. Since we know that the ATAA has no intention of changing the messages or goals, I do not believe that the symmetric model is applicable to the ATAA. This leads me to believe that the asymmetric model is the best model to use in application to the ATAA. The asymmetric model will provide the ATAA with a fair chance to qualify the organization's persuasive communication tactics as public relations.

The asymmetric model seems to be most applicable in the study of the ATAA's campaign because the model is effective in serving the public interest and represents the top-down approach the ATAA takes with its publics. The ATAA does allow for two-way communication in the form of questions and answers, but does not provide for feedback in the ideal sense, much like the asymmetric model. The organization focuses on its stance against the Armenian allegation of genocide and discredits the opposition, stating that the opposition touts accusations and lies. The asymmetric model provides for persuasive communication and

attempts to influence the public, but the organization does not attempt to change to please the public (Grunig, 1933; Grunig and Hunt, 1984; Fawkes, 2001). The asymmetric model, most importantly, differentiates between advocacy that is fair and balanced (presents its side and presents the other side), fair and one-sided (only presents one side) and unfair and one-sided (presents one side, but states that its side is the most credible). According to the public relations theorists, as an advocate, the ATAA must be a fair and honest broker in their persuasive communication tactics to influence public opinion. Thus, the asymmetric model of public relations will provide the fairest assessment of the ATAA's campaign efforts as public relations. That being said, I also need to balance this examination with a propaganda model. The following synthesis of Lasswell (1972) and Herman and Chomsky's (1988) propaganda models will provide a fair assessment of the organization's efforts as propaganda.

Propaganda: Synthesized Propaganda Model

While Lasswell (1972) and Herman and Chomsky's (1988) propaganda models are highly regarded, none of them seem completely applicable to the ATAA. Thus, I synthesized elements of the theorists' models using objectives two and three from Lasswell's (1972) propaganda model and the third filter from Herman and Chomsky's (1988) propaganda model. Objectives one and two from Lasswell's (1972) model state that: 1) the propagandist aims to preserve the friendship of allies, and 2) if possible, procure the co-operation of neutrals (Lasswell, 1972, p. 195). Herman and Chomsky's (1988) third filter states that the media is reliant upon the expert information funded by the government, business or other agents of power (Herman and Chomsky, 1988, p. 2). While the two models differ in scope, as one is a wartime model and the other focuses on media bias, they both have elements that can be applicable to various persuasive communication campaigns and organizations. The three aspects that I pulled

out of both models reinforce some of the most important aspects of any persuasive communication campaign. Persuasive communication campaigns are created to influence public opinion through the use of expert information, including information from individuals already associated with the cause or service and those who have no attachment. This synthesized propaganda model also introduces the notion of ethics and social responsibility in the media's use of expert sources and in the presentation of either fair and balanced, fair and one-sided or unfair and one-sided information. This concern for the media's use of expert information introduces the importance of ethical and socially responsible information. While distinguishing between ethical and unethical practices may be simple, it is much harder to assess an organization's emphasis on social responsibility. Social responsibility refers to the organization's use of persuasive messages that do not withhold information necessary for rational decision-making. This concern rationalizes the use of Herman and Chomsky's third filter, which deals with the media's reliance on expert sources that are funded by government or private entities.

The two objectives, the preservation of allies and procurement of neutrals, relate to the ATAA's desire to preserve its friendship with its members and supporters, and influence the general public. From a preliminary observation, the ATAA's affiliation with university professors and historians of all nationalities provides the organization with a face credibility that may aide the ATAA in its quest to influence public opinion. After all, the ATAA and its allies (experts and sources of information) target the public with information via the Web site to influence public opinion. However, the ATAA's sources of information also raise concerns surrounding the media's reliance on information funded by governments, businesses and other agents of power (Herman and Chomsky, 1988, p. 2). Although the ATAA does not own a mainstream mass media outlet in America, the organization makes available to such venues its

information, which can influence the media and indirectly, public opinion. This, then, leads me to question the organization's use of experts and the willingness of the media to use the information the experts provide. The questioning of the organization's use of sources and the media's reliability on these sources then introduces ethics and social responsibility. This filter suggests that an organization's face credibility is comprised of experts funded through business or government. The filter also suggests that the media is reliant upon this information because it saves time and money. All of these suggestions may result in biased and unfair media information. Thus, this filter raises concerns of ethics and social responsibility both with the organization and the media. These three elements from the two propaganda models will lead to a fair assessment of the ATAA's efforts as propaganda.

While this completes the discussion of the synthesized propaganda model, remember that the ATAA's persuasive communication tactics can be either public relations or propaganda. Only with the use of the asymmetric public relations model and synthesized propaganda model will I be able to assess whether the ATAA's persuasive communication tactics are public relations or propaganda. Before I move on to list the study's research questions and methodology, I would like to continue my discussion of the importance of ethics in persuasive communication. While these models do not discuss ethics, I believe ethics are so basic that they are presumed to be part of each model. Therefore, I want to turn once again to the importance of ethics in persuasive communication.

Persuasive Communication Campaigns and Ethics

Persuasive communication can include public relations or propaganda. Differentiating the two tactics is a powerful tool, which can be used to further assess an organization's actions. An organization cannot be held responsible for public relations or propagandist actions until the

tactics have been assessed. If an organization's actions are unethical and resemble propaganda, nothing can be done to counteract these tactics until they have been defined. Only after an organization's conduct as public relations or propaganda is assessed, can the attention turn to whether the organization acts ethically and socially responsible. Of course if an organization's efforts are ethical, the tactics appear to be in congruence with public relations. If an organization's actions are deemed unethical, then chances are the organization is using propaganda-like tactics.

Regardless of the communicator's desire to influence and shape public opinion, the communicator must act ethically and allow individuals to come to their decisions through rational appeals. A communicator must not use emotion and fear to appeal to the individuals. This type of communication would result in irrational decision-making – a product of propaganda. While there exists a presumption that ethics are a part of all persuasive communication campaigns, there also exists a presumption that public relations is good and propaganda is bad, and good communication is a product of fair and honest communication. But, we must learn to separate ethics from social responsibility. While we can distinguish between ethical and unethical behavior as public relations or propaganda, we must also take into consideration that social responsibility is measured in degrees. A campaign can be either ethical or unethical, but the campaign's messages can have differing degrees of social responsibility. Social responsibility does not only refer to the telling the truth, but it also refers to a communicator's ability to reach out and create socially responsible messages to help individuals come to decisions based on what is best for society.

While, I do intend on assessing the ATAA's persuasive communication campaign as public relations or propaganda, I am also concerned with whether the ATAA is socially

responsible information. Withholding socially responsible information hinders the public from making rational decisions based on logic and reason. Instead, the public can be lead to make decisions based on emotion and fear. Thus, while distinguishing between public relations and propaganda would distinguish the organization's ethical or unethical behavior, the organization must still be held responsible for disseminating socially responsible information. Social responsibility means that an organization disseminates persuasive information with a responsibility to society to be fair and honest brokers of the truth. For example, Phillip Morris USA is a tobacco leader, but also educates society and provides anti-smoking campaign messages to counteract the company's image as a tobacco industry leader. Today, simply being ethical (telling the truth) or unethical (not telling the truth) is not enough. Now, more than ever, organizations must be socially responsible – go the extra mile and create messages that will resonate with members of society. Socially responsible information is that which is seen to be good for society. As this chapter comes to an end, remember that I will use the ethics as a lens to assess the ATAA's campaign efforts as public relations or propaganda, which will then allow me to address the ATAA's social responsibility. In the next chapter, I will present the study's research questions.

CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study will analyze the ATAA's campaign regarding the 1915-1918 Ottoman deportations of the Armenians through an analysis of selected publications found on the ATAA Web site's reference library. I will use Grunig and Hunt's (1984) asymmetric model of public relations, as well as the synthesized propaganda model to assess the ATAA's persuasive communication efforts as being either public relations or propaganda. Specifically, I will examine the writings for appeals, discourse, format and theme.

Operational Definitions

In order to understand what I will gain from noting the appeals, discourse, format and themes of the publications, I will operationalize them in the following ways:

- Theme is the overall feel and focus of the publication and can be phrases that communicate a complex idea such as: blaming the victim, ethnic and racial identity and history and truth.
- Appeals are categorized as an appeal to rationality and appeal to irrationality. They refer to the presentation of the publication's points and can be categorized as appeals that appeal to rationality [meaning that they do not attempt to make the reader make decisions based on fear and emotion] and those that appeal to irrationality [meaning they result in decisions based on emotion, fear and tactics that appeal to an emotional and irrational response].
- Discourse refers to the key modifiers like relocation, civil war, "so-called" or "alleged" that can be categorized as modifiers that dispel doubt, raise doubt and nouns with a negative connotation and denotation and positive connotation and denotation.

- Format is the presentation of each publication. The format of a publication can be either the skeleton of an argument or a fleshed-out argument.

Rationale and Research Questions

The ATAA's persuasive communication campaign will be assessed using both the asymmetrical model of public relations, as well as the synthesized propaganda model. The organization's efforts will be assessed using a close reading of seven of its publications, noting the themes, appeals, discourse and formats. These elements will be analyzed because they are indicative of the models and of a close reading. Then these elements will be compared to the characteristics of the two models, which in turn will provide a fair assessment of the ATAA's persuasive communication campaign. That being said:

RQ 1: Which of the two models best describes the ATAA's persuasive communication campaign?

RQ 1a: What themes does the ATTA use in campaign publications?

RQ 1b: What kind of appeals does the ATAA use in the campaign publications?

RQ 1c: What kind of discourse does the ATTA use in campaign publications?

RQ 1d: What kind of format does the ATAA use in the campaign publications?

The importance of ethics and social responsibility in persuasive communication campaigns, then leads me to present RQ 2. This research question reinforces RQ 1 in that it uses the models and assessment as either public relations or propaganda to address the ATAA's concern for social responsibility. As all persuasive communication campaigns attempt to

influence public opinion, it is imperative that the campaign present ethical information that will provide individuals with information that is beneficial to society. These fear and emotional appeals are products of the appeals, discourse, format and themes used to differentiate tactics between public relations and propaganda. Thus, once the campaign's efforts are assessed for ethical or unethical behavior, the degree to which the organization is socially responsible must be assessed. Once the campaign is assessed for public relations or propaganda, the campaign's commitment to social responsibility can be assessed, as follows. The question will concern whether the ATAA communicates messages that allow the recipient to behave ethically and make a decision based on what is best for society as a whole.

RQ 2: Does the ATAA's persuasive communication campaign withhold or include socially responsible information?

Now that I have set forth my operational definitions, rationales and research questions, I will present the methodology.

CHAPTER 5 METHODOLOGY

ATAA and Sample Publications

In this qualitative case study, I will analyze the seven publications available for download on the ATAA's site. I will use the synthesized propaganda model and public relations model in order to determine whether the ATAA's campaign uses propaganda as discussed in the works of Lasswell, Herman and Chomsky or public relations as Grunig and Hunt explain.

The seven publications I will analyze are among the 24 total articles listed in the Reference Library on the ATAA's Web site. I chose the publications because they are important aspects of the ATAA's campaign, but also because the authors such as the ATAA, American historians, and various Turkish-American authors give the ATAA's campaign face credibility. Although they are not all authored by the ATAA, as full text and accessible documents on the ATAA's Web site, it is understood that they are in congruence with the ATAA's objective and overall message.

The remaining 17 articles were excluded from the analysis because they were either lists, statements, testimonies, quotes, press releases or official government documents, which did not have a specific format and were mostly disconnected pieces with no context. The excluded documents lacked well-reasoned arguments, as well as an appearance of objectivity. For example, press releases, are mere public relations, will have less face credibility than a reference library article. Most of the press releases on the ATAA site deal with news and events and do not consist of reasoned arguments. The political statements (testimonies) do not provide face credibility either because they can be heavily slanted to one side. Thus the remaining 17 articles were left out of the sample because they lacked the face credibility and well-reasoned arguments that the other seven publications display. Therefore, my methodology will consist of a close

reading of the publications, which are listed in Table 1.1 below and explained in greater detail below.

Table 1.1
Close Reading Publications
ATAA Web site Reference Library

Publication	Description/Words	Author
The Armenian Allegation of Genocide: Facts	Discussion points ⁵ 2,161 words	ATAA
The First Shot	Article 7,173 words	Justin McCarthy, Historian
Hitler and the "Armenian Question"	Article 3,906 words	Turkkaya Ataov, Professor, Ankara University
Perpetuating the Genocide Myth	Article 3,656 words 2 tables included	Demir Delen, Federation of Canadian Turkish Associations
Facts and Discussion Points in the Armenian Allegations	Discussion points ⁶ 851 words	Ayhan Ozer, President, Ozay Educational Volunteers Association
Let Historians Decide on So-called Genocide	Article 7,298 words	Justin McCarthy, Historian
The U.S. Congress and Hitler on the Armenians	Article 5,506 words	Heath W. Lowry, Institute of Turkish Studies

Publications are listed under the "Reference Library" of the ATAA's Web site at: www.ataa.org.

While I will look at each publication separately in the analysis, it is already evident that some of the publications have similar themes and formats. For example, the ATAA's "The Armenian Allegation of Genocide: Facts," Justin McCarthy's "The First Shot," and Ayhan Ozer's "Facts and Discussion Points in the Armenian Allegation" discuss the allegation of genocide and the history and facts which resulted in the Armenian accusation of genocide. "The Armenian Allegation of Genocide: Facts" presents an issue, seven facts and a suggested reading list that provides supportive and additional information about the alleged genocide. "The First

⁵ This publication is written in a segmented form, rather than a full body of text.

⁶ This publication is also written in a segmented form, rather than a full body of text.

Shot” is an article in which McCarthy, as a historian, writes about truth and history of the Ottoman events. He asserts that as a historian, he has a duty to report the truth. In Ayhan Ozer’s “Facts and Discussion Points in the Armenian Allegations,” he uses facts and discussion points to address Armenian terrorism and the U.N. Report’s claim that the Armenian Genocide was the first genocide of the 20th century. While these three publications have similar themes, some of the publications also have similar formats. Both the ATAA and Ozer’s publications use a similar format – discussion points – to get their intended message out to the public. The four remaining publications also have similar themes and formats.

Turkkaya Ataov’s “Hitler and the ‘Armenian Question,’” Demir Delen’s “Perpetuating the Genocide Myth,” Heath Lowry’s “The U.S. Congress and Hitler on the Armenians,” and Justin McCarthy’s “Let Historians Decide on the So- Called Genocide” link the Armenian genocide to the Jewish Holocaust. Ataov argues that Armenian propaganda often relies on the biased opinions of others such as Hitler. In “Perpetuating the Genocide Myth,” Demir Delen compares the Armenian claims to the Jewish Holocaust and argues that the Armenians posed a threat to their nation, unlike the Jews. He also argues that the Armenians perpetrated the genocide, resulting in the deaths of millions of Muslims and Turks. Again the link to the Holocaust is seen in “The U.S. Congress and Hitler on the Armenians,” by Heath W. Lowry, which traces the history of Hitler’s quote, “Who after all speaks today of the extermination of the Armenians?” a response to his planned extermination of the European Jewry. This article suggests that there is no historical basis for the statement. Finally, McCarthy discusses the need to establish a joint commission of historians to consider the question of genocide. The four publications share a similar theme and all provide a comparison to the Holocaust, which allows readers to comprehend the magnitude of the topic. The publications also share a similar format –

they are all articles. Whether these articles serve a narrative or informative purpose, I will not know until I assess the themes, format and discourse in the publications.

The publications were all chosen because a preliminary observation revealed consistent themes and formats. Now that I have described the seven publications I will use to assess the ATAA's persuasive communication campaign, I will discuss the method I will use – close reading. However, I would first like to restate the operational definitions of theme, discourse and format. These operational definitions are important because they will dictate what I will gain from noting the appeals, discourse, format and themes of the publications.

Operational Definitions

- Theme is the overall feel and focus of the publication and can be phrases that communicate a complex idea such as: blaming the victim, ethnic and racial identity and history and truth.
- Appeals are categorized as an appeal to rationality and appeal to irrationality. They refer to the presentation of the publication's points and can be categorized as appeals that appeal to rationality [meaning that they do not attempt to make the reader make decisions based on fear and emotion] and those that appeal to irrationality [meaning they result in decisions based on emotion, fear and tactics that appeal to an emotional and irrational response].
- Discourse refers to the key modifiers like relocation, civil war, "so-called" or "alleged" that can be categorized as modifiers that dispel doubt, raise doubt and nouns with a negative connotation and denotation and positive connotation and denotation.

- Format is the presentation of each publication. The format of a publication can be either the skeleton of an argument or a fleshed-out argument.

Close Reading, the Synthesized Propaganda Model and Public Relations

I will conduct a close reading of the seven selected publications available in full-text on the ATAA Web site. While I conduct the close reading of the text, I will note aspects of the text including the theme, discourse and format. Additionally, I will document similarities, differences and repetitions of thematic patterns in each publication. These elements are essential features to note when conducting a close reading because they will reveal the intended meaning and direction of each publication.

I created a coding sheet, which is available in Appendix C, to make the documentation of themes, format and discourse for each publication easier. This coding sheet will allow me to categorize the findings from each publication, which will aide my analysis of the campaign as either public relations or propaganda. A separate coding sheet will be used for each publication, allowing individual analysis of each article, while keeping the contents of the coding sheet consistent. At the top left-hand side of the coding sheet is the identification box for which I will provide the author's name, title of the publication, the online address and last date the publication was accessed. On the right-hand side of the coding sheet is another box so that I can label each publication's format. The publications are either the skeleton of an argument or a fleshed-out argument. Skeletal arguments consist of facts and discussion points, bulleted lists and other publications that lack the prose or context of a fully formed article. A fleshed-out argument is a fully formed article. Examples of a fleshed-out article include a narrative or persuasive essay. The rest of the coding sheet includes categorizes for each publication's themes and discourse.

Theme – the overall focus of the publication – is the next section of the coding sheet and includes the categories for which each publication’s themes may fall under including: blame, guilt, truth and face credibility, to name a few. The next section is labeled appeals and is categorized as an appeal to rationality, an appeal to irrationality and other. An appeal to rationality is that which uses expert sources and historians to provide face credibility for one side or another – making the one side seem infallible. An appeal to irrationality is that which presents emotional and fearful portrayals of psychological responses that move an individual to action. Finally, I have provided for an “other” category in the event that other categorizes of appeals may arise that can be valuable in the analysis. The next section underneath appeals is labeled discourse.

This section also includes categories for the discourse – the text or outcome of the author’s efforts. The categories of discourse include modifiers that dispel doubt, modifiers that raise doubt, nouns with a negative connotation and denotation, nouns with a positive connotation and denotation, and other. Modifiers that dispel doubt are words that are used to dismiss the possibility that the information in the publication is biased or untrue. Examples of this kind of these types of modifiers can include the “expert,” “objective” or “historical” information in each publication. Modifiers that raise doubt are words that that are used to create doubt and disbelief. These types of modifiers can include words such as “alleged” and “so-called.” Nouns with a negative connotation and denotation are words that have a negative literal meaning and association. Examples of these types of nouns may include “mass murder,” “annihilation” and “massacre.” Nouns with a positive connotation and denotation are words that have a positive literal meaning and association and can include words such as “liked” or “favored.” Finally, I included an “other” category in this section as well because I may find another useful category

for discourse after each publication has been closely read. This concludes the explanation of the coding sheet, which I will use as a preliminary analysis of the appeals, discourse, format and themes.

The preliminary analysis from the coding sheet will then be used with in conjunction with the synthesized propaganda model and public relations model to assess the campaign as either public relations or propaganda. For example, if the theme, discourse and format lead to emotionally charged messages, chances are they are more along the lines of propaganda. If the appeals, discourse, format and themes result in messages based on rational thought and socially responsible information, chances are they are more along the lines of public relations. Only after documenting the appeals, discourse, format and themes, will I be able to apply these results to the synthesized propaganda model and public relations model. This detailed analysis will allow me to assess the ATAA's persuasive communication as public relations or propaganda.

At this time, I feel as though the coding sheet categories have been defined and will be applicable to the seven publications. However, because problems may arise as I conduct each of the seven analyses, I will be prepared to re-assess the categories or add to the "other"⁷ themes and discourse categories that will be applicable to the specific publication. At this point, one possible problem that may arise in the preliminary analysis is the mixture of themes and discourse in each publication. In other words, each publication may include more than one theme category or discourse category. While some themes and discourse categories may be more dominant than others, I think they are all important and must be discussed in the analysis. In

⁷ The "other" category is there to accommodate any additional themes, appeals or other important aspects of the close reading that may arise after the research has begun. Most research tends to change shape as it is being conducted; thus, I wanted the other category to be there to make sure I would be able to address the changes if and when they arise. The coding sheet actually changed form a few times before it became what it currently is in the appendix. It began as one coding sheet that incorporated all of the publications. It then became a coding sheet for each individual publication, but did not include a category for appeals. The category for appeals was added because of its importance in the study of persuasive communication efforts. This category will help differentiate between public relations or propaganda.

order to test the probability of a mixture of themes and discourse and the applicability of the coding sheet to the publications, I will pre-test the coding sheet.

I conducted the pre-test with an article that I am not going to use in the analysis of the seven publications because I felt that it would have been redundant of the four other articles that already discuss the relation of the alleged Armenian genocide to the Holocaust. Therefore, I conducted the pre-test using Bruce Fein's article "Differences Are Overwhelming," which compares the alleged Armenian genocide to the Holocaust. The following paragraphs will describe the findings of the coding sheet.

Fein's article is available for download on the ATAA Web site's reference library and was last accessed on November 26, 2006. The format of the publication is quite obvious in that it is a fleshed out argument. The article did reveal themes such as blaming the accuser, ethnic and racial identity and history and truth. The article blames the Armenians as the alleged perpetrators of genocide and also employs themes such as ethnic and racial identity in a comparison of the Armenians and the Jews. The appeal to irrationality was race and ethnicity. Fein makes the claim that the Jews were a race and therefore prosecuted because they were an inferior and unwanted race. The use of race presents the Jews as a hated race and the Nazis as racist. Race is indeed an appeal to irrationality and plays an important role in the dynamic of the article. Fein sets up the race issue from the very beginning when he writes that the Armenians were a favored religious minority in the Ottoman Empire and were unlike the Jews because the Jews were exterminated because of their race. The appeals in Fein's article also appeal to rationality, at least on the surface. Fein uses the comparison between the alleged Armenian genocide and the Holocaust to his advantage in the sense that a comparison makes for easier comprehension for the reader. However, the reason I say that this comparison is an appeal to rationality on the surface is because it is a false

comparison in that Fein is comparing apples to oranges. He sets up the claim that the Armenians are a religious minority and Jews are a race. While this claim leads to a false comparison, on the surface it seems as though a comparison of such a horrific event that has been labeled genocide (the Holocaust) to the Armenian claim of genocide is a credible comparison. Another appeal to rationality is seen in the article's use of experts. Both Fein's credentials as an adjunct scholar and ATAA general counsel member, as well as his mention of other historians such as William Langer, Stanford Shaw, Bernard Lewis and Justin McCarthy are examples of Fein's appeal to rationality. Finally, Fein appeals to rationality when he states that the reasons for the Armenian deaths were political and therefore cannot be considered genocide. He refers to the premeditated nature of genocide and suggests that political retaliations cannot be considered genocide because, after all, former U.S. President Harry Truman's retaliatory attack on Hiroshima and Nagasaki would then be considered genocide as well.

In regard to discourse, the article has modifiers that dispel doubt as well as nouns with negative and positive connotations and denotations. Modifiers that dispel doubt include Fein's categorization of the Armenians as a "religious minority" and not a "race" like the Jews (Fein, p. 1-2). The other modifiers that dispel doubt in this article include Fein's labeling the Armenians as a "political" group whose allegiance to the Ottoman Empire's enemies caused an "unfortunate fall-out" of the Armenians (p. 3). These modifiers dispel doubt because they help eliminate the possibility of that the Armenian allegation of genocide is true. Instead, these modifiers present the idea that the Armenian allegation of genocide fails the test of premeditation because the Armenian "fall-out" was a result of political reasons (p. 3). Also, another important modifier that dispels doubt is the use of the Armenian's "unpersuasive" claims (p. 3). Fein writes that Morgenthau's evidence is "entirely hearsay" and "highly suspect" (p. 3). He claims that because

Morgenthau's translator and secretary were Armenian, his evidence and reports to President Wilson were biased and does not provide for a "racial, ethnic or religious" motivation for genocide (p. 3). Instead, Fein uses these modifiers to dispel doubt about Morgenthau's evidence once again to claim that the reasons behind the Armenian deaths were political and that does not constitute genocide. Finally, the article includes nouns with both a negative and positive connotation and denotation. The nouns with a negative connotation and denotation include "guerilla," "counter-massacre," "exterminated" and "genocide" (p. 1-5). Nouns of this nature do not seem concentrated in the document and from a preliminary observation do not seem to jump out to the reader. Instead, the nouns with a positive connotation and denotation such as "liked" and "favored," seem to stand out more because they relate to the theme of the Armenians being a favored religious minority and not a race that was disfavored. Instead, these nouns contribute to the theme that race and religion plays in the article, and, most importantly, the impossible comparison between genocide (the Holocaust) and the Armenian allegation of genocide. This concludes the pre-test of Fein's article and the coding sheet.

While this pre-test only tests the coding sheet's usefulness, it does not go onto compare the results from the pre-text to the synthesized propaganda model and public relations model. Only after I use the preliminary results from the coding sheet can I go onto compare the results to the synthesized propaganda model and public relations model. After these assessments are complete, I will be able to determine the degree to which the ATAA's campaign is public relations or propaganda. Then, I will be able to judge the ATAA's behavior as ethical or unethical. If the ATAA's behavior is ethical, the organization probably uses public relations to persuade its publics. If the ATAA's behavior is propaganda, the ATAA is probably using propaganda for its persuasive purposes.

Addressing the ATAA's use of public relations or propaganda will then lead to a discussion on whether the ATAA is socially responsible. An organization is socially responsible when the organization disseminates information that will allow individuals to make decisions based on reason and not fear and emotion. Ideally, a persuasive communication campaign will use public relations (the ethical form of persuasive communication) to provide its publics with socially responsible information. On the other hand, an organization that uses propaganda (the unethical form of persuasive communication) will withhold socially responsible information from its publics. Thus, ethics and the type of persuasive communication (public relations or propaganda) are important to note as they can foreshadow an organization's focus on social responsibility. The close reading and noting of the appeals, discourse, format and themes, will provide a fair assessment of the ATAA's use of public relations or propaganda and coincidentally, ethical or unethical behavior. This conclusion will then determine whether the ATAA is socially responsible.

CHAPTER 6 ANALYSIS

This qualitative case study will analyze the seven publications available for download on the ATAA's site. In order to analyze the seven publications, I will conduct a close reading of the text of the seven selected publications available in full-text on the ATAA Web site. While I conduct the close reading of the text, I will document aspects of the text including the appeals, themes, discourse and format on each publication's coding sheet [found in Appendix C]. Additionally, I will document similarities, differences and repetitions of thematic patterns in each publication. These elements are essential features to note when conducting a close reading because they will reveal the intended meaning and direction of each publication.

Findings from the use of the coding sheet will allow me to categorize the findings from each publication, which will aide my analysis of the campaign as either public relations or propaganda. In this chapter, I will describe the actual appearance of the publication, provide a brief overview of the publication's content, present the data for each section of the coding sheet and present conclusions for each individual publication. Only then, will I be able to synthesize the findings from each publication and use the synthesized propaganda model and public relations model in order to determine whether the ATAA's campaign uses propaganda as discussed in the works of Lasswell, Herman and Chomsky or public relations as Grunig and Hunt explain.

I will now describe the actual appearance of each publication, provide a brief overview of the publication's content, present the data for each section of the coding sheet and present conclusions for each of the seven selected publications from the ATAA's Web site reference library.

The Armenian Allegation of Genocide: Facts

Publication Description

“The Armenian Allegation of Genocide: Facts” is written by the ATAA. The publication is available for download on the ATAA Web site’s reference library and was last accessed on March 6, 2006. Because this version of the publication is available on the ATAA’s Web site, I imagine that it looks different than the original copy would look. At the very top of the publication is the title “The Armenian Allegation of Genocide: Facts” separated not by a colon as it is my reference of the title, but instead by a red line. The words, “The Armenian Allegation of Genocide,” appear in black bold letters and are separated from the word “Facts” (which appears in a much larger red bold san-serif type-face) by a red line. The visual of the title foreshadows the theme of the publication, which is that the Armenian allegation of genocide is illogical because the ATAA presents the facts to discredit the allegation. The body or text of the publication is presented in a sans-serif font, single-spaced and flush left, with no indentions. The only way to distinguish the facts, supporting facts and paragraphs from one another are by the double spaced lines between them.

Although the ATAA takes credit as the author of this publication in the reference library, the organization does not present authorship on the actual document. Directly beneath the title are the words “The issue:” and then the issue: “Whether during the collapse of the Ottoman Empire genocide was perpetrated against Ottoman Armenian citizens in Eastern Anatolia” (ATAA, ¶1). After the issue is presented, the document is supported and divided into seven facts and supporting facts. There are no bullet points or numbers that separate the seven facts. Instead, they are presented single-spaced with a double space in between the facts and supporting facts. While there are no bullet points or numbers to distinguish between the seven facts with

supporting facts, there are seven separate topics within the publication that build upon the publication's themes of providing facts to discredit the Armenian allegation of genocide.

Therefore, the seven facts are presented single-space and in one sentence, often taking up only one line of text. After each fact is presented, the supporting facts and background information needed to address the fact presented. I will refer to the main fact presented as the *fact* and the subsequent facts as the *supporting facts* for the sake of this analysis. For example, the issue presented is “Whether during the collapse of the Ottoman Empire genocide was perpetrated against Ottoman Armenian citizens in Eastern Anatolia” (ATAA, ¶1). The issue is then followed up with background information regarding the history of the Ottoman Empire, the people [Turks] who ruled it, those [Armenians] who began the conflict, as well as the dominant theme of the publication – the Armenians have attempted to “extricate and isolate” their history from the rest of the people living in the “century of ever-increasing conflict” in the Ottoman Empire (ATAA, ¶3). This issue takes up six small paragraphs in total.

After the presentation of the issue, the seven facts are introduced as follows: “The complete story of the vast suffering of this period has not been written yet. When that story is told, the following facts must not be forgotten” (ATAA, ¶7). Thus, the ATAA prepares the reader for the introduction of the seven facts. The first fact is “Demographic studies prove that prior to World War I fewer than 1.5 million Armenians lived in the entire Ottoman Empire. Thus, allegations that more than 1.5 million Armenians from eastern Anatolia died must be false,” (ATAA, ¶7). This two-sentence fact is supported by two supporting issues for a total of three paragraphs, which address the Armenian claims of a pre-war population of more than 1.5 million. The ATAA writes that the British, French and Ottoman sources give total figures that suggest there were only 1.05 to 1.5 million Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire at the time.

This creates doubt and uncertainty for the Armenian claim that the Ottoman Turks killed 1.5 million Armenians.

The second fact, “Over 2.5 million Muslims died during the same period from similar causes,” is followed by one supporting fact that the non-Christians also suffered a high mortality rate (ATAA, ¶10-11). This fact is followed quickly by the third fact, “Armenian American evidence of genocide is derived from dubious and prejudicial sources,” which is then followed by two supporting facts regarding the wartime propaganda efforts of the Armenians and enemies of the Ottoman Empire, including the Armenian’s use of U.S. Ambassador to Armenia Henry Morgenthau’s reports to President Wilson. The fact brings up points such as the fact that Morgenthau’s translator was Armenian and therefore his reports were not conclusive or objective.

The fourth fact, “The Armenian deaths do not constitute genocide,” is followed by bulleted supporting facts (ATAA, ¶15). This is the first fact thus far to be supported facts labeled A through D. The supporting facts address the issue in regards to Armenian [minority] rebellion against the Ottoman Turks [majority]. The facts go onto make stronger claims including the fact that the Armenian rebellion can hardly be labeled as genocide since the Armenians started the conflict themselves. While the ATAA writes that the allegation is illogical, the organization does agree with historian Bernard Lewis, who is quoted as saying that the Armenians did “suffer terribly” (ATAA, ¶18). In fact, the ATAA continues to echo Lewis’ comments regarding dismissing the events as an “ethnic dispute,” instead of genocide since [supporting fact D] the term genocide did not even exist during that time (ATAA, ¶18-21).

In the fifth fact, “The British convened the Malta Tribunal to try Ottoman officials for crimes against Armenians. All of the accused were acquitted,” the ATAA makes another bold

statement and provides evidence to support its claim that the allegation of genocide is illogical (ATAA, ¶22). This fact continues to remain important as the publication nears an end with the sixth fact, “Despite the acquittals by the Malta Tribunal, Armenian terrorists have engaged in vigilante war that continues today” (ATAA, ¶24). This fact is followed by a small paragraph, which discusses a secret Armenian network Nemesis that assassinated Talat and Jemal Pasha [leaders of the Ottoman Empire at the time of the alleged genocide] and other Turkish diplomats to seek revenge.

Finally, the ATAA presents its seventh and final fact, “The Holocaust bears no meaningful relation to the Ottoman Armenian experience,” which is supported by another set of numbered supporting facts (1 through 4). These four, two to three sentences and supporting facts seek to dispel the Armenian claim that their conflict with the Turks resembles the conflict between the Jews and the Nazis during the Holocaust. The four supporting facts address the claims that the Jews did not rebel against the Nazis and/or Hitler, but that the perpetrators of the Holocaust were tried and acquitted, concluding that the “depth and volume of scholarship on the Holocaust is tremendous,” but the study of the late Ottoman Empire remains inconclusive (ATAA, ¶31). Immediately following the final statement/fact, the publication provides a suggested reading list of 11 publications that are single-spaced with a double space in between.

Now that I have described the publication in detail, I will provide a brief summary of the article to be followed by a discussion of the coding sheet findings and analysis.

Publication Summary

After carefully reading the article, I found the main point of the publication to be that the Armenian allegation of genocide is built around the Armenians’ isolation of their history. According to the ATAA, the Armenians have isolated their history to make it seem as though

they were subject to genocide – when history and documentation suggests that non-Christians also suffered greatly during the time 1912-1922. It was a period of great conflict and the Armenians have isolated themselves from the rest of the groups involved in conflict at that time. They have excluded themselves, perhaps suggesting that their [Armenians] lives are worth more than those of the non-Christians who also perished. Thus, the ATAA claims that the Armenians are not allowing for a fair debate and are limiting free speech.

The publication begins with the statement of the issue (that “whether during the collapse of the Ottoman Empire genocide was perpetrated against the Ottoman Armenian citizens in Eastern Anatolia”) and then goes on to explain that the Turks ruled as the majority during the Ottoman Empire (ATAA, ¶1). The ATAA writes that conflict arose in the Ottoman Empire beginning in the 1820s and culminating in the founding of the Republic of Turkey in 1923. The result of this period of conflict was the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire. During the period of conflict, prior to the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire, millions of Christians and non-Christians died. The Armenians, however, have attempted to “extricate and isolate” their history (ATAA, ¶2-3). The ATAA then goes on to introduce the seven facts that back up their claim that the Armenians suffered along with other citizens of the Ottoman Empire, but are attempting to only tell their side of the story and labeling all who do not agree as a genocide denier.

Following the statement of the issue and some background information, the first fact and supporting facts are introduced; and this presentation follows suit with the rest of the six facts and supporting facts. After the presentation of the seventh and final fact, there is a list of suggested reading. This list includes 11 publications, which from the look of the list range from publications written by the ATAA, Turkish authors, and American authors (McCarthy, Lowry). Most of the publication seem to be articles that either stand alone, or are apart of larger

publications such as the *Political Communication and Persuasion* journal. While I have discussed the format and the main point of the ATAA's publication, I will now go in depth with an explanation of the coding sheet findings.

Coding Sheet Findings

I used the coding sheet [found in Appendix E] to code the following categories of the ATAA's publication: format, themes, appeals, discourse, as well as patterns in the text.

Format

"The Armenian Allegation of Genocide: Facts," is written by the ATAA and is the skeleton of an argument because while some of it is written in paragraph form, the publication itself is formatted with an overarching issue, seven facts and supporting facts. The publication does have a beginning and an end, but the middle of the publication, usually referred to as the body with supporting evidence, is segmented into facts and supporting facts. These facts and supporting facts are evidence within the publication, but can also stand alone as facts and discussion points and are therefore not imperative to the publication. In other words, if one or two of the facts and supporting facts are taken out of the publication, it might not be evident. The more facts and supporting facts there are, the more evidence there is; but, there is no logical construct to the publication that makes it stand as strong as a full-fledged argument. Therefore, it is definitely a skeleton of an argument.

Themes

Using the coding sheet, I found the themes of blaming the accuser, ethnic/racial identity and history and truth. The theme of blaming the accuser is seen throughout the publication, as the Armenians are seen isolating themselves from the non-Christians who also suffered greatly during this period. The publication states that the "Armenian Americans have attempted to

extricate and isolate their history from complex circumstances in which their ancestors were embroiled” (p. 1). The ATAA also states that the Armenians have attempted to hinder free speech. “Armenian Americans seek to deny this right [to free speech] to others by branding anyone who disagrees with their portrayal of the genocide as a “genocide denier” (p. 1). These genocide deniers who attempt to “challenge the credibility of witnesses, or authenticity of documents” are the Armenians (p. 1). These statements portray the Armenians as the ones who are denying the Turks or anyone who speaks out against the genocide allegations the right to freedom of speech. Not only does this portrayal damage the Armenians reputation, but it also reduces their [Armenian] claims from being facts, which we assume deal with truth and historical evidence, to mere accusations, which are always associated with a negative connotation. This negative connotation thus diminishes the credibility of the Armenian claims and allegations of genocide. The introduction of this theme leads the ATAA into the other theme noted in the publication – blaming the accuser.

The theme of blaming the accuser is apparent in the publication as the ATAA suggests that the allegation has never been proven and that the continuation of the allegation does not allow for a fair debate. Thus, the Turks cannot talk about the genocide as an allegation without being labeled a genocide denier. To make it worse, during the conflict historical sources such as U.S. Ambassador to Armenia Henry Morgenthau and J.G. Harbord, a lieutenant general in the U.S. Army during World War I, were dependent upon Armenian sources and translators to describe to them what was going on during the period of conflict in the Ottoman Empire. Thus, the ATAA states, that the information derived from Morgenthau and Harbord are biased and untrue. However, these sources are often quoted and their names assign credibility to the Armenian allegation of genocide, which in turn hurts the Turks from telling their side. This is

where the reader really begins to put together the notion that the Turks are not trying to deny that during the century of conflict no Armenians died, but that both Christians and non-Christians died in the conflict and that the Armenians were not sought out and massacred. Most always, Morgenthau and Harbord have suggested that the Turks were an “inferior race,” which then brings into play the theme of ethnic and racial identity.

Thus, the theme of ethnic/racial identity is seen in this publication through the ATAA’s statements that the Armenians positioned themselves as a racial and ethnic minority who were relocated because of an “ethnic dispute.” While the ATAA does claim that a ethnic dispute did ensue during the time, it was because the Turks were the majority and the Armenians were the minority. Therefore, when there is conflict between the majority and minority of a land, there exists an ethnic dispute in which the victor is almost always the majority. In response to the ethnic dispute, the ATAA states that the Armenians have only focused on their deaths and not the deaths of their Muslim counterparts. The fact that they [the Armenians] have ignored the deaths and losses of these other groups suggests that they do not value non-Christian lives. The ATAA claims that more than 2.5 million Muslims died during the same time “from similar causes” (p. 1). This was, after all, a “century of ever-increasing conflict...” (p. 1). While the ATAA recognizes that the “Armenians suffered a high mortality,” the Armenians do not consider the number of non-Christian dead. The ATAA writes that “documents of the time describe intercommunal violence, forced migration of all ethnic groups, disease and famine as causes of death” (p. 2). Thus, they write, that the years 1912-1922 constitute a horrible period for humanity, not just for Armenians. Instead, this was a time of suffering for all who lived in the Ottoman Empire at the time.

The theme of racial and ethnic identity is also seen, perhaps the strongest, in the seventh and final fact in which the ATAA writes that the “Ottoman Armenian experience” bears no resemblance to the Jewish Holocaust. The Jews were specifically targeted and attacked by the Nazi party because of a racial hatred. The Armenians, the ATAA, claims were tolerated and liked even though they were the notable minority. They were not persecuted because of their religion or residence in the Ottoman Empire. Instead, it is the Armenians who joined forces with the Nazis, forming a battalion, issuing pro-Nazi and anti-Jewish propaganda in their daily papers. As the seventh and final fact before the suggested reading list in the ATAA publication, this is the strongest supporting fact of the theme of ethnic and racial identity. It actually comes as a surprise because it completely transitions the individual facts which support the issue in the opening statement directly and goes into a comparison of the “Ottoman Armenian experience” to the Holocaust. The surprising point in this comparison is the fact that it is not alluded to in the publication until this point in the publication – the end. It does serve as a shocking conclusion to the publication, but really throws the reader a curve ball because it makes four very specific points as to why there is no relationship between the Armenian experience in the Ottoman Empire and the Jewish experience during the Holocaust. Perhaps what is most impressive is the fact that the seventh fact and really the ATAA’s publication ends with the statement, “The depth and volume of scholarship of the Holocaust is tremendous. By contrast, much about the late Ottoman Empire has yet to be learned and many conclusions have yet to be drawn” (ATAA, ¶ 31). This is interesting because the previous 30 paragraphs and three pages of text has been spent introducing facts and supporting facts that discredit the Armenian allegation of genocide. Then, the ATAA introduces the seventh fact, which provides evidence to show that there is no relationship between the Armenian experience and the Holocaust, but ends with a statement

which claims there is not enough research and insight into the late Ottoman Empire's period. Thus, I find it hard to believe that the Armenian experience has no relationship to the Holocaust if there is no depth of scholarship and information on the late Ottoman Empire. If there is no depth, then there can be no definite answer into the comparison between the Holocaust and the Armenian experience.

I also find it interesting that in the beginning of the publication, the ATAA introduces the issue (whether the Armenians were treated in a genocidal manner) very matter-of-factly and neutrally. Then, the ATAA quickly provides background information to show that during the Ottoman Empire there was decades of conflict and death of both Christians and non-Christians. They also make the claim that the Armenians have attempted to isolate and extricate their history from the history of the time and have relied on prejudicial and biased sources to serve as their evidence. The ATAA concludes the issue statement with the fact that the Armenians are limiting free speech by not allowing anyone to speak out against the genocide, yet the ATAA has put together this document for a reason – to speak out against the allegation of genocide. Thus, the claim that the Armenians are not allowing anyone to speak out against the allegation begins to lose power, especially when the next few pages are dedicated to seven facts and a number of supporting facts to come to the conclusion that the Armenians have isolated their history and thus they were not treated improperly by the Ottoman Turks and that their allegation of genocide is inappropriate because they were the minority who rebelled against the majority [the Ottoman Turks]. In fact, the publication states that the reason the Armenians were “relocated” was not because they were beneath the other citizens of the Ottoman Empire, but because it was the result of an “ethnic dispute.” The ATAA claims that it was the Armenians who believe they are inferior to the non-Christians who lived and died in the Ottoman Empire during the same time.

While the Armenians only tell one side of the story, the ATAA writes that the “century of ever-increasing conflict” was the reason members of both communities perished (p. 1). This leads me into the discussion of the next apparent theme – history and truth.

History and truth is another dominant theme in the ATAA’s publication. The ATAA insists that the Armenian reports of atrocities and deaths are false and that the 1.5 million death toll the Armenians claim to have suffered is impossible because there are other sources which report that there were only 1.5 million Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire at that time. This suggests that the Armenian sources are inaccurate and that there lies a discrepancy in the actual number of Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire at that time. The article also states that the Armenians are “infusing history with myth” in that they vilify the Republic of Turkey, Turkish Americans and ethnic Turks worldwide (ATAA, 2006, p. 1). They [Armenians] have “attempted to extricate and isolate their history from the complex circumstances in which their ancestors were embroiled” (p. 1). The ATAA uses history as a credible source to influence the reader into believing that the allegation of genocide is untrue and cannot be proven because the Armenians use biased and one-sided sources and have isolated their history from the history of the period. On the contrary, the ATAA writes that the “years 1912-1922 constitute a horrible period for humanity, not just for Armenians” (p. 2). They claim that it was a century of conflict, as problems occurred throughout the Ottoman Empire, as numerous groups of invaders and conquerors passed through the empire.

Interestingly enough, in the beginning of the publication, after the presentation of the issue and before the first fact, the ATAA writes that the period of conflict in the Ottoman Empire led to the death of millions of millions of Muslims, Jews and Christians. Considering that Jews are not categorized as Christians and neither are Muslims, this statement qualifies that millions

of Christians died. The only group of Christians who lived and died in this period of conflict then is the Armenians. However, the first fact and two supporting facts are discredited because they claim that there were only 1.05 to 1.5 million Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire at the time, therefore the 1.5 million death toll the Armenians refer to cannot be accurate. However, after the issue is stated, the ATAA writes that millions of Christians died during this time.

Early in the publication, particularly following the issue and before the beginning of the seven facts and supporting facts, there is a contradiction in the ATAA's statements. First the ATAA presents the issue of whether the Armenians were massacred in a genocide, neutrally, but then immediately follows up with information that suggest that millions of Christians and non-Christians died during the century of conflict, and then goes on to say that the Armenian allegation of genocide is inaccurate and prohibits the right to free speech and that the following seven facts must be considered as well, beginning with the fact that there were fewer than 1.5 million Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire at the time.

The theme of history and truth then returns to my discussion of the seventh fact regarding the comparison of the Holocaust to the Armenian experience. If there no real depth into the late Ottoman Empire, then how can it be true that the historical facts in the Holocaust and the Armenian experience have no relation to one another. It is hard to see the truth in that because the ATAA chooses to end the publication with such a strong statement, "The depth and volume of scholarship on the Holocaust is tremendous. By contrast, much about the late Ottoman Empire has yet to be learned and many conclusions have yet to be drawn," (ATAA, ¶31). This section, fact seven, definitely fits into the category of history and truth, but really discredits the section because of the statement at the very end of the publication because the statement contradicts the section. The presentation of fact seven's four supporting facts are strong, but then come to the

final contradictory statement that there needs to be a more in depth discussion of the Ottoman Armenian experience. When there needs to be “more conclusions drawn,” how can the ATAA draw the conclusion that there is no relationship between the Armenian experience and the Holocaust. And, by choosing to end with this contradictory statement, how can a conclusion be drawn in regards to the ATAA’s claim that the Turks did not massacre 1.5 million Armenians and that while there was period of conflict during the Ottoman Empire between the Christians and non-Christians, there was no genocide against the Armenians because the Armenians rebelled against the Turks and the Turks responded in what the ATAA claims was an ethnic conflict.

The themes of blaming the accuser, ethnic and racial identity as well as history and truth are seen throughout the publication’s seven facts individually, but are seen together in the opening discussion of the issue. The three themes are seen in each of the facts individually as some [fact one and two] discuss the demographic studies and racial make-up of the Ottoman Empire and the deaths of Christians and Muslims. The facts then introduce the notion of the genocidal claims being prejudiced and inaccurate because the reports by sources such as Morgenthau and Harbord are inaccurate and were the result of Armenian translators and Armenian propaganda. The ATAA writes that the claims of genocide are illogical because the Armenians were the minority who rebelled against the majority [the Turks] and were relocated because of an ethnic dispute. In fact four’s supporting fact D, the ATAA writes that the term genocide is a crime of “specific intent,” and that requires intent on the side of the Turks. Thus, the ATAA writes that the Armenian allegation of genocide does not include intent because the Armenians rebelled against the Turks and therefore the Turks responded out of duty because they were the majority in the Ottoman Empire. Thus, the Turks job as the majority meant they had to

protect the Ottoman Empire against the minority's rebellion. This, the ATAA claims, does not represent genocide since genocide is described as an action which requires specific intent. Specific intent, according to the definition of genocide, is that which the Nazis inflicted on the Jewish population, resulting in the Holocaust [genocide]. The Jews were purposely persecuted against and were not tolerated because of their ethnic and racial make-up. Yet, the ATAA writes, the Armenians did not suffer at the hands of the Turks because of their religion or ethnic and racial identity.

The publication's themes are important to note because they reveal the direction of the publication, which involves the appeals to rationality and irrationality. The appeals to rationality and irrationality are necessary to understand because they back-up the themes and make the reader agree with or disagree with the publication's points.

Appeals

In the coding sheet's appeals section, there are three options that suggest that the publication can appeal to rationality, irrationality or another appeal category that comes as a result of an in depth reading of the publication. The appeals in this case are noted because they refer to the presentation of the publication's points and can be categorized as appeals that appeal to rationality [meaning that they do not attempt to make the reader make decisions based on fear and emotion] and those that appeal to irrationality [meaning they result in decisions based on emotion, fear and tactics that appeal to an emotional and irrational response].

In regard to the appeals, the publication appeals to rationality and irrationality. The appeal to rationality is in the use of the facts and supporting points, which are backed up with information including statistics and reference to other sources, sources besides the Armenians and the Turks. For example, in fact one the ATAA writes of the demographic studies of the

Ottoman Empire's Armenians and uses British, French and Ottoman sources that report that there were fewer than 1.5 million Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire during the time of the conflict (ATAA, ¶7-8). Also, the ATAA introduces sources and information derived from historians and political figures such as Admiral Mark L. Bristol [U.S. Ambassador to Turkey from 1920-1926] and Bernard Lewis (ATAA, ¶14-18). The appeal to rationality is also strong in the fourth fact's supporting fact D, in which the ATAA writes that the term genocide did not exist until 1944. This fact is an appeal to rationality in that it discredits the Armenian allegation of genocide, since the term came into existence more than twenty years after the genocide. Thus, this presents the Armenian allegation of genocide is illogical and thus appeals to an individual's ability to make a rational decision. This also allows the ATAA to make the assumption that the Armenian deaths do not constitute genocide if the term did not even exist at this time.

The appeal to rationality is also seen in the publication when the ATAA introduces fact five in which the ATAA writes that the British were convened at the Malta Tribunal to try the Ottoman officials for crimes against the Armenians and were acquitted (ATAA, ¶22). This a definite appeal to rationality because it shows the reader that the Ottoman Turks were tried in a court of law and found not guilty of crimes against the Armenians. It gives the Turks credibility as investigators and seekers of the truth. It shows that they were tried and not convicted in committing atrocities against the Armenians. And, the appeal to rationality continues in fact six in which the ATAA writes that the Armenians have continued to terrorize Turks, engaging in "vigilante war," killing Turks even after the Malta Tribunal trials (ATAA, ¶24-25). Finally, the appeal to rationality is seen in the seventh fact in which the ATAA writes that there does not exist a relationship between the Holocaust and the Armenian experience during the Ottoman Empire. As discussed previously, this is the final fact and really comes as a surprise to the reader

because there is no allusion to this comparison in the text prior to the seventh fact. However, while this fact is an appeal to rationality in the presentation and four supporting facts, it quickly becomes an appeal to irrationality in the final statement and end of the publication which claims that the depth and volume of scholarship of the late Ottoman Empire is incomparable to the depth of scholarship and information regarding the Holocaust. This statement contradicts the fact and its supporting fact, but really paints a grim picture on the publication, which up to this point has presented seven strong facts with several supporting facts, introducing and shedding light on the Armenian accusations of genocide.

Thus, the ATAA's publication also appeals to irrationality in that it suggests that there is lack of a real debate and that the Armenians are causing the problem and limiting the Turkish right to free speech. The other appeal to irrationality is that, according to the ATAA, the Armenians suffered terribly because of an ethnic dispute, which does not constitute genocide. These appeals to irrationality can cause the reader to become confused and uncomfortable because they have just learned that there is no real debate between the two groups, but are certain that the ATAA has still chosen to adamantly deny that the Armenians were massacred and expelled from the Ottoman Empire. Instead, the ATAA adamantly states that the Armenians were relocated and died along the way. The ATAA also consistently reminds the reader that non-Christians perished during this time of "ever-increasing conflict" as well and that the "years 1912-1922 constitute a horrible period for humanity, not just for Armenians" (p. 2). Thus, this results in an appeal to irrationality because the reader is introduced to the issue that the Armenians may have suffered at the hands of the Turks, but then that they did not and the genocide allegation is illogical because it was a period of conflict between the majority and minority and the rebellion of the minority resulted in the majority's reaction.

Another appeal to irrationality includes the ATAA's questioning of U.S. Ambassador to Armenia Henry Morgenthau (ATAA, ¶12-13). The ATAA claims that his reports were biased and falsely proclaimed the idea that the Turks felt they were inferior to the Armenians. Thus, the ATAA concludes that Morgenthau's accounts cannot be considered as objective and truthful (ATAA, 2006, p. 2). Not only was Morgenthau's translator Armenian, but the ATAA suggests that most sources who were sent to provide a third-party report about the on goings of the Ottoman Empire at the time were given Armenian sources to dictate and translate. This assigns credibility to the Turkish claim and significantly reduces the credibility of the Armenian sources.

The final section of the coding sheet allows me to note the discourse in the text, which refers to the key modifiers like relocation, civil war, so-called or alleged that can be categorized as modifiers that dispel doubt, raise doubt and nouns with a negative connotation and denotation and positive connotation and denotation. Thus, I used the coding sheet to note the discourse and found that the ATAA's publication includes modifiers that dispel doubt, raise doubt and nouns with a negative connotation and denotation.

Discourse

The modifiers that dispel doubt include the following: "protect relocated Armenians," "Armenian experience," "many died at this time," "relocation," "ethnic dispute," and "external and internal problems" (p. 1-4). These modifiers that dispel doubt relate to the positioning of the Armenian allegation of genocide. The modifiers dispel doubt because they position the Armenian allegation of genocide as a simple relocation or result of an ethnic dispute. The conflict between the citizens of the Ottoman Empire [mostly the Muslim Turks and the Christian Armenians] was the result of internal problems and the Armenian rebellions. These rebellions were then met with Ottoman Turkish resistance. As the ATAA writes, the Turkish majority had

no choice but to respond to the Armenian minority's rebellions. Thus, the terms minimize the severity of the events and allegation of genocide.

While the publication is comprised of 31 paragraphs of text, the following discourse: "protect relocated Armenians," "Ottoman Armenian experience," "many died at this time," "relocation," "ethnic dispute," and "external and internal problems" are the modifiers that dispel doubt and are used throughout the publication to dispel doubt. The phrase "protect relocated Armenians," makes the reader think that the Turks were trying to protect the Armenian population while they relocated them because they rebelled against the majority's rule of the empire. The phrase "many died at this time," "ethnic dispute," and "external and internal problems" all relate to the ATAA's point that during the Ottoman Empire's rule there existed conflicts between the majority and minority, and the ethnic dispute and external and internal problems [relating to Armenian support of the Russians] among the Ottoman Turks and Armenians caused the relocation. Thus, this makes the reader think that it was the appropriate response to the Armenian rebellions and conflict. If there is conflict, one is usually the victor, as we can see in history. There is usually no compromise that allows both parties to be the victors. Thus these modifiers dispel doubt and allow the reader to see that the Turks did not intentionally remove the Ottoman Armenians from the empire and were instead forced to relocate them because of their rebellious nature against the empire's majority.

The modifiers that raise doubt include the "Armenians suffered a high mortality," "their [Armenian] attempts to use the Armenian massacres to diminish the worth of the Jewish Holocaust," "vilify," "ethnic dispute," and "challenge the credibility of witness and authenticity of documents." These modifiers and phrases allow readers to question the validity of the claims the ATAA makes. For example, the ATAA does admit that the Armenians suffered a high

mortality, but their deaths do not constitute genocide. The ATAA also challenges the credibility of the Armenian sources, suggesting that Morgenthau's aides were Armenian and no doubt gave him biased information. The ATAA also makes the claim that the Armenian allegation of genocide is in no way comparable to the Jewish Holocaust. Thus, this claim allows readers to question the validity of the Armenian's statements and claims.

These modifiers that raise doubt allow the reader to question the ATAA's claim, much like the statements on the Holocaust and Armenian experience. The phrases such as the "Armenians suffered a high mortality," raises the question of what that high mortality is since the ATAA claims at first that millions of Christians died in the conflict, but then states in its first fact that the Armenian population at that time could not allow for 1.5 million Armenians to die. The second phrase, "their [Armenian] attempts to use the Armenian massacres to diminish the worth of the Jewish Holocaust," questions the ATAA's claim that the Holocaust bears no resemblance to the Armenian experience, yet in the final statement the ATAA writes that there is no significant scholarly research about the late Ottoman Empire. If there is not enough research then how can the ATAA claim that the Armenians are attempting to diminish the worth of the Holocaust if they claim that it bears no resemblance. It is a contradiction any way the reader looks into it. Finally, the modifiers that raise doubt also include "vilify," "ethnic dispute," and "challenge the credibility of witness and authenticity of documents" because they allow the reader to question the Turkish treatment of the Armenians and their story. If the ATAA and Ottoman Turks were allowed to react to the Armenian rebellions and are not telling the reader how they reacted, but explaining in detail the Armenian terrorism and vigilante war, then how come the ATAA is not forthcoming about their treatment. Also, how is it that the ATAA can diminish the worth of the Armenian sources, but suggest that the Armenians do not allow the

Turks to challenge the credibility of their sources. Again, it presents a contradiction on the Turkish side and leaves the reader questioning the validity of the Turkish sources and story. Finally, from the close reading of this text, there were no uses of nouns with a positive connotation and denotation.

Analysis

Using the close reading and the coding sheet, I found that the ATAA's publication focuses on the claim that the deaths of the Armenians cannot be genocide as the term did not exist in 1915-1918, and, most importantly, because the Armenians have managed to isolate their history from the other non-Christians who perished in the Ottoman Empire as well. The Armenians have isolated their history in a "century of ever-increasing conflict," and one in which there were many tragedies on both sides (p. 2). Patterns in the text reveal thematic patterns of blaming the accuser, history and truth and ethnic and racial identity. The notion of the Armenians as a religious minority, who like the non-Christians also died because the increasing conflict in the Ottoman Empire during the years 1915-1918. The patterns also reveal that the Armenians were a group that has isolated their history from that of the millions living in the Ottoman Empire at the time. It seems unfair that a group like the Armenians can separate their history from others who shared in their pain and tragedy, especially since they are seen in a negative, prejudicial light. The Armenians are highlighting their history over the history of the Turks and other non-Christians living in the Ottoman Empire.

While this is the overarching theme of the article, the results of the coding sheet allow me to see the contradictions that lie within the text. Reading the text only on the surface, really paints the Armenians in a negative light because the themes, facts and supporting facts are powerfully stated. While the facts and supporting facts and entire document is not supported by

sources for the evidence, there are mentions of political figures, countries [the British and French sources in fact one, paragraph eight] and historians [Bernard Lewis in paragraph 18] the sources are not attributed and that really makes the reader question the validity of the statements. The publication includes a suggested reading list, but more importantly does not include a bibliography or reference section of the sources. There are no footnotes or endnotes to discuss where the statements originated, they are only reference in the actual statement with a name.

Thus, while at the surface the publication appears to be very convincing, the coding sheet has allowed me to look into the text and pull out the contradictions of each fact and supporting fact. These contradictions are really apparent in the facts that include the population figures of the millions dead but no more than 1.5 million Ottoman Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire. Major contradictions are also seen in the seventh fact in which the ATAA writes that there is no resemblance between the Ottoman Armenian experience and the Holocaust, but then contradicts itself by ending the entire publication, not just the fact, with the fact that there needs to be more in depth study of this time in the late Ottoman Empire. The analysis of this text has led me to believe that it is full of contradictions and ends on note which questions the credibility of the publication's themes and overarching point that the Ottoman Armenian allegation of genocide is illogical. The analysis of the text and use of the coding sheet will allow me to draw larger conclusions after the six other texts have been analyzed. Once this is complete, I will be able to use the analysis to draw much larger conclusions in regard to the synthesized propaganda model and public relations model. I will now continue with a discussion of the next publication, "The First Shot," written by Justin McCarthy.

The First Shot

Publication Description

“The First Shot” was written by Justin McCarthy, a professor of history at the University of Louisville. This article was first presented at a conference in Istanbul at Yeditepe University. “The First Shot” is available for download on the ATAA’s Web site reference library and was last accessed on March 6, 2006. McCarthy’s article is available for download from the ATAA’s Web site and is presented in the format of a journalistic article with the title of the article, the byline with the author’s name, title and a mention of the article’s origin.

The article is comprised of 95 paragraphs that are anywhere from one to eleven sentences long. The 95 paragraphs are single spaced and separated from one another by a double space in between. All paragraphs are flushed left with no paragraph indentions. Each line begins at the same spot on the page, flush left. Intermittently, a one or two sentence paragraph will appear alone. This is usually a bold statement and repetitious theme such as “It was not the Turks who attacked the Armenians. It was the Armenians who attacked the Turks,” that appears throughout the article (McCarthy, ¶36). This statement is repeated throughout the article and is meant to reinforce the fact that the Armenian accusation of genocide is illogical because the Armenians started the rebellion against the Turks and the Turks responded because of the rebellion. Thus, the Turks could not have premeditated their behavior against the Armenians, and, as we know genocide is a term, which refers to intent and premeditated actions against a group of people.

McCarthy begins his article by giving advice to historians and prefacing his credibility on writing such an article. He continues his reference to historians and the truth throughout the article and ends the article with his personal opinions that the question of who started the conflict is both morally and historically important. Those who began the conflict, he writes, were the

Armenian nationalists and revolutionaries. He ends with a powerful statement, in which he writes, “The guilt is on their heads” (McCarthy, ¶94). At the end of the article, McCarthy’s name appears once again. This notation of authorship mimics the closing signature one would see on a letter.

In the first paragraph he introduces the historians creed and duty to write only the truth through the review of “all relevant sources” (McCarthy, ¶1). In the second and third paragraph he poses the question of whether historians follow this creed. He writes that “there are ways to tell if a historian is true to his craft” (McCarthy, ¶2-3). He states that the way to tell whether a historian has been true to his craft is to check the sources that he has reviewed. He then begins the next paragraph with the fact that historians have to deal with facts and, at times, uncomfortable facts that may not agree with the historian’s beliefs. There will be facts that one is forced to deal with to get to the truth. In the fifth paragraph, he writes that historians as well as politicians must also deal with the duty to the truth. “They must look honestly at the historical record, the whole historical record” (McCarthy, ¶5). The politicians and historians must deal with the truth and seek the truth from all relevant sources; and, while this should be obvious, he writes in the next paragraph, he states that there are many who have evaded this necessary rule. There are parliaments, he writes, that have ignored the truth and all relevant sources to pass resolutions on the Armenian Genocide without a detailed study of all sources. The parliaments of France and the European Union, McCarthy writes, do not have a detailed study of the alleged genocide nor do they have the training to make such a decision to pass a resolution recognizing the genocide. “To them [the members of the parliaments] I offer this unsolicited advice: if you cannot do the work necessary to find the truth, say nothing,” writes McCarthy (McCarthy, ¶6). Historians who

do not seek the truth because they refuse to study the whole issue anger McCarthy. Those historians, he writes, are only pretending to be a historian (McCarthy, ¶9).

In the next paragraph, he introduces the “Armenian Question,” which he writes has been discussed at various meetings in Germany and America. The meetings were held behind closed doors and are not open to the public or anyone who has any doubt about the existence of the genocide. Even the Turks who have attended these meetings are asked to answer the question of whether there was a genocide and if they do not answer correctly, they are not allowed to attend the meetings. Thus these meetings, McCarthy writes, are political gatherings in which no one is allowed to disagree. McCarthy writes that the freedom to disagree is not the way of the Armenian nationalists. In paragraph 13 he writes, “I hope this is never the way of the Turks” (McCarthy, ¶13). He then says that most Turks who disagree with their counterparts [that there was never a genocide] sound as though the Armenian nationalists have written them. They anger McCarthy as he begins to state in the next statement and goes onto say that he does not rebuke these people because they disagree with him, but because they betray scholarship (McCarthy, ¶16).

Throughout the next few paragraphs he advises the reader that they should not be afraid of debate and that he calls for honest debate and asks parliamentarians and historians to forget the politics and ask the real questions, which he says “whatever they believe the Turks did, whether genocide or self-defense, why would the Turks do it?” (McCarthy, ¶16-18). He says one of the main problems with the Armenian nationalist explanation has always been the question of why the Turks would attack the Armenians when the Armenians were allowed to live in the Ottoman Empire and keep their customs and religion. He writes that the emotional reasons have been invented to address why the Turks lashed out against the Armenians. He writes that the Turks did not seize the Armenian’s property or have any ambitions to seize their lands, in fact,

the Armenians had stolen Turkish property during World War I.

Then, the first break in the text appears after paragraph 22 with the introduction of “Map 1.” The first 22 paragraphs were three to five sentences in length. Again, this is the first time there is a break-up of the text. However, the map is not visible in this version of the article. I am sure the map was presented in the original version, but in this version of the article available on the ATAA’s Web site, the map is not accessible. Thus, it makes the reader stop to wonder what would be on the map because there is no explanation or reference to the map in the text. The only thing that appears is the words, “Map #1” (McCarthy, ¶22). Immediately following the map’s text is the next paragraph in which McCarthy writes that if the Turks did have their eyes set on Central Asia, they would not have gone through Armenia to get their. “It only takes one look at a map to prove this,” writes McCarthy. Well, the map is not available to prove this point. He then goes on to paragraph 23 to pose the question of whether the Turks kill the Armenians because they felt they were superior. He writes that he has known many Turks over the past 35 years and says that most of the Turks he knows feel that all men are created equal and that they do not feel inferior to anyone. “I very much doubt if the Ottoman Turks felt any different,” McCarthy concludes. McCarthy’s personal testimony about the Turks is then followed by the next three paragraphs (¶24-26) in which he writes about the Turkish tolerance of the Armenians. He writes that the two groups coexisted for 700 years and said that it does not make sense that all of a sudden the Turks decided to hate the Armenians. It does not make sense nor does the comparison of the Armenian allegation of genocide to the Jewish Holocaust. Unlike the Turks, the Nazis acted irrationally when they killed the Jews (McCarthy, ¶28). He spends the next paragraph discussing the fact that there are no similarities between the Ottoman Empire’s treatment of the Armenians and the Germans’ treatment of the Jews (McCarthy, ¶29).

In the next paragraph he states that it is better to look for the rational reasons as to why the conflict developed between the Turks and the Armenians. The next question to ask and consider is who was the attacker and who was the defender. He continues in the next few paragraphs to address the importance of the questions and says that while historians tend to avoid these questions, they must be answered. He writes that he too has avoided the questions but that when asked about these questions, he says that he describes the conflict between the Armenians and the Turks as a “sad chapter in the history of humanity” and that “who was at fault is not the real issue. I have said that the real issue is the suffering of humanity, whether Turks or Armenians. That is still the most important consideration” (McCarthy, ¶ 32). However, while these question of who started it is not the most important, it must be considered because there are politicians who condemn the Turks and not humanity (McCarthy, ¶33).

Then, there is another introduction of “Map #2 in paragraph 34. Like the first map, the second map is also not available on the web version of the article. Following the map are five paragraphs discuss the Armenian loyalty to the Russians and their desire to live under Russian rule and not with the Turks. He says while the Turks and Armenians did not always live in peace, the Turks did not wish to gang up on the Armenians. Instead, he writes, the Armenian nationalists are the ones who wanted to rule the empire and would not allow the Turks to stand in their way. It was the Armenians who attacked the Turks (McCarthy, ¶37). Then the first sub heading appears in paragraph 38. The sub heading reads “1877-78 Russo-Turkish War” (McCarthy, ¶38). Following the sub heading is four paragraphs that discuss the Armenian alliance with the Russians. The Armenians attacked the Ottoman soldiers and the local Turks.

The next section begins with the sub heading the “Armenian Revolutionary Organizations,” which goes into further explanation of how the Armenians banded together to

form nationalists parties to rebel against the Ottoman Empire. The Armenian Revolutionary Party, the Dashnaks, formed in the 1890s to plan the downfall of the Ottoman Empire. They incited bloody rebellions against the empire and had aims different than other revolutionaries, the Armenian nationalists fought to dominate the land (the Ottoman Empire) even though they only made up 20 percent of the population. He writes that unlike the Poles, Italians, South Africans and Irish, the Armenians were not a large minority and thus their desire to rule the land was a bold move. The next two paragraphs are spent discussing the Armenian nationalists bold move and intentions on taking over the empire (McCarthy, ¶47).

McCarthy then introduces the next sub heading, “1890s Rebellion,” in which he writes about the Armenian rebellions that became heavily concentrated in the empire in the 1890s. In fact, the rebellions got to be so concentrated that the Turks advanced on the rebels, and as the rebels slaughtered the Muslims, the Muslims killed the Armenians. McCarthy states that the Turkish response and killing of the Armenians is not excusable, but that the Muslims are not the ones who started the killing. It was the Armenians who started killing the Muslims. “The result was horrible for both,” he writes (McCarthy, ¶50). The Armenian rebels are the ones who started the slaughter, the Turks just responded (McCarthy, ¶53).

Next comes the sub heading “World War I” in which McCarthy describes in the next 16 paragraphs how the Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913 gave the Armenian revolutionaries reason to believe their methods and rebellions would be successful against the Turks. The Armenians saw how the rebel bands were able to drive the Turks from the Balkans and thought they could do the same of the Turks in the Armenian territory. While the “mythology of Armenian history holds that peaceful Armenians were attacked without provocation by Turks,” the reality is the Armenians rebelled against the Turks who were busy fighting on the Ottoman/Russian border.

Some Turks were sent to fight the internal enemies, the Armenian rebels, who were fighting on the side of the Russians. The Ottomans, he writes, needed to put down the revolt and stop the Armenians from slaughtering the Muslims for “military reasons” (McCarthy, ¶67). Therefore, the Ottomans began deporting the Armenians to “remove a civilian population that would surely aid and comfort the enemy” (McCarthy, ¶69). But, McCarthy then says that he thinks the Ottoman Turks went too far and deported too many that were not a threat to the empire. However, he says, it should not be forgotten that the Ottomans had “good reason to act as they did” and deport the Armenians. He reminds the reader once again, it was the Armenians who attacked the Turks.

In the next sub heading, “Azerbaijan and Armenia,” he writes that at the end of World War I the Armenians attacked the Turks in Azerbaijan [a small neighboring country of both present-day Turkey and Armenia]. The Armenians allied with the Bolsheviks in Baku forced Turks in Baku to flee from the city and destroyed villages in Azerbaijan also forcing the citizens to flee. Again he reminds the reader that it was the Armenians who incited the attacks not the Turks (McCarthy, ¶72).

Finally, in the final sub heading “The Armenian Claims” McCarthy writes about the Armenian Genocide claim. Those who make the claim that there was a genocide, he writes, take the facts out of historical context. “We are told that the Ottoman Government deported the Armenians, and that many died during the deportation. This is true, although the number who died are always grossly exaggerated” (McCarthy, ¶73). The facts that are ignored, he says, are that most of the Armenians who were deported survived “indicating” that there was no plan of genocide (McCarthy, ¶73). He spends the next 23 paragraphs reiterating the fact that the Armenians were the ones who began killing the Muslims and the Turks responded to their

attacks. They Turks, he writes, sometimes acted out of revenge and sometimes went too far, but they were not the ones who started the conflict. “Armenians died because of the conflict started by Armenians,” (McCarthy, ¶77). In fact, history shows that the Armenians started conflict with the Turks in 1796, 1878, 1890s, 1909, 1915 and 1919. The Ottoman Empire had a right to fight back. Minorities should have religious rights, but not the right to rule over a majority. Sometimes one group suffers more than the other that, he writes, is the way of war. Right before he ends the article, he reminds the reader that the Armenians were the ones who started the conflict with the Ottoman Turks, they are the guilty ones (McCarthy, ¶95). Within the 93 paragraphs between the first and last paragraph, McCarthy uses five sub headings and two maps to separate specific information from one another.

Throughout the article, McCarthy addresses his own concerns, opinions, poses rhetorical questions and uses the repetitious statements to reiterate the main point of the article that it was not the Turks who started the conflict with the Armenians, it was the Armenians who started the conflict. Another one of McCarthy’s tactical writing tools is the use or reference to four maps throughout the article. I am sure in the original article, not the downloadable version on the ATAA’s site, the maps can be seen; however, in the version available on the ATAA’s site, the maps cannot be seen or referenced. There are just mentions of the map, “Map #1,” “Map #2,” etc. but they cannot be accessed elsewhere or seen in the article. Finally, another unique feature in McCarthy’s article is the use of subheadings such as “1877-78 Russo-Turkish War,” “Armenian Revolutionary Organizations,” “1890s Rebellions,” “World War I,” “Azerbaijan and Armenia,” and “The Armenian Claims,” that separate and introduce the events leading up to the Turkish and Armenian conflict, which resulted in the allegation of genocide.

Now that I have described the publication in detail, I will provide a brief summary of the article to be followed by a discussion of the coding sheet findings and analysis.

Publication Summary

As a professor of history, McCarthy begins the article with very bold statements such as, “historians should love the truth,” (McCarthy, ¶1) and “a historian has a duty to try to write only the truth,” (McCarthy, ¶1). He then ends the first paragraph of his article, with the historians’ creed that he hopes all historians follow – “Consider all the sides of an issue; reject your own prejudices. Only then can you hope to find the truth” (McCarthy, ¶1). According to McCarthy, the Armenians started the conflict with the Turks, and the Turks responded because they had a moral obligation to do so because they were the majority in the Ottoman Empire. Thus, the main point of the article is that the Armenians fired the first shot, the Turks responded out of duty and to protect the empire from the minority’s revolt. McCarthy uses this main point to enforce the secondary point that there is no connection between the Holocaust and the Armenian Genocide because unlike the Armenians, the Jews did not begin the conflict with the Germans.

At first glance, the article appears to make a greater statement than the ATAA’s publication in the first analysis because it is written by a third-party source (a credible historian) and the main theme is structured throughout the article and is built into each supplementary argument. I conducted the close reading of the text and used the same coding sheet with this text as I had in the other analysis. The following paragraphs will document what I found in this article.

Coding Sheet Findings and Analysis

I used the coding sheet [found in Appendix F] to code the following categories of the McCarthy’s publication: format, themes, appeals, discourse and other notes.

Format

McCarthy's article is a fleshed-out argument, written in a journalistic style with a beginning, middle and end. It has a byline with the author's name and the university where he teaches, as well as information on where the article was first presented. Unlike the ATAA's article, this article is written by a historian, which assigns it instant credibility. Before someone even reads the article, there is a sense of truthfulness to it because it is written by a professor of history. Not only is the author a third-party source, but the author's name bears no mention of Turkish nationality, even more reason to assign the article credibility. Also, since the article was presented at a conference at a Turkish university, it also assigns it some scholarly credibility. However, what sets it apart from a scholarly article is the fact that it does not include a bibliography, endnotes, footnotes or a reference section. It is about the importance of truth and history – a theme that was also in the ATAA's facts and discussion points. However, the thing that separates this article from the ATAA's publication in the first analysis is the fact that it has third-party credibility.

Themes

The themes in the article are blaming the accuser, ethnic/racial identity and history and truth. The article definitely incorporates the theme of blaming the accuser throughout the article. I would say that this is the main point that pervades the text as McCarthy reminds the reader time and again that the Armenians were the ones who began the conflict. McCarthy places the blame of the conflict on the Armenians repeating throughout the article that it was the Armenians, not the Turks, who started the conflict. The Turks responded to the Armenian nationalists' rebellions. He scolds the Armenians and those who believe there was a genocide for not considering the whole issue and not investigating all sources. These people do not take into

consideration the uncomfortable facts that must be dealt with to make a decision or statement such as that. They are pretending to be historians (McCarthy, ¶7-9).

He blames the members of the parliaments that pass genocide resolutions without taking into consideration the whole issue. The members of the French and European Union who pass resolutions do not consider the evidence that disagree with their own prejudices (McCarthy, ¶6). These members have not studied the records of the Ottomans, they have only studied that which the Armenians have presented and their records on the historical events of the time (McCarthy, ¶6). He also blames the Armenians who have meetings about the genocide in Germany and in America. These meetings, he writes, only consist of those who agree with the Armenian allegation of genocide. Those who disagree are never invited. While he disagrees with their conclusions, he invites people to speak and believe as they please. He says Turkey is mature and confident enough to allow people to disagree, unlike the Armenians. Thus, he calls for an honest debate and asks the Armenians and those who believe in the allegation to debate and be willing to argue. He calls on the parliamentarians and politicians to forget the politics behind the event and ask the real questions, which include who started the conflict (McCarthy, ¶18-20).

Throughout the article, McCarthy places blame on the Armenians for starting the conflict and the politicians and historians for believing their side of the story and not studying the whole issue.

Not only is this the prevailing theme of the article, but it also serves as the article's main point.

The second major theme is of ethnic and racial identity. McCarthy addresses the Armenian claim that the Armenians suffered at the hands of the Ottoman Turks like the Jews suffered at the hands of the Nazis during the Holocaust. McCarthy says this is not possible since the Jews did not start the conflict with the Nazis, on the contrary, the Nazis premeditated the torment against the Jews. The Jews did not start the problem or conflict with the Nazis. The

Armenians, on the other hand, started the conflict with the Turks and they had no choice but to respond to their retaliation. These are the “uncomfortable facts” that McCarthy says a historian who loves the truth and has a duty to report and write about the truth must face (McCarthy, ¶3-7). These facts must be considered when investigating the “whole issue” (McCarthy, ¶7).

McCarthy’s article is unique in that he writes both about the Armenian-Turkish conflict in the Ottoman Empire, but also spends time giving advice to his fellow historians and those who have an interest in history. The theme of ethnic and racial identity as well as history and truth are just as important as the theme of blaming the accuser. In fact, McCarthy does an excellent job of uniting all three themes and making each theme build upon one another with each argument throughout the article.

The theme of ethnic/racial identity is seen in the article through McCarthy’s statements about the Armenians being the minorities and the Turks being the majority in the Ottoman Empire. This theme is intertwined with the theme of history and truth because the history and truth behind the conflict is directly related to the fact that the Armenians were the minority in the Ottoman Empire at the time and that was the reason the conflict between the Armenians and the Turks developed. I think this theme is the connecting link between the theme of blaming the accuser and history and truth. From the title, to the first and last paragraph, McCarthy spends his time explaining just how the Armenians rebelled and how they managed to become a threat to the Ottoman Empire. McCarthy is able to get the readers attention through the use of the facts and numerous examples he provides which makes the reader believe what comes next and so and so forth.

The theme of history and truth is seen throughout the article as well, especially since the article is written by a historian with a duty to tell the truth. McCarthy writes that this duty to tell

the truth translates to the Turks as well as he says they had a moral duty to respond to the Armenian attacks (McCarthy, ¶91). While McCarthy does admit that the Turks were not “completely innocent,” the “truly guilty were those who began to kill the innocent” (McCarthy, ¶92).

The three themes of blaming the accuser, ethnic/racial identity and history and truth are highly pervasive in the text. McCarthy uses the themes to build upon one another and assign more credibility and strength to the argument related to the main points of the article which are that the Armenians started the conflict and that there is no connection between the Jewish Holocaust and the alleged Armenian Genocide.

Appeals

Throughout the text, McCarthy appeals to rationality and irrationality. The appeal to rationality is seen first and foremost in McCarthy’s occupation as a historian. The appeal to rationality is also seen in the McCarthy’s use of maps and the use of the historical perspective as the truth. Although the maps cannot be seen in the web-based version of the article, they are referenced in the article. Also, the headlines “1877-78 Russo-Turkish War,” “Armenian Revolutionary Organizations,” and “1890s Rebellions” separate the events leading up to the rebellion of the Armenian citizenry in the Ottoman Empire. These headlines give the reader categories with which to consider the events leading up to the alleged genocide. Finally, the credibility of the article is also seen in the fact that the article was first presented at a conference at Yeditepe University in Istanbul, Turkey. In his article, McCarthy acknowledges that the “Armenian Question” has been addressed in meetings in America and Germany. “... Few meetings have allowed the public to listen, but have never included speakers who have doubted the existence of the ‘Armenian Genocide’”, McCarthy writes (p. 1). The meetings have been

widely publicized and attended by both Turks and Armenians, therefore the Armenians have said the Turks must agree with the Armenians regarding the existence of genocide. But, McCarthy writes, that these Turks who attend these meetings are those who have outwardly agreed with the Armenians. They are not the Turks who question the existence of the genocide, but have been outspoken about the Armenian genocide. Thus, these meetings are not political gatherings in which there is a discussion, these meetings are held to condemn those Turks who do not agree with the Armenians. In fact, McCarthy writes that those Turks who go along with the Armenians should not be condemned for their freedom of expression. “Sometimes they anger me. But I know that it is a good thing that they are able to speak. It shows that Turkey is mature enough, confident enough, to accept disagreement,” McCarthy writes (p. 2). He invites the reader to disagree and to debate; and, advises the reader once again to forget the politics and ask real the historical questions that will allow them to make the right and informed decision.

Although he invites the reader to come to his/her own conclusion, he also makes it known that he has gone through the process of making an informed decision and has sided with the Turks. He does not see the relationship between the Armenian allegation of genocide and the Jewish Holocaust because the Armenians started the conflict. He addresses his point of view through the description of the events that led up to the alleged genocide. McCarthy introduces the first map, which he says proves that the Turks did not want to conquer Armenian lands. They did, however, want a path to Central Asia, but would have gone through Iran to achieve control over Central Asia, not Armenia. In fact, he writes, that the Turks he knows believed that “all men were created equal” and believed in treating all men, including Armenians, equally. “I very much doubt if the Ottoman Turks felt any different” (p. 3). The Ottoman Turks accepted the Armenians and lived with them in peace. They were accepted, allowed, tolerated and coexisted

among one another until the Armenians started to rebel against them. In fact, the Armenians also allied themselves with Russians.

McCarthy uses this argument to address the comparison of the Armenian genocide to the Jewish Holocaust. There is no comparison, McCarthy writes, because with the Jews, there was never an acceptance. The Nazi hatred against the Jews was established way before the Holocaust was administered, that was not the case with the Armenians and the Ottoman Turks. “It is better to for rational reasons...,” McCarthy writes (p. 3). The real reason behind the conflict is “easily explained and completely rational” (p. 3). They [Turks] were simply defending themselves (p. 3). Although he points the finger at the Armenians, he then explains that he usually refers to this period in history as a “sad chapter in the history of humanity,” which discredits his argument that it was the Armenians who started the conflict and the Turks, as the majority, had no choice but to retaliate and protect the empire. He says what is really important is the suffering of humanity, and that who started the conflict is not even that important. However, he then goes back to finger pointing and says that is what most politicians are interested in – who started what and why.

Thus, he introduces the second map, another appeal to rationality, and addresses the history of the events that led up to the Armenian attack on the Turks. “Armenians had lived with Turks in the Southern Caucasus region for 700 years. Their lives had not been perfect, nor had the lives of the Turks” (p. 4). They lived in peace until the Armenians banded with the Russians to rebel against the majority [the Turks]. McCarthy then discusses the 1877-78 Russo-Turkish war and states that the Armenians were on the battleground between the two groups, but were not selected out or persecuted by the Ottoman government during the war. In fact, he writes that instead of joining forces with the Turks, the Armenians joined the Russians in their attacks against the Turks. He then goes into an explanation of how the Armenian nationalists formed the

Armenian Revolutionary Federation (ARF), which led the “bloody rebellion against the Ottoman Empire” (p. 5). McCarthy states that the goal of the Armenian revolutionaries was different than the Polish, Uzbeks, South Africans, Algerians and the Irish in their revolutions because the Armenians were never the majority in their lands; thus, he reiterates the point that the Armenians were the ones who started the conflict with the Turks.

Next comes a discussion of the Armenian rebellion of the 1890s when the Armenians “truly began to put their plans into effect” (p. 5). While they began the conflict, the Turks advanced on the rebels. “What happened next is not in any way excusable. The Ottoman army advanced on the rebels. As the rebels retreated they slaughtered the Muslim inhabitants of the villages in their path. In response, the army and local Muslims killed Armenians” (p. 5). This is the first time that McCarthy acknowledges the Turks killing the Armenians. Since the beginning of the article, McCarthy stuck to the statement that the Armenians started the conflict and the Turks started it. He tells the reader that the Turks responded by killing the Armenians because they were rebelling against the majority [the Turks]. He then concludes the section with “it was a horrible period for both” (p. 5). It was the Armenian nationalists who started the “slaughter,” the Turks just responded.

Discourse

The discourse includes modifiers that dispel doubt and raise doubt. The modifiers that dispel doubt are “bad history,” “accept disagreement,” “defending their government,” “defending the majority,” “historians should love the truth,” and “duty to truth.”

The modifiers that dispel doubt include “bad history,” “accept disagreement,” and “historians should love the truth,” and that they have a “duty to the truth,” defend the author’s side of the story because they frame the story. McCarthy addresses the historians creed and the

duty of historians and politicians to consider the whole issue and search for the truth in studying the Armenian Question. According to McCarthy, the “appalling political pronouncements of politicians are easy to recognize as bad history,” suggesting that these politicians have not studied the issue from both sides and have made up their minds by studying only the Armenian records. By passing resolutions and supporting parliaments that pass these resolutions they are producing bad history and not the whole truth (McCarthy, ¶5-7). By ignoring their “duty to the truth,” the historians and politicians alike have not felt with the “uncomfortable facts,” that do not agree with their preconceptions and prejudices (McCarthy, ¶2-4).

McCarthy writes that the Armenians do not “accept disagreement,” only inviting those who agree with the allegation of genocide to their meetings in America and abroad. They do not invite anyone who does not agree with their allegation. The Turks, on the other hand, are mature and confident enough to “accept disagreement” from because they understand that people must be able to debate and come to their own conclusions through the study of the whole issue. “Forget the politics,” he advises, and “ask the real historical questions” (McCarthy, ¶15-18). He advises the reader throughout the article that in order to address history one must study the entire history of an event and time. One must not only take into account one side of the story but must study the whole issue. This really assigns credibility to McCarthy’s account of the truth. Now remember that this is still his account of the truth. While he does address each specific time period surrounding the conflict between the Armenians and the Turks and provides evidence to back up his claims, he never reveals the source of his references and evidence. As I mentioned before, there is no reference or bibliography section to the article. For someone who stresses studying and researching all sides of the issue, I find it ironic that he does not come forth with his

references and sources. He states facts and discusses historical events and figures but does not attribute where he got the information.

The modifiers that dispel doubt also include “defending their government,” and “defending the majority,” because these modifiers show that the Turks were responding to the Armenian rebellions and had no choice but to defend their government and defend the empire, since they were the majority in the Ottoman Empire (McCarthy, ¶46). Rebellions were breaking out and the Armenians were siding with the Russians; therefore, the Turks had no choice but to respond. They were, after all, the majority in the Ottoman Empire and could not allow the Armenian minority to take over the empire. So, McCarthy writes, the Turks responded out of a moral obligation to protect the citizens of the empire. McCarthy’s explanation of the Turk’s moral obligation is interesting because it alludes to the fact that the Turks were a moral people and people who would never intentionally harm others. In fact, McCarthy’s personal testimony of the Turks that he has known for the past 35 years paints a very different picture of the Turks that the Armenian sources paint. They are not considered barbaric and murders, instead, McCarthy’s explanation makes people believe that they were a moral group of people who were responsible for the empire and protecting the empire. While there are modifiers that dispel doubt in this article, the dominant theme and point of the article – that the Turks responded to the Armenian rebellion – really dispels the blame from the Turks to the Armenians.

There are many modifiers in this article that raise doubt as well. They include “uncomfortable facts,” “political pressure groups,” “fallible,” “all historians can make mistakes,” “emotional reasons have been invented,” “guilt is on their heads,” “Armenian claims,” and the “mythology of the Armenian Genocide.” These modifiers raise doubt because, according to McCarthy, the Armenians have “forgotten the rules of honest history” and have chosen to take

parts of their history out of context to prove that their allegation of genocide is true (McCarthy, ¶3). These statements make the reader understand why McCarthy is allowed to make such comments since he is a historian. These statements make the reader question why the Armenians would not play fair in the study of the Turko-Armenian history. The statements validate McCarthy's authorship. Yet, at the same time, McCarthy gives his own opinion of how it angers him that there are those who do not believe and go against the Turks. He definitely takes the side of the Turks, but does not stress the side he takes; instead, he continues to return to the main point which is that historians must love and study the truth. He also describes the Armenian allegation of genocide as mythology and bad history. The Armenians, after all, take their history out of context and do not research and admit to the whole truth (McCarthy, ¶57). The fact that he refers to their side of the story as mythology, discredits the Armenian story in the eyes of the reader.

The article also includes nouns with a negative connotation and denotation and a few nouns with a positive connotation and denotation. Nouns with a negative connotation and denotation include "Armenian rebels," (McCarthy, ¶50) and "Armenian guerrillas" (McCarthy, ¶60). The reference to the Armenians as rebels and guerillas suggests and reiterates McCarthy's point that the Armenian minority lashed out at the empire's majority [the Turks] and the Turks had a moral obligation to respond. The Armenians, after all, were acting irrationally and attacked the empire. Thus, the Turks had to protect their government, state, citizens and power as the leader of the empire. This description of the Armenians gives the Turks more reason and right to have attacked the Armenian rebels. They were an internal threat that had to be dealt with, according to McCarthy (McCarthy, ¶29). These are the "rational reasons," that McCarthy presents to answer the question of who started the conflict (McCarthy, ¶29).

Now that I have described in detail the publication, provided a summary of the main points and provided the results of the coding sheet, I will wrap up the article's analysis with some final thoughts.

Analysis

McCarthy's article is unlike the other publications I have studied thus far because he is able to get the reader to trust him, as a source in this matter. He begins and ends the article with the thought that history should be left to historians and the historians should love the truth and have a duty to the truth. He refers to the historians' creed and is able to set up his arguments according to the creed. He does not begin the article with accusations and allegations, while he does blame the Armenians for starting the conflict and admits that the Turks had no choice but to respond, McCarthy uses his credibility as a third party source and a historian to make his claims. His framing of the article and his arguments is skillful and really does make for a better argument. Not only does his style affect the reader during the reading of the text, but the frame of the historians' creed and commitment to the truth is something that sticks with the reader long after the article has been read.

Hitler and the "Armenian Question"

Publication Description

"Hitler and the 'Armenian Question'" is also available for download on the ATAA Web site's reference library and was last accessed on March 6, 2006. The article is written by Turkaya Ataov, chairman and professor of the International Relations Division in the political science department at Ankara University. Again, because this publication is available online, it may look different than the original print version.

At the very top of the article is the word “REFERNCE” in all capital letters and directly beneath that is the title of the article – “Hitler and the ‘Armenian Question.’” One double-spaced line below that is the author’s name and identification – Prof. Dr. Turkkaya Ataov, Chairman, International Relations Division, Faculty of Political Science, Ankara University. This identification really gives the reader the sense that this author is credible since he is a university professor. Each paragraph in the article is presented single spaced and flush left. In between each paragraph is a double spaced line. The entire article is comprised of 29 paragraphs in total and a list of 18 footnotes at the end.

In the first paragraph, Ataov begins with a definition of propaganda – “the deliberate manipulation, by means of symbols (like words or images) of others thoughts” (Ataov, ¶1). The propagandist, Ataov writes, seizes the “emotional initiative” to create animosity (Ataov, ¶1). This introductory definition of propagandists, leads Ataov into the next paragraph in which he writes that the Armenians serve the same purpose of propagandists. They [the Armenians] write of Hitler’s statement on the Armenian genocide, “After all, who remembers today the extermination of the Armenians,” which he says appears in numerous Armenian sources is Armenian propaganda. In paragraph four, he writes that the Armenians rely on the use of biased opinions and the claim, he writes, has been “proven false” and “ill-intentioned” (Ataov, ¶4). The definition of propaganda, statement of the Armenians as propagandists and the presentation of Hitler’s quote sets up the rest of the article which examines the comparison of conflicts involving the Turks, Armenians, Germans and Jews. There are many contradictions and interpretations, Ataov notes in the next paragraph, but the fact that they are disputed makes it okay. What is not okay, is when a group [the Armenians] attributes a “single sentence” to man “whose opinions are now in utter disrespect” – that he writes, is a “detestable piece of

propaganda” (Ataov, ¶5). He questions how the Armenians can use a statement made by such an unreliable and untrusted source to represent and encompass decades of conflict (Ataov, ¶5).

In the sixth paragraph, he provides the reader with a background on Hitler. According to Ataov, Hitler was a failure from the very beginning. Not only was he a failure, but he was never a historian or expert on the Turkish-Armenian conflict or the “Armenian question” (Ataov, ¶6-7). Neither Hitler or his aides were experts on the issue/question. He continues in the next two paragraphs (paragraph 8 through 10) to explain that the quote has never been attributed to the actual source. The quote, he writes, has been accepted as evidence by secondary sources (Ataov, ¶10). This statement is false and even if were true, according to Ataov, it does not refer to the Jews directly or indirectly and instead refers to the Poles. Ataov then goes on to explain that Hitler did not like the Armenians, and said after Kemal Ataturk’s death that he feared Turkey would be “ruled by morons and half idiots” (Ataov, ¶11-12). Regardless of Hitler’s thoughts of the Armenians, Ataov writes that Hitler was a dictator who stood for an “anti-democratic, totalitarian and imperialistic policy” and was responsible for “acts of immeasurable evil” (Ataov, ¶13). Thus, Hitler’s reputation makes him a poor reference for the Armenian side. He was found guilty in the Nuremberg trials and it was clear that he and his leaders were tried for offences against international law and morality. The trials provided evidence of Hitler and the Nazi wrong doings. While the trials served as evidence, the quote or statement is not found in the trial documents (Ataov, ¶14-15).

The Armenians, Ataov writes, continue to use the Hitler quote/statement because they want to connect with Jews who suffered at the hands of Hitler in the Holocaust. Ataov admits that the Jews were a persecuted minority and were abused and exterminated. The Armenians use the statement to “play on the sensitivities of the Jews” (Ataov, ¶17-18). So while the Armenians

claim to sympathize with the Jews, what most people do not know, Ataov writes, is that the Turks have always held out a helping-hand to the Jews. In fact, Ataov writes, that the Armenians were anti-Semitic and attacked Jewish people, calling them “fanatical nationalists and race-worshippers,” in the daily Armenian paper Hairenik (Ataov, ¶19-21). Ataov spends the next few paragraphs (paragraph 21 through 24) presenting quotes to demonstrate the Nazi and Armenian relationship and hatred of the Jews (Ataov, ¶23-24). On the other hand, the Turks were friends of the Jews, as they were a tolerable group who wanted to deliver religious groups from oppression (Ataov, ¶25). The Ottoman state assured religious and civil autonomy to all non-Muslims and wanted individuals to have “unfettered freedom” and respect. Therefore, Ataov spends the next two paragraphs discussing the tolerable Turks, and in the final two paragraphs, paragraph 28 and 29, he writes that the Armenians “enjoyed similar autonomy” living in the Ottoman Empire. The Turks and the Armenians lived in peace for many centuries, the conflict began between the two when the Armenians started “campaigns of terror” and “exterminated the Turks” (Ataov, ¶28). Ataov poses this question at the end of the article, “If the Jews had known the particulars of these historical facts, would any of them supported the Armenian ‘cause?’” (Ataov, ¶29). He leaves the reader asking him/herself if the Jews knew that the Armenians were anti-Semitic and tolerated by the Turks.

Finally, at the end of the article are the 18 footnotes, which include footnotes and reference materials. This is the first article/publication that has footnotes or any inclusion of reference materials, proof and attribution of the evidence.

Publication Summary

Ataov’s article provides the definition of propaganda and points out the ways in which the Armenians are using propaganda to further their allegation of genocide against the Ottoman

Turks. The Armenians, Ataov writes, are relying on the use of propaganda, particularly in the use of the Hitler quote about the Armenian genocide. They claim that the quote was the reason that Hitler planned and executed the Holocaust, but what they have yet to prove, Ataov writes, is where the quote is referenced. There are no original documents that can be attributed to the quote. The Armenians rely on propaganda, he says, because it is the only way in which they can get people on their side through the play on emotions.

Ataov uses the article to discredit not only the Armenians because of their use of propaganda, but also tries to discredit Hitler as a reliable source or “expert” on the “Armenian question” (Ataov, ¶7). Hitler, after all, was one of the most hated men of all time and should not be the one the Armenians rely upon to make their claims. Ataov also begins to describe the anti-Semitic behavior of the Armenians. Although they compare themselves to the Jews, the Turkish government did not hate the Armenians like the Nazi regime hated the Jews. The Ottoman Turkish government was tolerable of the Armenians, their culture and Christianity. They lived in peace for years, according to Ataov. The Armenians were friends of the Nazis and were anti-Semitic. It is these facts that Ataov hopes the reader will remember when the “Armenian question” is brought up the next time.

Coding Sheet Findings and Analysis

I used the coding sheet [found in Appendix G] to code the following categories of the Ataov’s article: format, themes, appeals, discourse and other notes.

Format

The article is a fleshed out argument in that it is an essay written by Ataov with a purpose of having a thesis and argument regarding the infamous Hitler quote about the Armenian

genocide. After a thorough reading of the article and note taking, I used the coding sheet to document the themes, appeals, discourse and patterns in the article

Themes

The themes present in Ataov's article are blaming the accuser, ethnic and racial identity, as well as history and truth. The theme of blaming the accuser is definitely seen in the author's description of the Armenians as propagandists. Ataov introduces the reader to the definition of propaganda in the first sentence of the article. After he defines propaganda, he begins to explain that the Armenians are guilty of propaganda, particularly seen in their [Armenian] use of the Hitler statement.

The theme of ethnic and racial identity is seen in the explanation of the Armenians as a favored group of the Turks. They were tolerated, Ataov writes, and lived in peace with the Ottoman Empire until they began to rebel. It was not the Turks who attacked the Armenians. They tolerated all groups, unlike the Nazi regime. They did not seek out the Armenians like the Nazi group sought out the Jews. In fact, the Armenians were anti-Semitic and helped the Nazi regime, while the Turks were helpful and friendly to the Armenians and Jews. However, thanks to Armenian propaganda, Ataov writes, the Jews and most people do not know this about the Armenians. Their propaganda has made the Jews think that they too suffered at the hands of the Turks, much like the Jews suffered at the hands of the Germans.

Finally, the theme of history and truth is seen in the article in Ataov's point that the Hitler statement has no truth and is not attributed to a specific source. Thus it is not a credible statement nor a credible fact for the Armenians to rely upon. Ataov gives the reader a number of examples of how the Armenians have been anti-Semitic and unappreciative of the fact that the Ottoman Turkish government was tolerable and accepting of their religion and existence in the empire. He

does this so that the reader can come to the conclusion that the Armenians were the ones who started the conflict with the Turks, although the Turks had no problems with them. Also, he uses these examples to show the reader that if the Jews had only known that the Armenians were anti-Semitic, then they would not be supporting their allegation of genocide or not pity them; they [the Jews] would instead sympathize with the Turks because they were wrongly accused and treated the Armenians with justice and fairness.

Appeals

The appeals in Ataov's article are mostly rational, but there are examples of how the article appeals to irrationality. Ataov's article is about the Armenian use of Hitler's statement, why the statement is unreliable and untrue and what the Armenians really felt about the Jews. The Armenian connection to the Jews, Ataov writes, is part of their propaganda and the link they like to use to make the comparison of the Holocaust and Armenian Genocide a level playing field. Thus, Ataov appeals mostly to rationality in that he sets up the situation to the reader, addresses the situation in an effort to discredit the claim, provides rational reasons to discredit the claim and introduces the Armenian mentality toward the Jews. Basically, Ataov is effective in discrediting Hitler's statement and the Armenian use of the statement – thus labeling the Armenians as propagandists.

He writes that Hitler was always a failure and the Armenian use of his statement to support their claim of genocide and attempt to compare the Holocaust to the Armenian Genocide is illogical as Armenian propaganda relies on the statement of a man whose "... opinions are now in utter disrespect..." and was "...no historian, certainly no expert on Turkish-Armenian relations or on the 'Armenian question'" (Ataov, ¶6-7). While Ataov is not telling the reader something new [most people know that Hitler is not a trusted or credible source], I think he

really uses this statement to get the reader out of the mind-set that Hitler knew that the Armenians suffered genocide at the hands of the Turks, to remember that he is not a credible source. He wants the reader to see how the use of the Hitler statement is nothing but the propagandist nature of the Armenian people. According to Ataov's article, the Armenian campaign is made-up of propagandist tactics that include using Hitler's statement, which has yet to be found in a written statement and comes from a highly unreliable and disrespected source. This is communicated to the reader so in turn the reader sees the Armenian's irrational appeal. Then, Ataov ties in this wake-up call with the rational appeal he takes in the rest of the text.

Ataov's rational appeal is seen throughout the publication, beginning with his definition of propaganda, examples of the Armenian use of propaganda and how the propaganda should not be believed because the Armenians were anti-Semitic and the Turks were tolerable of people and religion. While he begins the article with a statement on propaganda [paragraph 1], he quickly segways into the Armenian's use of propaganda [paragraph 2] and begins to explain how the use of the Hitler statement is propaganda because Hitler is a distrusted source who, like the Armenians, was anti-Semitic. This appeal and positioning of the Armenians makes the reader really distrust Hitler, for obvious reasons, but also the Armenians. It makes the reader question their use of propaganda, their selection of sources and most importantly, their anti-Semitism. Whether the Armenians were anti-Semitic is not proven in this article. Ataov makes the claim, but does not reference it or attribute the claim. This is an extremely powerful accusation, which one would think needs to be attributed; however, what the claim does do is anger the reader. It angers the reader, rightfully so, because it depicts the Armenians as hypocrites. If they want the Turks to admit to genocide, how could they have been anti-Semitic toward a group who was also persecuted.

Also, Ataov's use of examples and quotations from the Nuremberg trials is also an appeal to rationality, particularly in his statements in paragraph 10 where he tells the reader that the Hitler statement has not been attributed to the original source, but has only been attributed to secondary sources. For example, he writes that Professor Richard Hovannisian refers to the statement in the Nuremberg trial transcripts [the trial after the Holocaust], but, according to Ataov, this statement has not been found in trial transcripts. He writes that while none of the versions of the trial transcripts contain the sentence in quotation is false, they "establish that Hitler has not made that statement" (Ataov, ¶10). This is an interesting statement and appeal to rationality, although it is quite a loaded statement. Ataov has spent the last nine paragraphs talking about the Armenian propaganda and use of the statement from a distrusted source. He then spends the tenth paragraph explaining how the statement was not included in the trial transcripts, but at the last second says that the statement was not false, but was not made by Hitler.

He immediately jumps, in paragraph 11, to the statement, "even in its forged version, the 'statement' does not refer, directly or indirectly, to the Jewish people" (Ataov, ¶11). He goes onto explain that the reference is to the Poles and that Hitler made only one reference to the Armenians and that was in a talk he gave in 1942 in which he described them as unreliable and dangerous. While Ataov does not explain where Hitler gave his talk, he provides a reference to footnote 11, which is written in German and seems to the reference to where this quote appears. He writes that after Kemal Ataturk's death, Hitler replied in a speech in 1939, that Turkey would be ruled by a bunch of "morons and half idiots" (Ataov, ¶12). He then continues to support Hitler's assessment with the following statement, "In assessing subsequent events the reader will agree with me that Hitler's assertion actually suited himself and his Nazi entourage quite well.

One can say, on the other hand, that Turkey's leadership during the Second World War was crowned with success" (Ataov, ¶12). By making this statement, he is telling the reader that he agrees with Hitler's feelings regarding the Armenians, because while he writes that Hitler's assertion suits himself and his party, he agrees that Turkey's leadership during World War II was great and since the leadership was Turkish [not Armenian] he too believed the Turks were better rulers. I am not, in any way, suggesting that Ataov supports Hitler's ideology but I cannot ignore the fact that up to this point, Ataov has attempted to discredit Hitler and the Armenians, especially. It is in this statement, where the reader is prompted to see how ignorant the Armenian claims are since they are coming from a man who was so detested and unreliable, and also thought the worst of the Armenians. If the reader has had any doubt up to this point, I think Ataov has crushed it here and grabbed the reader's attention – giving the reader proof that the Armenian use of Hitler's statement is inaccurate and illogical. I think this is Ataov's best appeal to rationality. After all, according to Ataov, Hitler was responsible for evil (Ataov, ¶13).

Another appeal to rationality in the article is seen in the next few paragraphs, in which he says that the Nazis were tried for their offenses against the Jews in the Nuremberg trials. The trials were "clear" and tried the appropriate people for their offenses against "international law and morality, against compacts and treaties, and against the peace of nations" (Ataov, ¶14). Ataov shows the reader that while those who perpetrated the Holocaust were tried and convicted, the Armenians do not have the same result – meaning that no one was tried or convicted for crimes against humanity. Thus, he goes on to show that the Armenians do not have "connecting link" to the Jewish Holocaust (Ataov, ¶16). While the Armenians want to have a link to the Holocaust because it plays on emotions and sensitivities and can influence the Jewish community, Ataov shows how the link is irrational and makes no sense. His appeal, however,

makes sense. This is the first article in which I see a connection between the appeals – rational and irrational. Ataov finds a way to make the irrational seem rational. In other words, he shows how the Armenian irrationality makes for a rational opinion – his opinion.

He continues to disprove the Armenians connection to the Holocaust as he ends the last ten paragraphs (paragraph 18-28) discussing the difference between the German treatment of the Jews and the Turkish treatment of the Armenians and vice versa. He writes that while the Jews were a persecuted minority among the Nazi regime, the Armenians were tolerated and helped by the Turks. The “undistorted truth,” about the Turks being aggressive and hateful toward the Armenians, Ataov writes is untrue. Not only did the Turks like the Armenians and live in peace with them, but they definitely did not start to attack them. The Armenians, Ataov writes, were favored and tolerated in the empire, and were in fact anti-Semitic and often attacked Jews on the side of the Germans. Ataov uses quotes appearing in Armenian dailies, German officials and others to show that the Armenians were anti-Semitic, supporting of the German persecution of the Jews (Ataov, ¶19-27). At the end of the article, he tells the reader that most people, especially the Jews, did not know that the Armenian religious community enjoyed autonomy before they rebelled against the Turks. This is a very rational appeal as the article comes to a close. It really leaves the reader with the thought that the Armenians, who were a religious minority who were given religious autonomy, are hypocrites. They were the ones who rebelled against the Turks, yet they claim to have suffered like the Jews but they were anti-Semitic and seen supporting the Germans.

Over all, I think Ataov’s article was the best one thus far. Not only does it include a list of 18 footnotes and attribution, but it also has the most impressive arguments in that it combines the irrational behavior of the Armenians and rational thoughts of Ataov and the Turks and

creates the feeling that the Armenians had an easy life in the Ottoman Empire. According to Ataov's claims they were treated well, ruled wisely and still felt inclined to rebel against the group who allowed them to live and practice Christianity in a Muslim dominated empire and compare themselves to the Jewish genocide – "truly a genocide" (Ataov, ¶16). While the footnotes definitely provide credibility for many of Ataov's statements they are not all formatted the same way and two of them are actual footnotes with a discussion or statement. The rest are bibliographic information about the source that Ataov references within the article.

Discourse

The discourse within the text includes modifiers that dispel doubt, raise doubt, as well as nouns with a negative connotation and denotation. The modifiers that dispel doubt include the words "false and ill-intentioned," which Ataov refers to in the fourth paragraph. He uses these terms in reference to Hitler's statement – which he claims to be Armenian propaganda. The statement, he writes is the product of Armenian propaganda (Ataov, ¶2-4). Again, it is seen here how Ataov skillfully intertwines the appeal to rationality and irrationality, as well as the discourse that both raises doubt and dispels doubt. By using these terms, he shows the reader that the statement is false and it is the product of Armenian propagandists and is therefore untrue.

Another modifier that dispels doubt is the various statements of Hitler as an unreliable source, as Ataov states, he is a "failure" and was "no historian" and "no expert" on the Armenian question or Turkish-Armenian relations (Ataov, ¶6-7). These statements, again, dispel doubt from the Armenian use of Hitler as the source and "connecting link" to the Jewish Holocaust. In fact, Ataov's use of the examples from the Nuremberg trials serves to dispel doubt as the along with the "connecting link" because he expresses the clarity the trials for the Holocaust provided. While the trials convicted the Nazi officials for crimes against humanity, the same was not true

for the Armenians. Thus, there can be no relationship to the Holocaust. Thus, once again, Ataov shows how he is able to continuously show how the Armenian claims are the result of propaganda.

The modifiers that raise doubt include “Armenian propaganda” and “disseminate biased opinions” and “contradictions and interpretations that may be disputed” (Ataov, ¶3-6). These modifiers reiterate the use of Armenian propaganda and its consequences. Many authors would have made the accusation and have made the accusation that the Armenians are spreading their one-sided story [propaganda], but Ataov makes it a point to show the reader how the propaganda is being used and the consequences it involves. I think it is a very convincing way to not only alert people about the use of propaganda, but also show how it could and does affect society. After all, everyone wants to know why they should care, well Ataov tells the reader to care because otherwise, these contradictions, interpretations and biased opinions are disseminated time and again.

There are plenty of nouns with a negative connotation and denotation including an “undistorted truth,” “persecuted minority,” “ill treated, hounded, injured, exterminated,” “immeasurable evil” (Ataov, ¶18-22). This discourse paints a very negative picture of the Armenians because it continues to show the consequences of their behavior. It is one thing to write about the Armenian rebellions and the Turkish response, but it is another thing to write about the Armenians continued response and use of propaganda. Ataov writes that the Armenians are using the “undistorted truth” to share their story with the world. They are attempting to link to the Jewish Holocaust and prove how the lack of recognition of the Armenian Genocide justified Hitler to kill the Jews. They use Hitler, who everyone knows is evil, to make a statement – that genocide cannot go unrecognized as it prompts history to repeat

itself. While this is a very strong claim, Ataov manages to break down the argument and provide examples of how the Jews and the Armenians were different and thus the situations are different. Ataov writes that the Armenians were not the “persecuted minority” that the Jews were, as the Jews were “ill-treated, hounded, injured, exterminated” (Ataov, ¶18). The Jews suffered at the hand’s of Hitler’s “immeasurable evil,” and the Armenians know this comparison will pull at the heart-strings of the public and make them see the similarities between the two. This comparison is used so that the public, the Armenians hope, will always associate one with the other. This is a powerful tool and Ataov attempts to combat it throughout the article.

Analysis

Ataov has an ability to continuously show the reader how everything the Armenians do and say is propaganda. He wants the public to realize that what the Armenians are presenting is propaganda and their goal is to have the public compare what happened to them to the Jewish Holocaust so that it will forever be associated together. This comparison will continue to spread propaganda throughout all layers of decision-making – within the public, legislatures and parliaments. Thus, the allegations will continue and there will never be a clear and definite answer so long as they continue the propaganda. I think he does a good job in making these arguments because he sets up the article with the definition of propaganda and shows how the Armenian lobby has managed to do what the definition suggests. However, regardless of the argument’s strength, again I cannot get over the fact that the definition, the examples and the entire argument is not supported by hard facts that are listed in a reference or bibliography section. That really makes the argument weak and ineffective in my eyes.

Perpetuating the Genocide Myth

Publication Description

Demir Delen's article, "Perpetuating the Genocide Myth" is available for download on the ATAA's Web site reference library and was last accessed on March 6, 2006. The article, according to the byline, was a publication of the Federation of Canadian Turkish Associations. It is comprised of 40 paragraphs, including an introduction, sub headings, bullet points, as well as two tables.

At the top of the article is the word "Reference." This is the first time an article that is in the reference section has been labeled as such. Beneath the words reference is the title of the publication, "Perpetuating the Genocide Myth" and underneath that is the byline of the author's name and notation that the publication and author are from the Federation of Canadian Turkish Associations. Immediately following the byline, separated by a double space, is the word "Introduction." One single space beneath the beginning of the introduction is the first paragraph in which Delen begins to explain that approximately 700,000 Armenians were killed or died of starvation and disease in World War I and that more than 2 million Turks and Muslims were massacred by the Armenians at the turn of the century or died during the fighting with the Armenians and Russians during World War I (Delen, ¶1). Delen then goes onto the second paragraph in which he writes that the tragic events that occurred between the Ottoman Turks and Armenians should be a lesson from which others can learn from and not repeat. Incidents, Delen writes, of "ultra-nationalism that result in the uprooting and devastation of communities are not allowed to occur again" (Delen, ¶2). He then goes on to express that the Turks in Turkey, the United States and Canada do not disagree with the Armenians that many Armenians during the "tragic events" died and suffered; however, they [the Turks] do not support or agree with the

Armenian propaganda and distortion of facts. The Armenians, Delen writes, are trying to spread their propaganda and influence public opinion through the one-sided portrayal of an event which clearly was the result of two warring groups of people. The Armenians, he writes, “resort to forgeries and falsifications” and he will attempt to address these falsifications in the following article and booklet (Delen, ¶2-3). It is interesting to note Delen’s reference to the “booklet,” because while he mentions it two or three times throughout the text, there is no booklet available to view online. This article stands alone, but mentions the booklet (Delen, ¶3). My assumption is that this article appeared in a booklet with other articles that support the claims made by Delen in this article.

In the fourth paragraph he continues to discuss the Armenian propaganda and allegations, which he says were unopposed for many years in America and Canada. The Americans, particularly, were not knowledgeable on the issue and thus the Armenian propaganda and one-sided presentation of their history greatly influenced public opinion. Now that Americans and Canadians are becoming aware of the issues that surround the Armenian claims, the Armenians are changing the face of their tactics and campaign. The Armenians discuss the ““psychology of the genocide denial and deniers”” and the Turkish revision of history to discredit anyone who opposes their side of the story or propaganda. Immediately, in the next paragraph, he jumps to his opinion that it is “absurd” for the Armenians to talk about genocide deniers when they themselves ignore the fact that 2 million Armenians died in the conflict with the Armenians. He matter-of-factly states, “No Armenian publication, propaganda literature, conference or seminar mentions the Armenian massacres of the Turkish and Muslim population by the armed revolutionary committees at the beginning of the 20th century” (Delen, ¶5). He writes that if they did mention the Armenian massacre of the Turkish and Muslim population, they would not be

bale to claim a “so-called Armenian genocide.” The Armenian’s version of a genocide, Delen mocks, results in more perpetrators dead than victims (Delen, ¶5). Delen writes that the history of the Ottoman Empire during the First World War was well documented, as was the Armenian rebellions and revolutionary committees (Delen, ¶6). It is ironic, he writes, that the Armenians accuse anyone who denies the genocide with attempting to rewrite history, when the Armenians themselves are “rewriting history” in the parliaments and governments of countries through the passage of resolutions and legislation. The Armenians rewrite history by lobbying and influencing politicians, Delen writes in the seventh paragraph (Delen, ¶7).

In the next paragraph, paragraph 8, Delen introduces the first subheading titled, “Comparison of Armenian Claims with the Jewish Holocaust.” Armenians, Delen writes, want to “cash in on the worldwide sentiment regarding the Jewish Holocaust by claiming that they were the ones who were subjected to the first genocide of the 20th century and that if the world paid more attention to their suffering, there would not have been a Holocaust” (Delen, ¶8). He writes that the Armenians think that if they parallel their so-called genocide with the Jewish Holocaust, they will gain the same sympathy that the Jews have from the public (Delen, ¶8). In paragraph nine, he makes a statement he often returns to over and over again – if someone is truly knowledgeable and familiar with the history of both the European and Ottoman history of the 20th century, then that person should know that the comparison of the alleged Armenian Genocide to that of the Jewish Holocaust is illogical and highly absurd (Delen, ¶9).

He then presents some facts for the person who believes there is a connection between the two. The facts he presents are provided in six bullet points, which are written in blue font. The bullet points provide a comparison of the two events. The Jew, unlike the Armenians, were law-abiding citizens who were singled out and attacked by the Nazis. The Jews, unlike the

Armenians, posed no threat to the state. The Armenians on the other hand formed revolutionary committees and rebelled against the majority rule, posing a threat to the stability and leadership of the empire. Also, while the Nazis had great military power to destroy the Jews, the Ottoman Empire – called at that time the “sick man of Europe” – was in decline and had to protect itself and relocate the Armenians. Finally, he ends these points with the last two points in which he says that no one was punished by the Nazis for the inhumane treatment of the Jews, but the Ottoman administration did execute 62 people for the inhumane treatment of the Armenians during the relocations.

Immediately following the bullet points, he goes into an explanation of how the Ottoman Empire was in the hands of the British, who also produced propaganda on behalf of the Armenians. The British tried the Ottoman officials at Malta and while they had plenty of time to find evidence pointing to the alleged Armenian massacres, no evidence was found. He spends the next seven paragraphs (paragraph 11 through 17) discussing how no evidence was ever found in the months following the Allied occupation of the Ottoman Empire following World War I. The meticulous search of the British and powerful Armenian lobbies in America could not find evidence of genocide, Delen writes. The British High Commission, he stresses, “left no stone unturned in order to prove the so-called ““Armenian massacres,”” but their search ended in failure (Delen, ¶12-14). Thus, the officials held at Malta were released. He writes that Armenians still try to rewrite history through their organized campaigns to influence politicians and put forth legislation in legislatures. He concludes this section with the statement with the statement that there is no parallel between the alleged Armenian Genocide and the Jewish Holocaust (Delen, ¶17).

Following this statement is the beginning of a new sub-heading titled, “Uprising and Massacres of Turks by the Armenians” in which Delen writes about the formation of the Hunchak and Dashnak committees to rebel against the Ottoman Turkish rule. These parties formed to insight rebellion and terror against the empire. He provides in paragraph 20 and 21 quotes from members of the parties [Louise Nalbandian and K.S. Papazyan] that reveal the purpose of the parties, which used terrorism, agitation and terror were used by both parties to elevate the spirit of its members. While he does not get into Nalbandian or Papazyan’s connection or relationship to the groups, he uses their quotes to validate his claims that the Armenians were up to no good and rebelled against the empire. In fact, to further support his claim, Delen provides a table [Table 1: Turkish Massacres by the Armenians] on the far right-hand side of the text that has two columns that acknowledge the date and location of the Armenian massacres of Turkish citizens. He then quotes American sources Captain Emory Niles and Arthur Sutherland who were Americans ordered to investigate the situation in eastern Anatolia in 1919. In a quote from their report, Delen selects a paragraph to insert into the article in which Niles and Sutherland refer to the Armenian destruction of the empire’s villages, especially the Muslim villages (Delen, ¶20-24).

Following the insertion of the paragraph, is the final subheading titled “Conclusion” in which he writes of the civilian and military losses on both the Armenian and Turkish side. The Armenian alliance with the Russians, who had an imperialistic vision at the time, led to the wars between the Turks and Armenians. The wars left villages within the empire in ruins and resulted in the death of 2 million Turks and 700,000 Armenians (Delen, ¶26). In the next paragraph, he writes that the crime of genocide is an intentional crime in which the destruction of a nation, ethnical, racial or religious group is brought about. That “intent” is absent from the “tragic

events” of the First World War in eastern Anatolia, Delen writes. Yet, the revolutionary committees, Delen says, continue today to attempt to force Turkey to accept the so-called genocide, apologize to the Armenians, pay retribution and annex eastern Turkey into Armenia. Delen lists these attempts in bullet points, which are again in blue ink (Delen, ¶27-28).

In the next paragraph he continues to write about how the revolutionary committees still try to obtain that which was not given to them in the Treaty of Sevres in 1920. The Armenians were given a large part of eastern Anatolia, he writes, but because the Treaty of Sevres was never enforced and was instead replaced by the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923, the boundaries of Armenian and Turkey were redrawn. The Armenians, until today, cannot accept the fact that they were not given everything they were promised in the original treaty (Delen, ¶29-30). While he has spent some time discussing the reign of terror of the different Armenian revolutionary organizations, he spends the next eight paragraphs (paragraph 31-39) discussing the terrorist activities of the Armenians. He writes of their terrorism and weapons offenses, as well as the number of Turkish diplomats the Armenians killed. In fact, in paragraph 32, he notes the table in which he has provided a list of the Turkish diplomats and individuals the Armenians have killed. This table is at the end of the document and text, [Table 2: Turkish and Other Citizens Murdered by Armenians] lists the date, location, name, position and location of the Turkish individuals killed by the Armenians. He continues to write about the political agenda, the murderous and terrorist tactics of the Armenians to play mind games they play with the Western population. The Armenians, Delen writes, indoctrinate young American minds with their false teachings and political agenda (Delen, ¶31-34). The Turkish community, he concludes, must realize that the time has come to expose the truth and respond to the decades of misinformation provided to the Western population by the Armenians (Delen, ¶35-38).

At the end of the article, Delen refers once more to the several articles and historical documents in the booklet that are all written by non-Turkish writers and observers. He also mentions the inclusion of an appendix, but neither the booklet nor appendix are available on this online version of the article. In fact, he references Justin McCarthy's article in the booklet, which he writes, is important because McCarthy addresses the lesson that the reader must learn – silence does not work and historical lies must be addressed (Delen, ¶39-40). Finally, beneath this last sentence, is Table 2 – the list of Turkish diplomats and individuals killed by the Armenians.

Publication Summary

Demir Delen's article, "Perpetuating the Genocide Myth" examines the Armenian use of propaganda to support the allegation of genocide. Delen writes that the Armenians ignore the fact that 2 million Muslims were killed by the Armenians; thus, he claims that they are re-writing history on their terms. The Armenians were a minority in the Ottoman Empire and lived among the Turks for years in peace. During the First World War, the Armenians teamed up with the Russians and their imperialistic dreams. The Armenians formed revolutionary committees and began terrorizing and killing the Ottoman Turks. Thus, the Turks had no choice but to protect themselves from the Armenian threat. They forced the Armenians to relocate, during which time many Armenians died of disease and starvation. While the Ottoman Turkish government should have protected the Armenians they relocated, they had to spend most of their time fighting off the rebels on the Russian border. These rebels were both Russians and Armenians. Thus, while Delen does admit to the fact that Armenians and Turks died, he makes it known that the Armenians started the conflict with the Turks.

Delen focuses his article on the fact that Armenians have always used propaganda, as well as forged documents to influence public opinion. He writes that the Armenians believe it is

important to link the alleged genocide to the Jewish Holocaust because it assigns the genocide importance. Delen explains the difference between the alleged genocide and the Jewish Holocaust, concluding that the comparison of the two events is absurd and illogical. In his article, he gives examples of Armenian terrorism with the use of two tables in which he lists the names and locations of the Turks that the Armenians killed. Delen provides examples of Armenian propaganda and terrorism, and ends the article with a call to action. He calls for the end of the spread of Armenian propaganda and deception. He wants legislatures and politicians to stop allowing the Armenian propaganda influence their decisions and replace the one-sided account of the story with the whole story.

Coding Sheet Findings and Analysis

I used the coding sheet [found in Appendix H] to code the following categories of the Delen's publication: format, themes, appeals, discourse and other notes.

Format

Delen's article "Perpetuating the Genocide Myth" is a fleshed-out argument that includes bullet points and two tables. After a thorough reading of the article and note taking, I used the coding sheet to document the themes, appeals, discourse and patterns in the article.

Themes

The themes in the article are blaming the accuser, ethnic/racial identity and history and truth. The theme of blaming the accuser is seen through Delen's explanation that the Armenians began the conflict and still blame the Turks for genocide. He estimates that 700,000 Armenians and 2 million Turks died in the "tragic events" in eastern Anatolia. The theme of blaming the accuser is consistent throughout Delen's article, as he writes that the Turks lost more lives than the Armenians, yet the Armenians still allege they were subject to genocide. He also blames the

Armenians for their use of propaganda and setting their political agenda to label anyone who disagrees with them as a genocide denier. They use propaganda, he writes, to get politicians to side with them. They also attempt to compare the alleged Armenian Genocide to the Jewish Holocaust. This comparison, Delen writes, is absurd and illogical because there is no connection.

He spends the majority of the article writing about how there can be no comparison of the two events. His biggest argument is that the Armenians were never intentionally killed, after all, they are the ones who started the conflict with the Turks. Since the Turks were the majority and felt threatened by the Armenians, they had no choice but to relocate them, during which many died of disease and starvation. The Turks, Delen emphasizes, lost more lives than the Armenians and that must be considered in the decision-making. The facts are there, but are being ignored by the Armenians in their one-sided portrayal of the events. Delen gives the reader fact after fact that shows that the British and Allied forces who proceeded over the trials of the Ottoman officials found nothing to convict the officials on – particularly no genocide charges.

Delen's article is perhaps one of the most interesting thus far because the article's themes are intertwined and build upon one another nicely. Within the overarching theme of blaming the accuser, Delen uses examples of ethnic and racial identity as well as history and truth. He blames the Armenians for their propagandist tactics throughout the piece, always coming back to that the Armenians started the conflict, they were a threat to the Ottoman Empire that had to be dealt with and, most importantly, that there is no logical comparison between the Ottoman Armenian experience and the Jewish Holocaust. I think he really does a good job at making the three themes work together which in turn makes his argument that much stronger. He continuously reminds the reader that anyone who is familiar with the history of the time would know that the Armenians were a threat to the Ottoman Empire, unlike the Jews. Everyone knows

that the Jews were singled out and intentionally killed by the Nazi regime and the word intent is what separates genocide from conflict. The Armenians started the conflict, were relocated by force and died along the way. There is no intent here, Delen argues. He continues to mention the fact that the Armenian propagandists use their lobbying and influential power with the legislatures and decision-makers in the U.S., Canada and abroad to showcase their side of the story. He claims that they are rewriting history and presenting it to those who have little knowledge of the history of the time.

In essence, he presents a call for action through his article, which up to this point is the only article that does so. The previous four articles have presented claims, facts and shed light on the Armenian propaganda, but have really not made the reader realize that in order to make a decision on whether to believe the Armenians, a whole study must be done of the time period. While the other authors do request a complete study and a historical study, Delen really leaves the reader thinking about the use of propaganda and the illogical comparison of the alleged Armenian Genocide to the Jewish Holocaust because he provides numbers of Armenians and Turks killed in the conflict and tables that list the names and or locations and dates of those Turks killed by the Armenians. Delen provides convincing evidence. Maybe it is more convincing because it is presented in tables, which have a certain degree of instant credibility. He also provides the reader with examples of Armenian propaganda. Delen's article stands out from the rest, thus far, in that it does not just accuse the Armenians of spreading propaganda and presenting one-side of the story, but it actually provides examples of how the Armenians spread propaganda and the consequences that brings about.

Appeals

Delen's article definitely appeals mostly to rationality, but also to irrationality in the examples of Armenian terrorism. The appeals to rationality are the strongest in the text as he writes that "lessons should be learned" from his article (Delen, ¶2). The things people need to know before they make a decision about whether to believe the Armenian allegation of genocide is how many people died on each side and how they died. He tells the reader that there is no way the Armenians were intentionally killed by the Ottoman Turkish officials if there were only 700,000 dead, but 2 million Muslims dead. How does a genocide result in more of the perpetrators dying, he writes, than the victims (Delen, ¶5). He also provides the reader with examples of Armenian propaganda and terrorism. He presents the two tables in which he lists the number, location and position of the Turkish officials and innocent citizens who were intentionally killed by the Armenians – Ottoman Turkish Embassy officials, consuls, their family members, etc.

Perhaps one of his strongest appeals to rationality is when he calls into question those who believe the Armenian propaganda. The people who believe the Armenians, he writes, must not know much about the historical facts that surround the time period. They must not realize that the Armenians attacked and rebelled against the Turks and the Turks responded as any majority would to protect what was rightfully theirs. He stresses that the Armenians are rewriting history themselves, although they claim that the Turks are rewriting their history.

Another strong appeal to rationality is the "absurd" comparison of the alleged Armenian Genocide to the Jewish Holocaust. Delen presents the reader with the reasons why this comparison is illogical as he lists the differences between the two warring facts – the Armenians and the Turks and the Jews and the Nazis. He concludes this argument by stating that the Jews

were never a threat to the Nazi regime and they were intentionally killed. The Armenians, on the other hand, were a threat to the Ottoman Empire and were thus dealt with by the Ottoman Turkish officials. These are “historical facts,” which cannot be ignored, Delen stresses (Delen, ¶7).

He also appeals to rationality in the presentation of the Treaty of Sevres and Laussane in the article’s conclusion. He provides examples of Armenian terrorism due to the fact that the treaties did not satisfy the Armenians. He explains the different Armenian revolutionary parties and tells the reader about their acts of terrorism and murder. He provides the lists of the places and people the revolutionaries killed and how the Armenians continue to “poison the minds” of individuals through the use of their propaganda (Delen, ¶38).

Finally, the article also appeals to irrationality within its appeal to rationality because the discussion and portrayal of the Armenians as terrorists sheds a negative light on a group who claims to have been intentionally decimated by the Ottoman Turkish government. The Armenians are terrorists and are poisoning the minds of those who do not know any better. They do not know the historical facts, Delen writes, and believe what the Armenians tell them. The Armenians try to draw the comparison to the Jewish Holocaust by twisting and rewriting their history to play on the sensitivities associated with the Holocaust, but Delen does a good job in quelling the argument and comparison. Through the article’s appeal to irrationality, he writes that anyone who knows anything about the history of the late Ottoman Empire, knows that it was in decline and once threatened by the Armenian revolutionaries, the Turks were left no choice but to protect their empire. The Armenians do not present the historical facts, instead they spread lies through their propaganda, they ignore the large number of Turkish deaths and attempt to rewrite and retell their history to anyone who will listen.

Discourse

In regard to the discourse that supports Delen's appeal to rationality and irrationality, there are many modifiers that dispel doubt and raise doubt, as well as many nouns with a negative connotation and denotation. The modifiers that dispel doubt include the phrases, "no evidence, reliable witness, no proof and no case," "complete failure," "no parallel" and "meticulous search" and "utmost zeal." These modifiers dispel doubt because they all provide strength for Delen's argument that the Armenians were not intentionally killed and that their one-sided representation is indeed propaganda and thus not built upon the historical facts of the time. The Armenians claim to have been intentionally forced out and killed by the empire's officials, however, once the Allied forces and British came into the picture at the end of World War I and began to investigate the situation and try the Ottoman officials at the court in Malta, they found "no evidence, reliable witnesses, no proof and no case" against them. The search was a "complete failure" and the officials were acquitted (Delen, ¶14). The "meticulous search" conducted by the British for two years left no stone unturned and was conducted with the "utmost zeal," but did not uncover the Turks had intended to kill the Armenians (Delen, ¶13). Regardless of this investigation, the Armenians continue to produce propaganda and poison the minds of anyone who will listen to their side of the story. Thus, these modifiers that dispel doubt about the Turkish guilt, lead to the modifiers that raise doubt regarding the Armenian portrayal of the truth.

The modifiers that raise doubt include, "rewriting history," "influencing politicians," "attempting to poison young minds," "Armenian terrorist," "organized campaigns," "constant propaganda and accusations." These modifiers raise doubt against the Armenian portrayal and allegation of genocide. They really make the reader think twice about siding with the Armenians.

For example, the Armenians, Delen writes, are “rewriting history” even though they claim that the Turks are rewriting their history (Delen, ¶7). The Armenians are lobbying and “influencing politicians” who are not historians and are not well versed on the history of the time (Delen, ¶8). By putting power in the hands of the politicians, Armenians are lobbying their political agenda in the legislatures and are getting legislation passed by people who do not know the historical facts surrounding the tragic events that took place in the late Ottoman Empire. “Armenian terrorists” are violently attacking Turkish officials even after they were tried and acquitted in the Malta tribunal (Delen, ¶34). The “organized campaigns” of violence and “constant propaganda and accusations” are leading politicians to make poor choices (Delen, ¶10-15). Again, Delen uses these terms to raise doubt in the reader. He wants the reader to realize that the politicians are making decisions based on one side of the story and based on propaganda, not historical facts. The Armenians are using the parallel to the Jewish Holocaust in order to raise doubt against the Turks. Delen makes sure that the reader understands the Armenians propaganda and its consequences. He uses discourse, such as nouns with a negative connotation and denotation to portray the Armenians as the ones who are rewriting history, not the Turks.

The nouns with a negative connotation and denotation are “Armenian agitators,” “genocide deniers,” “Armenian propaganda,” and “forgeries and falsifications.” The “Armenian agitators,” are the ones who continue to cause the problems (Delen, ¶10). Not only do they create conflict with the Turks, but they continue to create conflict long after the alleged genocide. They continue to label anyone who disagrees with them a “genocide denier” and continue to spread lies through their “Armenian propaganda,” and “forgeries and falsifications” (Delen, ¶3-4). Delen truly paints a horrible picture of the Armenians. He skillfully presents both sides of the story, but highlights the negative aspects of the Armenian allegation. He takes the reader from

the Armenians during the conflict, to the Armenians now. He shows how they have progressed and continue to spread lies and the one-sided story. Delen also shows how they continue to deceive people who make decisions based on their lies and illogical comparison to the Jewish Holocaust.

Analysis

While I do think this article was by far the most impressive and convincing, the one thing I cannot get over is the fact that even though the article is full of evidence and examples of Armenian terrorism and forgeries, there is no bibliography or reference section. There is no appendix available either. It really makes me have to stop and think about this article. While it does present very convincing arguments, it does not have the real proof a researcher looks for; and, while anyone can read this, the only people who will really read this article and information on this site are ones who are interested in the time period. Thus, although Delen's article is convincing and presents a lot of information and examples, the fact that there is no document attribution concerns me. Anyone can quote or reference historical documents in a text, but if it is truly a quote or prime example, it must be attributed to the source.

Facts and Discussion Points in the Armenian Allegations Publication Description

The "Facts and Discussion Points in the Armenian Allegations," is written by Ayhan Ozer. It is actually a very short publication that is separated into two facts/discussion points with sub heads labeled "Armenian Terrorism," and "U.N. Report." The article is available for download on the ATAA's Web site reference library and was last accessed on March 6, 2006. When printed out and accessed, the article's title appears in blue font in the center at the top. After the title, which is in framed in a box, is the author's byline and the first sub head "Armenian Terrorism." The publication is separated into two points in the Armenian allegation

of genocide with seven paragraphs in total. This short publication has much lengthier paragraphs than the previous two paragraphs I assessed. The publication's two points are filled with statistics, numbers, names and dates suggesting that they are accurate and fact-filled. Interestingly enough, like the other two publications there is no reference section, bibliography, endnotes or footnotes to attribute where the author got the statistics and data.

The first sub heading, "Armenian Terrorism," appears in bold letters. After the sub heading, is a double space and then two paragraphs which describe the Armenian terrorism. The paragraph is nine sentences long. The paragraph discusses the Armenian terrorism that began on January 27, 1973. The Armenians launched a brutal campaign of violence and blood-shed, killing Turkish diplomats. According to Ozer, the terrorism continued for two decades, claiming the lives of more than seventy Turkish diplomats and innocent bystanders. The next paragraph in the Armenian terrorism section discusses brings the discussion of the Armenian terrorism to today. Ozer writes, "A closing paragraph can go as follows: Today, the Armenians are counting on the scant sense of history of people" relying on war-time propaganda and yellow journalism (Ozer, ¶2). Armenians, Ozer claims, have "romanticized their history" and "embroidered the truth" (Ozer, ¶2). He echoes the comments of McCarthy in the previous article in that he says the Armenians have ignored and refused to believe any evidence that shatters their "mythical convictions" (Ozer, ¶2).

The next sub heading in the document is titled "U.N. Report." This section is comprised of five paragraphs. In the first paragraph, Ozer writes about the Armenian representation in the Holocaust Council. The Armenians, represented in the council by Seth Moomjian, were not very giving to the council and when the earthquake hit the present-day Republic of Armenia, the community and Moomjian pulled their support of the council and only half of their pledge was

fulfilled, according to Ozer (Ozer, ¶3). In the next paragraph, Ozer introduces the alleged U.N. Report written by Benjamin Whitaker in 1990. Whitaker, a U.N. reporter, prepared the report echoing the allegations of the Armenians that the ““tragic events during the First World War involving the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire constituted the first case of genocide in the 20th century” (Ozer, ¶4). Ozer writes that the reporter had been “spoon-fed” the Armenian’s “distorted version of history” (Ozer, ¶4). According to Ozer, Moomjian was the informant who helped the reporter write the alleged report. “Like all Armenian falsehoods, it was far from being serious work, and the U.N. had nothing to do with it. It was a private venture...” (Ozer, ¶4). This private venture, according to Ozer, was the Armenian attempt to “desecrate the truth,” and “corrupt venerated institutions” (Ozer, ¶4).

In the next paragraph, Ozer writes about the pressure the U.N. Economic and Social Council felt in the 35th session of the Commission on Human Rights to add a paragraph about the Armenian allegation of genocide. The sub council resisted the inclusion of the paragraph because it was “not based on historical facts” (Ozer, ¶5). Ozer notes that the “eminent historians,” observers and artifacts point the finger at the Armenians as being the ones who started the conflict. “The Armenians,” Ozer concludes, “counting on the short memory of the people, keep heating up this old dish and try to foist it upon the public as a truth.” According to Ozer, the Armenians started the conflict, but still try to pull parts of their history out of context and place the blame on the Turks. Ozer has positioned himself to introduce the facts and discussion points against this distortion of history.

Publication Summary

Ozer’s publication is very different from the other two publications I have analyzed thus far. What makes it different is not only the format and length, but the fact that the publication is

really not an article and is instead two discussion points that do not create a story or point. They just seem to be two discussion points that can added or subtracted from any article or publication. Since both points are different and the publication is not a coherent argument, I will summarize both points separately.

In the section titled “Armenian Terrorism,” Ozer presents the past and present actions of the Armenian terrorists who killed Turkish diplomats and citizens for two decades beginning in 1973 and who still, today, continue to romanticize their history and embroider the truth with what they want people to know and remember about the alleged genocide. Ozer uses the two paragraphs to tie the past and present together with a message warning the reader about the future – the Armenians will continue to embroider the truth and the reader must be conscious of the Armenians’ actions.

In the section titled the “U.N. Report,” Ozer presents the story of Seth Moomjian and the fabricated U.N. report to show that the Armenians were never interested in telling the whole story and only want people to know what they want them to know – that the Turks killed the Armenians. Ozer uses this section to show the reader that the Armenians present their side of the story and those who are not versed on the topic believe what they present. Thus, he concludes that the Armenians are “counting on the short memory of the people,” and continue to present the same story to the public and trying to pass it on as the truth.

Now that I have described the publication and summarized the publication, I will present the findings from the coding sheet.

Coding Sheet Findings and Analysis

I used the coding sheet [found in Appendix I] to code the following categories of the Ozer’s publication: format, themes, appeals, discourse and other notes.

Format

Ozer's publication is a skeleton of an argument, not a fleshed-out argument. In fact, not only is the publication not an argument, but it is two points that are independent of one another.

Themes

Ozer's publication includes the themes listed on the coding sheet of blaming the accuser. The theme of blaming the accuser is seen in Ozer's publication as he blames the Armenians for their brutal attacks and terrorism against the Turks decades after World War I. Armenians, Ozer writes, "launched a brutal terrorism campaign against the Turks," to validate their mythical genocide (Ozer, ¶1). This is a definite attempt by Ozer to blame the accuser. Not only is he blaming the Armenians for their terrorism against the Turks, but he also discusses, in the second section, the fact that the Armenians started the conflict with the Turks in 1915 as well.

Ozer blames the Armenians for propagandist activity and for fabricating and embroidering the truth. He writes that they romanticize their history and refuse to believe evidence that disagrees with their version of history (Ozer, ¶2). In fact, the second section about the U.N. Report can be considered an example of Ozer's claim that the Armenians fabricate their history. In the second section, Ozer discusses the propagandist nature of the Armenians. He writes that the Armenians use wartime propaganda and parts of their history to make it seem as though the Armenians were massacred by the Turks. The U.N. Report, in fact, can be seen as Ozer's example of the Armenians continued use of wartime propaganda. Ozer's description of the U.N. Report. The report was manufactured by the Armenians and presented as though it came from the U.N., when in actuality it was produced by an "obscure reporter," according to Ozer (Ozer, ¶4). While this report seemed credible, Ozer states that it was not the product of a

credible source. The historical document was not the result of the truth, according to Ozer. Not only did the Armenians fabricate the report, but they also tried to get the U.N. to include a paragraph on the question of the Armenian allegation of genocide.

In the description of the publication, I noted the fact that this is strictly a publication and not an article because the publication is made-up of two points that do not flow like an argument. However, after a careful close reading, I have begun to see the connection between the two sections. While on the surface they seem to be two points with no connection, I am beginning to see how the first section and the second section fit well with one another. In the first section, Ozer describes Armenians as propagandists and terrorists. Then, in the second section, Ozer uses the example of the U.N. Report as the example of the Armenian propaganda and tactics.

Appeals

In regards to the appeals, Ozer's article appeals both to rationality and irrationality. The appeal to rationality is seen in Ozer's use of the U.N. Report. The report seems impressive and authoritative, but Ozer makes the claim that it was written by an "obscure reporter" (Ozer, ¶4). However, he never states that the report was discarded by the U.N.; but, he does attempt to discredit the credible source and provide the reader with an example of what the Armenians will do to fabricate the truth. Not only is the report written by an "obscure reporter," with the help of an Armenian source, but the Armenians still use it and try to showcase the truth behind the report. This shows the reader that the Armenians will use information regardless of where the information is from or what it includes.

Ozer's publication definitely appeals to irrationality in that he paints a very negative picture of the Armenians. Not only does he call them propagandists, but he also calls them terrorists. In his publication, Ozer provides examples of how use propaganda to spread their side

of the story. He uses the U.N. Report as well as information about the terrorist attacks against Turkish diplomats and citizens to make the reader fear the Armenians. Ozer's depiction of the Armenians is also achieved through the discourse he uses.

Discourse

Ozer's publication includes modifiers that raise doubt, as well as nouns with a negative connotation and denotation. The modifiers that raise doubt include, "mythical convictions," "yellow journalism," "war-time propaganda," "fictions," "add-on stories," "spoon-fed," "embroidered truth," "romanticized history," and "Armenian terrorism" (Ozer, ¶1-7). Ozer writes that the Armenians use "war-time propaganda" to spread the "fictions," and the "add on stories," about the Armenian genocide (Ozer, ¶1). They [the Armenians] rely on "yellow journalism" to tell the story they want to tell. The story they spoon feed to others in an attempt to spread their "embroidered truth" and "romanticized history" (Ozer, ¶2). This discourse shows the reader that the Armenians cannot be trusted. They are making compelling arguments but their arguments cannot be supported by evidence because they are not sound arguments. Their history and their arguments are taken out of historical context and the reader is told that he/she cannot make a rational decision based the evidence/propaganda the Armenians present as they are not a trusted source.

The nouns with a negative connotation and denotation include "endless terrorism," "savage operations," "brutal terrorism campaign," "senseless terrorism," "blood-shed and violence" and "death threat" (Ozer, ¶1-7). These nouns/phrases are very graphic, to say the least. I think they really convey Ozer's feelings toward the Armenian people. He tells the reader, through the use of this discourse, that the Armenians are terrorists and do not think twice about violence and killing innocent people. Ozer paints an image of a savage group of people who will

use guerilla tactics and any means in their “brutal terrorism campaign,” and acts of “senseless terrorism” (Ozer, ¶1). These terms do not focus on the consequences of Armenian propaganda as much as they do on the nature and character of the Armenians. They really paint a savage picture of the Armenians and reveal the reason this group continues to spread lies through their propaganda. Anyone who can go around brutally terrorizing people will not think twice about spreading lies about their history. This is particularly dangerous when people do not know too much about the time period and make their decisions based one side’s arguments.

Analysis

Ozer’s publication is formulated in complete sentences and paragraphs , but is not an article because it is not like a story with a beginning, middle and end. Instead, the two points in his publication seem to be the explanation of the Armenians as terrorists and propagandists with an example to follow. If the points were attributed in endnotes or footnotes, I think they would have been stronger. While I do think the arguments are strong, the stretch between linking the two is too great. This is by far the most ineffective publication because it seems like the author pulled out two facts from another publication and put them into this format. I do not think it is effective enough to make the reader remember what he/she read and reuse the arguments in making a decision between who to believe. While I know the end result is not who to believe, but who it telling the truth, I know that many people make their decisions on events such as this based on who provides the most compelling evidence.

Let Historians Decide on the So-called Genocide

Publication Description

Justin McCarthy’s article, “Let Historians Decide on the So-called Genocide,” is also available for download on the ATAA’s Web site reference library and was last accessed on

March 6, 2006. It is actually the first article, in my sample, with a publication date on it. In fact, it is the first article I have analyzed with a complete byline. Not only does it state, beneath the title, “Let Historians Decide on the So-called Genocide” that the article was written by Justin McCarthy on April 11, 2001, but it also notes that it is copyrighted and was published by the *Turkish Daily News*.

Underneath the title, which appears in blue font at the top/center of the article, and byline of the author, date and publication, are the words, “Part I:” and then the beginning of the article. McCarthy’s article is divided into three parts, and is comprised of 88 paragraphs in total. Three paragraphs are three to five sentences in length and are all flush-left and single-spaced in between. There are no indentations to introduce the next paragraph, instead each paragraph is separated by a double space. There are also no charts or tables in this article, nor is there a bibliography, appendix or reference page. The article is obviously an opinion piece that is written by the historian Justin McCarthy. The interesting thing is that the previous article, “The First Shot,” was also written by McCarthy in which he establishes himself as a professor of history and a professor who follows the historians creed to always study the whole truth and present the whole truth. Thus, before the reader even begins to read this article, McCarthy’s reputation as a historian who studies and follows the creed, gives him the credibility he needs in this article as well.

In part one of McCarthy’s article, he begins by telling the reader that there is a difference between a nationalist and a historian. While both groups have political ideologies and goals, the nationalist strives to triumph for the cause and will do anything to make sure that the goal is achieved. The historian, on the other hand, will do acknowledge the historical facts, even if they do not coincide with his beliefs. After he sets this up, he presents the issue of the Turks and the

Armenians (McCarthy, ¶1). “Yet when the histories of the Turks and the Armenians are approached with the normal tools a logical and consistent account results,” he writes (McCarthy, ¶1). Thus, he sets up the rest of the article to show how the histories of the two are presented, in both the wrong way and right way – by the nationalists and the historians (McCarthy, ¶1). In the next paragraph, he specifies who the historians are and how they need to make their decisions (McCarthy, ¶2). Regardless of the historians’ prejudices, a real historian who finds the truth illusive, will put aside his prejudices, political ideologies and opinions to find and write the truth (McCarthy, ¶2-3).

He then presents the opinion and view of the nationalists, which he writes have a different set of goals and will use “events from the past as weapons in their own nation’s battles” to allow for their cause to triumph (McCarthy, ¶4). These nationalists, McCarthy writes, will do anything to succeed in their goal, even if that means they will select pieces out the relevant facts, put them together into a coherent picture and present it regardless of what they left out (McCarthy, ¶4). In the fifth paragraph, he reiterates the difference between a nationalist and a historian and then introduces the Armenian issue in the sixth paragraph, which he says has long been plagued with nationalist studies (McCarthy, ¶6). He says this problem has led to an inconsistent history of the Armenians and the conflict in eastern Anatolia against the Ottoman Turks. He then presents a call to action – a call to study the history of the Armenians the right way (McCarthy, ¶6).

The first way to study the history of the Armenians, he writes, is to think about whether there ever was an Armenia during the time period. If there was a large population of Armenians in the region, then why did they not have their own state and a reason to protect it, he asks (McCarthy, ¶7). From this point on, he begins to assess the Armenian situation of the time. In

paragraph eight, he writes that the Armenians were the minority and lived under the rule of the Ottoman Empire because they only made up 17 percent of the population. He retrieves this information from government sources, the place he says all historians must begin their investigation of the truth (McCarthy, ¶8). Thus, he writes, that the Armenians were not a great threat to the Ottoman Empire because they were only a small group of people. Even if they wanted to rebel against the Ottoman Turks, they did not have the manpower to do so; however, he then introduces the idea that while the Armenians could not rebel on their own, they could if they had a larger population of Russians to support their cause. Thus, McCarthy tells the reader about the Armenian-Russian alliance and the imperialistic desire of the Russians to expand into the Ottoman Empire at the time. The Armenians together with the Russians could create their own state and rid themselves of the Muslim domination (McCarthy, ¶9).

While he sets the reader up for the rest of the historical facts he will present, in paragraph ten he reminds the reader that the history of the Armenians is unlike the history of other peoples because all one needs to do is apply the historical principles to find the truth. While some of their [the Armenians] history is unique due to the environment, he adds, it is similar to those of the surrounding area and time period. In order to back up his argument, he presents three numbered claims in paragraphs 11 through 13. He applies the principals of history to the Armenians as he writes in points one through three that most ethnic conflicts develop over time, until very recent times ethnic conflicts resulted in the mass mortality of ethnic groups involved, and that when conflict erupts between two warring sides, between the state and the revolutionaries, it is always the revolutionaries who begin the conflict (McCarthy, ¶11-13). These are the reasons McCarthy gives the reader to further support his argument that the history of the Armenians is no different than the history of other groups who have been involved in an ethnic conflict (McCarthy, ¶14).

In the next paragraph, he continues to write about the Turko-Armenian conflict, which he writes was made possible because of the Armenian-Russian alliance. The Armenians did not have the man power to take control of the Ottoman Turks, but they did have the support of the Russians which made it possible to rebel. Once the Armenians joined forces with the Russians, the division between the Ottoman Muslims and Armenians occurred. In fact, McCarthy writes that many Armenians and Muslims did not want to fight, but that they had no choice but to choose a side when the Armenians and Russians came together to fight the Muslims (McCarthy, ¶15-16).

Thus a great population exchange happened in the region, as the Armenians joined the Russians and the mutual distrust between the Muslims and the Armenians developed. The Armenians joined the Russians as spies and police during the Russo-Turkish war in 1877-88. the Armenians ‘molested, ill-treated and insulted’ the Muslim population as the Russians forced the Muslims out of their homes and villages and occupied more and more land (McCarthy, ¶17-20). Russian imperialism, no thanks to the Armenians, saw to the death of 1.5 million people [no specific group mentioned] and the destruction of “ethnic peace” (McCarthy, ¶21). The Muslims quickly learned that their neighbors – the Armenians – were not the people they had lived in peace among for the past 700 years. They were their enemies and monsters created by the Russians. “The Russians had created the two sides that history teaches were to be expected in conflict and mass murder” (McCarthy, ¶22). Thus the mutual fear between the Muslims and the Armenians led to the creation of nationalist groups who resorted to terrorism as their “weapon of choice” (McCarthy, ¶23-24). McCarthy only mentions the formation of the Armenian revolutionary/nationalist groups, but does write that their use of terrorism forced the Ottoman Turks to respond (McCarthy, ¶24).

The Armenian rebels banded together to attack Ottoman Turkish villages and people. The Armenians were trying to drive out the majority population as the “lands they [the Armenians] covered were overwhelmingly Muslim in population,” (McCarthy, ¶25-28). Together with the Russians they began to kill and destroy Muslim villages. This was their attempt to rid the empire of Muslim control (McCarthy, ¶28). This is the point in the text that McCarthy stops the reader and the story, to remind the reader that there is a long historical period in which the conflict between the Muslims and the Armenians developed. To this point, he has explained the developing conflict and is setting the reader up for the rest of the article (McCarthy, ¶29-31).

In the next four paragraphs, he explains the beginnings of the “inter-communal” conflict in the Ottoman East with the Armenian rebellion in 1914 (McCarthy, ¶32). He continues in the next few paragraphs to discuss the Russian-Armenian alliance, which he says strengthened the rebels in size and power. The Ottoman government, he writes, estimated that as many as 30,000 rebels took to the streets cutting telegraph lines, seizing roads, attacking Ottoman officials and attacking and massacring Muslim villages on their way (McCarthy, ¶33-34). This is the end of part one, which is somewhat interesting that he ends this way without finishing the rest of the story, but picks it up in the second part, “Part II.”

He ends oddly enough with the explanation of the Armenian attacks, and begins in part two explaining popular opinion today which only knows of one set of deportations – the Armenian deportations. “There were in fact many forced migrations. For the Armenians, the worst forced migrations came when they accompanied their own armies in retreat. Starvation and disease killed great numbers of both, far more than fell to enemies’ battles,” he writes (McCarthy, ¶36). Today, however, people only speak of the deportation of the Armenians and the number of Armenians who were killed during these deportations. McCarthy’s belief is that

the Armenians died on the migration. In fact, he writes that the Turks had no choice but to deport the Armenians because they were a threat to the empire and forced migration/deportation was an “age-old tool in Middle Eastern and Balkan conflicts” (McCarthy, ¶37). This was nothing new and an unfortunate rule in war. He continues to write about the force migration and the fact that the Ottoman government should have protect the migrants more, but were spending most of their time and resources protecting themselves (villages and people) from the Russian-Armenian rebellions (McCarthy, ¶37).

“Historical principles,” McCarthy advises, “were once again at work. Rebels had begun the action and the result was the creation of two warring sides” (McCarthy, ¶38). The Armenians were a threat to the Muslims, the Muslims had to answer to their enemies and for the next five years a merciless conflict and total war raged in the Ottoman East, McCarthy concludes in paragraph 39 (McCarthy, ¶38-39). He then returns his focus to today in which he says that popular opinion only knows of one set of deportations, more properly called forced migrations. He writes that the Armenians were forced to migrate because they were a threat to the Ottoman state. They starved and died of disease along the way, after all, “it is also a historical principle that refugees suffer most of all” (McCarthy, ¶40). Thus, the forced migration and organized expulsion of the Armenians was an “age-old tool” was a result of the threat of Armenian threat. However, most people, McCarthy writes, ignore the fact that not all the Armenians were a threat and therefore not deported (McCarthy, ¶41-42).

The claim of genocide cannot rationally stand alone considering these facts, McCarthy writes. But, if the claim of genocide is going to be considered then the deaths of the Muslims must also be taken into consideration. The whole history must be considered (McCarthy, ¶43-46). Today, however, the Armenians rely on fabrications such as the Talat Pasha Telegrams,

quotes from American sources and even the Hitler quote (McCarthy, ¶47-52). The alleged Talat Pasha telegrams included his orders to the Ottoman officials of his instructions to perform hideous deeds. There are also quotes by Americans such as U.S. Ambassador Morgenthau in which he says Talat Pasha told him of his plans to exterminate the Armenians. These quotes, McCarthy writes, were not reported until they were put into Morgenthau's book years later. He writes that the Armenians are selective in what they choose to present, particularly with Hitler's quote because the quote and especially the "magic word" (Hitler) "conjures up an all too true image of undisputed evil" (McCarthy, ¶52-54). Armenians have been selective in the presentation of their side of the story, only selecting quotes that will make them look good, never citing contradicting evidence (McCarthy, ¶54-56). History, McCarthy reminds the reader, is only good history when it takes into consideration both sides of the story. He writes that the fact that the Armenians ignore the Muslim deaths shows that they do not want to face both sides of the story (McCarthy, ¶57-58).

Interestingly enough, at the end of part two, McCarthy then begins to talk about the accusations the Armenians make against the Turks. The Armenians claim that the Turks wanted to get rid of them because they blocked the transportation route to Asia. But, that, he writes, is not true because the Armenians did not live along the route to Asia. In fact, in the post-war courts many of the officials from the Committee of Union and Progress were tried for crimes against the Armenians, the courts returned verdicts of not guilty for killing the Armenians. However, there was no evidence of massacre (McCarthy, ¶59-61). Once McCarthy brings this up, the next part – part three – begins with a statement about the German scholar who decided that the Ottomans reported and killed the Armenians so that they would have more room to settle; but, he reminds the reader, anyone who knows anything about Ottoman history knows that

this is not true because the Balkan refugees they wanted the land for had already settled in the western part of Anatolia (McCarthy, ¶62-63). Therefore, if the reader applies the principals of history, the reader will see that the Armenians are only showing one of the two sides of the conflict. Thus, the Armenians are the nationalists, the nationalists that McCarthy first brought up in the opening paragraph. In the next few paragraphs, he repeats the information about the fact that the Turks needed the space for the Balkan refugees and while this accusation was checked out and answered, the truth advances (McCarthy, ¶64-68).

The Armenians, however, continue to silence history and present their side of the story; but, the only question, McCarthy explains, is the truth (McCarthy, ¶69-71). In fact the Armenians are getting to the historians as well. He writes that Professor Bernard Lewis can afford to confront the Armenians who try to silence the historical facts he presents, but can the other historians and professors who have just begun their careers. Even McCarthy writes that he has been the target of a campaign by an Armenian newspaper for denying the genocide. He writes that the Armenians are getting to the politicians and enlisting them to rewrite history. The ones they cannot keep from rewriting history end up passing legislation in parliaments that make people think there was a genocide (McCarthy, ¶72-74). The Turks are accused of genocide, but what that term really suggests that there is an intention and premeditation in the mass killing of a political, racial, ethnical or religious group. Thus the term is too loosely defined and does not fit the bill in regard to the Armenians and Turks. There was no intent, McCarthy writes, in the Ottoman history. The only intent is political, he writes (McCarthy, ¶75-76). By applying the principles of history, it is evident that the long history of imperialism and nationalist revolt and ethnic conflict, the result was horrible mortality on all sides, it was not genocide (McCarthy, ¶77-80).

He continues to remind the reader that what happened between the Armenians and the Turks was not genocide. The reason the Turks are accused of these horrible crimes are because they appeal both emotionally and politically because the Armenians feel in their hearts that the Turks are guilty. For many years, they have heard of the deaths of their ancestors and have only been told one side of the story. They believe this story to be the “unquestionable truth.” It was the Armenian nationalists who rely on the emotional and political reasons (McCarthy, ¶81-84). In fact, it is the nationalists who stop students and historians from studying the whole truth. McCarthy encourages graduate students, researchers and historians to study the archives of both Armenia and Turkey. He encourages the establishment of a joint commission to study the “Armenian question.” The political lies must be rejected and the truth will one day soon be recognized by the world. “I believe that the accurate study of history and the honor of the Turks will bring this to pass,” he concludes. As he concludes the article, McCarthy makes a link back to the beginning of the article, as he writes that the historians are the only ones who search for the truth and the Armenians are the nationalists, who will do whatever they need to do to make their cause triumph. The last line in the article is “Professor Justin McCarthy teaches at the University of Louisville in Kentucky” (McCarthy, ¶89).

Publication Summary

McCarthy’s article is a credible look at the “Armenian question,” one which he writes is in question because there are two groups who are trying to get their story across – the nationalists and the historians. McCarthy writes that the nationalists, the Armenians, will do anything in their power to make their case triumph. That includes telling one side of their story to anyone who will listen. The historians on the other hand, can see the difference between what the Armenians present and what actually happened during the time. He continues to remind the reader that

anyone who knows anything about the time period and applies the historical facts and tools, he or she will know that the Armenians are not telling the whole truth. They are leaving any contradictory information out of their account and only playing fair with those who play fair with them. He goes through and provides examples that point to the ethnic conflict between two warring sides in which one, usually the minority, losses. The Armenians were a threat to the Turks, thus the “age-old tool” of forced migration was implemented to get rid of the threat. This is the history and truth behind the conflict and any ethnic conflict during this time.

Coding Sheet Findings and Analysis

I used the coding sheet [found in Appendix J] to code the following categories of the publication: format, themes, appeals, discourse and other notes.

Format

The Armenians are a fleshed-out argument separated into three parts that discusses the strengths and weaknesses of the Armenian and Turkish arguments. It is a strong argument in that it presents the historical tools and facts necessary to make a decision in regard to the “Armenian question.” The article is written by McCarthy who has written another very well-written article. Also, the fact that McCarthy is a teacher and professor of history also assigns the article credibility; however, because it does not have a reference or bibliography, I do find the article less credible overall. While the arguments are well-written, the facts he uses in the article are not attributed. However, the article’s theme of blaming the accuser and history and truth – are seen very strongly in the text.

Themes

The themes of blaming the accuser, as well as history and truth are very prevalent in McCarthy’s article. Much like his other article, McCarthy writes that the difference between

historians and nationalists is the difference between the Armenians and the others who support the Turkish side of the story – the historians. He blames the Armenians of their nationalist propaganda and use of one side of the story to convince anyone who will listen to them.

However, the main theme in the article is the theme of history and truth.

McCarthy repeatedly writes that anyone who knows the history of the Ottoman Empire would know that the Armenians were not intentionally killed. In fact, anyone who knows the history of the time or researches the history would see that more Muslims died than Armenians. However, McCarthy writes, that the Armenians use their story and go to the people and, more importantly, the politicians who make the decisions that make others think the genocide existed. In fact, he spends most of the article discussing the history of ethnic conflict between two groups, one the minority and one the majority. The minority's attempt to take over the empire could not be done, until the Armenians allied with the Russians.

I think the strongest argument McCarthy makes is the argument of historian and nationalist. While he does not write that the Turks are the historians, he does label the Armenians as the nationalists. The Turks, he writes, are trying to show that they are able and willing to present both sides of the story, unlike the Armenians. However, he never comes out and says that the Turks are offering up their story and the whole story. He just writes as though his words represent the Turks and I am not so sure about that argument. If he is truly a historian, he should really not be taking any sides. A historian should not take a side and should just present the facts, however, he does take a side and show how the Armenians do not present both sides and are spreading propaganda and half-truths. Therefore, while I find the theme to be strong and prevalent, I do not think it is right for McCarthy to choose a side.

Appeals

Thus, these themes build on McCarthy's appeal to rationality and irrationality simultaneously because while he builds most of his argument to show how irrational the Armenians are in their presentation of one side of the story, but it also makes the reader want to know more about the truth and history of the time. He begins and ends his article with a rational appeal and message to the reader that historians are the only ones who tell the whole truth, they rely on facts and statistics to get to the truth. After all, he writes that the claim of genocide cannot stand in the way of the many facts that Turks present (McCarthy, ¶43). The rational appeal is also seen in the author's background as a history professor and historian. As a rational nationalist, McCarthy's words must be golden.

The appeal to irrationality is seen in the fact that the Armenians are irrational and nationalists because they do not consider and apply the historical facts and tools. McCarthy simultaneously appeals to rationality and irrationality at the same time because he presents the fact that historians must confront their own prejudices and come to the realization that their beliefs and the truth will differ; and, at the same time appeals to the irrationality as he tells the reader about the Armenian accusations. He explains to them how the nationalists have set different goals for themselves and that they want and will do whatever they need to for their cause to triumph, even if that includes not telling the truth.

Discourse

The modifiers that dispel doubt include, "two warring sides," "defend the interior," "organized expulsion," "forced migration," "age-old tool," and "practical politician." These modifiers dispel doubt from the allegation of genocide and instead, make the reader see the truth behind the history. The modifiers all lead to the realization that the Armenians are presenting

their side of the story and leaving out the facts such as the fact that there were “two warring sides” in the conflict (McCarthy, ¶12). In fact, McCarthy writes that in an ethnic conflict of this sort there are always two warring sides and the fact is that one will suffer more than the other. He then goes on to explain how the conflict developed between the Armenians and the Turks. The Armenians, he explains, were the minority and wanted to get out from under the control of the Muslims; but, knowing they could not do that without assistance, they got the Russians to join them in the fight against the Muslims. They began to band together and rebel against the Muslims. In response, the Ottoman Muslims had no choice but to “defend the interior” (McCarthy, ¶34). While the Armenians continued to pose a threat against the Ottoman Empire, thus the government at the time used the “age-old tool” and ordered the “organized expulsion” of the Armenians (McCarthy, ¶41). And, because the Ottoman Turks were not able to fully protect the migrants because they continued to defend the interior from the rebellions, the Armenians died along the way of the “forced migration” of disease and hunger (McCarthy, ¶41). Their deaths were horrible, but part of the nature of these ethnic conflicts.

The modifiers that raise doubt include, “political goals,” “political agenda,” “undisputed evil,” “terrorism as the weapons of their choice,” “deliberate distortion of the truth,” and “merciless conflict.” These modifiers that raise doubt created an avenue for McCarthy to explain the “political agenda” and “political goals” of the Armenians – the nationalists (McCarthy, ¶5). He spends the beginning few paragraphs distinguishing the nature of the nationalists and the historians. Both, he writes, have their own ideologies and beliefs, but the historian puts his prejudices aside and attempts to search and learn the whole truth. On the other hand, the nationalists’ goals are to triumph in their cause no matter what. They do not put aside their goals and objectives for the sake of the truth, instead they fight harder to get what they want in the end.

After he explains the difference between the nationalist and the historian, he begins to paint the picture of the Armenians as the nationalist. He writes of the Armenians “deliberate distortion of the truth,” which he says is the way they achieve their goals (McCarthy, ¶51). The Armenians leave out parts of the history of the time and are selective in the choice of their facts, quotes and sources. In fact, the reason the Armenians use the Hitler quote is because the “undisputed evil” that people know and feel about Hitler gives the Armenians the credibility they need in using a comparison of the alleged genocide to the Jewish Holocaust (McCarthy, ¶51). Finally, he continues to shed a negative light on the Armenians as he writes that they also resort to violence as “terrorism was the weapon of their choice” (McCarthy, ¶24). Thus, the “merciless conflict,” led to both Armenian and Turkish deaths (McCarthy, ¶38). Again, McCarthy is able to show the public what ends the Armenians are willing to go to in an effort to continue the propagation of their one-sided story.

The noun with a negative connotation and denotation is “mass mortality of ethnic groups” which provides McCarthy’s argument that both the Armenians and the Turks suffered in the “merciless conflict” between the “two warring factions” (McCarthy, ¶12). The “mass mortality of ethnic groups” suggests that both groups were harmed – people were killed and died of disease and hunger. These deaths were the result of the intercommunal conflict between the Armenians and the Turks; and, anyone who knows anything about the history of the time knows that this is what happens during war.

Analysis

We saw both in McCarthy’s first article, “The First Shot,” and now in this article, “Let Historians Decide on So-called Genocide,” that McCarthy begins his article by setting up the difference between those who tell the whole truth and those who tell part of the truth. Then, he

immediately, separates the Turks and the Armenians and puts them in their respective categories. By categorizing the Turks and the Armenians, he makes it easy for the reader to make a decision to support one group or the other. The reason he makes it easy for the reader is because categorizing anything makes it easier to deal with, especially when you are dealing with such a politicized and highly debated event, which occurred almost 100 years ago.

I think this is perhaps the strongest appeal to rationality and irrationality in any of the articles as the author does a great job in intertwining the two appeals which makes the reader go in two different directions, but draw a single conclusion. They may or may not draw a conclusion in regard to siding with the Armenians or the Turks, or they may be so confused that they begin to look into the history more and more. The danger with that is, however, that they may not know where to look. They may look at sources that do not present the whole truth. Remember that until now, the articles have not been a historical overview of the situation, but have included bits and pieces of the story.

The U.S. Congress and Hitler on the Armenians

Publication Description

This is the last of the sample publications and is an article written by Heath W. Lowry in 1985. The article is available, like the other six, on the ATAA's Web site reference library and was last accessed on March 6, 2006. The article is comprised of 84 paragraphs of three to five sentences. The paragraphs are all single spaced, flush left and there are no indentations to note the next new paragraph. Instead, there is a double space between the paragraphs to distinguish between them. The article is presented much like the previous article with the title at the top, "The U.S. Congress and Adolf Hitler on the Armenians," and the author and by line below it, flush left. The byline includes the name of the author, Heath W. Lowry, and the Institute of

Turkish Studies, Inc. in Washington, DC, where he works. The byline also includes the name of the journal/publication in which the article appeared, *Political Communication and Persuasion*, volume 3, issue number 2, in 1985. This is the first time that there is full documentation of the article, an abstract and appendix, which is available when one clicks on the hyperlinked word, Appendix, at the very end of the article, or if one clicks on the numbers 1 through 35, which will take the reader to a new window and show that particular number's appendix line. It will be interesting to note the importance of the appendix as I take you through the text.

The first paragraph in the article is the abstract, Lowry says that the article traces the history of the supposed Adolf Hitler quote which the Armenians claim Hitler justifies his extermination of the Jews since there was a lack of reaction to the fate of the Armenians. Lowry traces the history and origin of the quote and concludes that there is no historical basis for the quote. In the end he pleas with the policy makers and those who are proponents of the quote that they need to leave history to the historians (Lowry, ¶1). He is frustrated with the amount of congressional representatives who use some version of the quote time and again, especially on the annual Armenian Martyr's Day on April 24 (Lowry, ¶2). After the first two paragraphs in the abstract, there is the first sub-heading titled "The Hitler Quote: Its Source and Its Avowed Focus." This section is comprised of 27 paragraphs in which Lowry attempts to uncover the origin of the Hitler quote.

In the third paragraph, Lowry presents the quote as the justification for Hitler's extermination of the European Jewry since the world did not react to the Armenians who were killed in the Ottoman Empire. This is the charge and explanation the Armenians give in response to the use of this quote (Lowry, ¶3). The widespread utilization of this quote has found its way into the hands of congressmen and congresswomen as many have used some version of the quote

in floor speeches. Most of these representatives, interestingly enough, are Jewish (Lowry, ¶4-6). The problem, he says, with this quote is that there is no proof that Hitler made this statement because it is referenced time and again, but the primary source is never mentioned (Lowry, ¶7). Not only is the primary reference unknown, the reference, Lowry writes, is not to the Jews but is to the Poles (Lowry, ¶8).

Lowry writes that the Hitler statement was first used in an article by the German author Louis Lochner, a former bureau chief of the Associated Press in Germany. Lochner claims to be the “real source” and “sole source” of Hitler’s statement. While Lochner claims to be the original source of Hitler’s quote, no one has ever attributed the quote to Lochner. Lochner claims that an unnamed source gave him the original copy of Hitler’s statements at Obersalzberg, where he supposedly made the statement. Obviously, Lowry writes, even in the original form of the quote, “I have issued the command... that our war aim does not consist in reaching certain lines, but in the physical destruction of our enemy... men, women and children of Polish derivation and language... who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians” (Lowry, ¶11). Lowry states that the statement refers to Nazi invasion of Poland and not the extermination of the Jews in Europe. The quote, is therefore, taken out of context time and again (Lowry, ¶12-16). In fact, he spends paragraph 17 through 28 providing the reader with various interpretations and versions of the quote until he presents the next sub-heading, “The Hitler Quote and the Nuremberg Trials,” in which he writes that the quote never made it into Nuremberg trial transcripts because it was not entered into evidence by the prosecution (Lowry, ¶29-35).

There were a total of three documents submitted into the prosecution, but only two of the three documents were submitted into evidence because the third one, which mentions Hitler’s quote, was given to the prosecution by an American newspaperman. The man stated that the

notes were given to him by an unnamed man and were said to be the original minutes of the Hitler's meeting at Obersalzberg. Thus, the prosecution felt they needed to find better evidence (Lowry, ¶36-39). Thus, the transcripts entered into evidence do not include any reference to the Armenians (Lowry, ¶40). In the next few paragraphs, paragraph 42 through 45, Lowry inserts a conversation between the defense attorney and the president of the Nuremberg tribunal. In which they put aside the document containing the alleged quote because of the way it was obtained through the press (Lowry, ¶45-48).

Thus, Lowry writes that the world has been misled by those who claim the quote justifies his extermination of the European Jewry through the world's lack of recognition of the Armenian genocide. The world has been misled, also, by the people who believe this quote and document in which it appears was introduced as evidence at the Nuremberg trials. The Nuremberg trial does not authenticate the quote as it was submitted into the evidence but rejected. There is no foundation that the Hitler made the statement regarding the Armenians in the Nuremberg trial (Lowry, ¶48-49). In the next sub section titled "What About Lochner's What About Germany?" he writes that the newspaperman who gave the quote and statement to the Nuremberg prosecutor was Louis Lochner, who claims to be the originator of the source. Lochner says one of the Nazis gave him the paper, which had the German words for "a piece of filthy propaganda." The Nazi man who gave Lochner the paper, to protect himself in case he were searched, was General Beck who was plotting against Hitler. There were also passages that were left out of the Nuremberg trials because they would have been anti-Hitler propaganda, as many were plotting against Hitler and the Nazis (Lowry, ¶50-55). In the next nine paragraphs, all one-liners, he gives examples of the anti-Hitler propaganda (Lowry, ¶56-64). Basically, Lowry comes to the conclusion that the statement obtain by Lochner and the actual version in the Nuremberg trials was doctored for

propaganda purposes. Regardless, people still claim that the Hitler quote referred to the Armenians (Lowry, ¶65-67).

In the fourth sub heading “Why Has the Lochner Version Assumed the Importance That It Has?” he refers to the quotation which has caused so much conflict and caused so many congressman and women to repeat some version of the quote. Lowry writes that the answer is complex and boils down to “Armenian ethnic politics” (Lowry, ¶68). He writes that the Armenians devote a significant portion of their propaganda efforts to establish a link between the alleged genocide and the Jewish Holocaust. This link, he writes, provides the Armenians the credibility they need to get people to believe their side of the story (Lowry, ¶69-70). He then presents points one through five in which he writes that the Armenian propaganda and comparison has led to the congressmen writing legislation to recognize the genocide, use the statement in their speeches recognizing and designating April 24 as the Armenian Martyr’s Day and have included the study of the genocide in their state’s school curriculum (Lowry, ¶71-76). He then spends the next eight paragraphs discussing the fact that the passage of these resolutions and the use of these quotes does not help, in fact it leaves aside the “...larger question of whether or not the fate of the Ottoman Armenians in 1915-1915 was in fact anything that could conceivably be termed a genocide... focusing only on... the spurious Hitler quote...” (Lowry, ¶77-81). Lowry writes that this calls into question the following three points, the first that tools of “ethnic pressure groups” are allowing for partisan ethnic politics to appease voters, and second that the Armenians are lecturing Turkey on “her” own history. Finally, he writes, as he mentions in the beginning, that history should be left to the historians to decide. Politicians are obviously not historians and should leave the history to the historians (Lowry, ¶82-84). At the end of the article is the Appendix which is provided in blue hyperlinked text and can only be

accessed by clicking on the word. The appendix includes excerpts from the congressional speeches on the Armenians, excerpts from the Lochner version of the August 22, 1939 Obersalzberg speech dealing with the planned invasion of Poland and, the third, excerpts from the Nuremberg version of the August 22, 1939 Obersalzberg speech dealing with the planned invasion of Poland. Finally, the appendix also includes a list of 35 notes. It is also provided in this thesis' appendix, immediately following the text of the article.

Publication Summary

Lowry's article traces the origin of the spurious Hitler quote that Armenians and others claim justifies Hitler's extermination of the European Jewry due to the lack of recognition of the Armenian genocide. Lowry goes through numerous steps to discredit the claim, proving that it was not presented at the Nuremberg trials and is without foundation. He makes the argument that when this quote is used out of context, as it has been repeatedly, it contributes to the Armenian propaganda and, most importantly, it puts into practice partisan ethnic politics to appease voters. When congressmen and congresswomen use a form of this quote to recognize the Armenian Martyr's Day on April 24, they are giving into partisan ethnic politics and are allowing Armenian to call the shots and dictate a history that should be left up to the historians.

Coding Sheet Findings and Analysis

I used the coding sheet [found in Appendix K] to code the following categories of the publication: format, themes, appeals, discourse and other notes.

Format

The format of "The U.S. Congress and Adolf Hitler on the Armenians" is a fleshed-out argument by Heath W. Lowry. The article has been published by the *Political Communication and Persuasion* journal. There are two dominant themes in the article – blaming the accuser and

history and truth – which shed light on the Hitler quote and present the consequences of the continuing to use the quote.

Themes

The themes that appear in the article are blaming the accuser and history and truth. The theme of blaming the accuser is seen in the beginning and end, mostly of the article, in which Lowry writes that the Armenians use this quote and encourage the congressional use of the quote to assign credibility for their allegation and make it seem as though it was a legitimate recognition of the world's lack of recognition of the Armenian genocide. The Armenians claim that Hitler made this statement to justify his killing of the Jews. The Armenians continue to use this quote out of context and all that does it lead congressmen and women into using it to appease their voters. The Armenian propaganda, thus, results in the use of ethnic partisan politics. Not only should that not be going on, but politicians should also stop trying to be historians because they are clearly not historians, as historians would not use a historical quote out of context.

The theme of history and truth is prevalent throughout the text in that Lowry at the very beginning introduces the quote and proves through the presentation of historical facts and events that this quote was in reference to the Poles and not the Jews and Hitler did not justify his treatment of the Jews based on the treatment of the Armenians. Yet, time and again the quote has been used through the spread of Armenian propaganda. Lowry points to the U.S. Congress and the congress' use of the quote, which as I mentioned previously only plays into the hands of the Armenians and partisan ethnic politics. Lowry spends a lot of time and energy pointing out how the quote has been misused, misinterpreted and continues to be used regardless of the

consequences. The quote, its origin and meaning, most importantly, has been taken out of context and used to further the ill will of the Armenian propagandists.

The themes in this article mostly deal with the fact that the Armenians and therefore others have taken this quote out of context and used it to gain sympathy and the ultra-important comparison to the Jewish Holocaust. The theme of history and truth really comes to life in this article because Lowry spends time and resources not just talking about the wrong use of the quote, but actually provides a progression of how the quote gets misinterpreted time and again. Also, at the end of the article he makes a call to action in which he says to leave the history to the historians and not to the politicians to misconstrue and misinterpret. I think this is perhaps the strongest contributing statement to the theme of history and truth because it shows how without the historical facts, history can be misinterpreted and misconstrued to fit the political agenda of a particular group.

Appeals

The appeal in this article is definitely to rationality. From the very beginning, Lowry appeals to rationality because of his status as an author, the use of the sources and appendix and because he takes the reader step by step through the origin of the quote, the misrepresentation of the quote and the consequences that will come about because of the misuse of the quote. The step by step and order to his statements and arguments really leads the reader to believe that the quote is misused and without any foundation. Not only does this discredit the quote, but it also discredits the person who uses it. This is an interesting approach that Lowry takes because unlike the other authors, not only does he discredit the main point – the use of the Hitler quote – but he makes sure that the reader knows anyone who uses the quote is also not a credible source. He allows the reader to discredit the quote and the congressmen and women who use the quote. This

is really a big accomplishment on Lowry's behalf. Most people think very highly of their congressmen and women and believe they are there because they genuinely know what is going on and, if nothing else, have a great staff working to make sure they know what is going on; but, alas, this may not be the case. I really think Lowry has gotten to the reader and made the reader realize that there may be no truth to the quote and to the person who decides to use the quote. not only is this person using a quote out of context, but also does not have a clear understanding of the history behind the quote, as history, Lowry pleads, must be left up to the historians.

Discourse

Lowry works hard to raise doubt in the reader's mind of the use of the quote. He does this through the use of modifiers that raise doubt using the following modifiers: "sole source," "real source," "no primary source," "no proof," "tools of ethnic pressure," "ethnic partisan politics," and "spurious Hitler quote." These terms he uses refer to the fact that there is no real source or one source that is attributed when someone uses the Hitler quote.

Through the use of the "primary source," "real source" and "sole source," he writes that there is no one source that is attributed when the quote is used (Lowry, ¶7-10). Lowry writes that there is "no proof" that the quote was in reference to the Nazi's extermination of the European Jewry based on the world's lack of recognition of the Armenian Genocide. These modifiers are powerful, yet simple and to the point. They really make Lowry's words, loud and clear for lack of a better word. He continues to write about the "tools of ethnic pressure" that contribute to the use of the term (Lowry, ¶82). Not only does the use of the quote allow for pressure, but it allows for the use of "ethnic partisan politics" to please voters (Lowry, ¶82).

Also, the fact that he continuously mentions the "spurious Hitler quote" ingrains into the reader's mind that this quote has no primary source, is almost always used out of context and

was never deemed important or objective enough to include in the Nuremberg trial documents. Thus, in this article, Lowry pulls in the theme of history and truth together with the discourse he focuses on raising doubt of the use of the quote. Not only does he discuss the misuse of the quote, but he does a good job at explaining the consequences which should frighten people. It should make the reader nervous that politicians are calling the shots on history without fully studying the history.

Analysis

Lowry's article is by far the most well-written in many ways. First of all, it is dated and includes a full byline with publication in a communication journal. This gives Lowry's article a credibility none of the other articles have. It is also the only article that has an appendix and actual documentation of the sources it cites in text. I know this sounds simple, but it is the only one of the seven publications that has an appendix. Interestingly enough, the text does not have a bibliography or reference section, but the appendix is a start, I suppose. However, I also do not completely put my trust into the document's appendix as it includes notes the author has made as well as excerpts from original documents. Of course, not having the original document to look at, it makes it hard to completely trust the appendix either. Yet, again as the only one of the seven publications with an appendix or attribution of its sources, I will say that it is the most credible of them all. I also believe the article is well-written because the arguments are continuously put to the test with data, sources and statements.

Now that I have provided a detailed overview of each publication's description, summary and provided the findings and analysis for each publication, using the coding sheet in Appendix C, I will synthesize the results in the following chapter. In this chapter, I will discuss the findings from the analysis of each of the seven selected publications, and use the discussion to draw

conclusions and a comparison of the findings to the synthesized propaganda model and public relations model. After all, my objective in this thesis was to assess the efforts of the ATAA's persuasive communication campaign using the synthesized propaganda model and public relations model.

CHAPTER 7

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Perhaps one of the most important aspects of the following chapter will be the comparison of the results of the analysis of the seven selected publications to the synthesized propaganda model and public relations model. I have provided a detailed analysis of each of the seven publications – a description of the article, summary of the article and summary of the coding sheet findings. Now, I will discuss the findings as a whole, and use the synthesized propaganda model and public relations model to assess the efforts of the ATAA’s persuasive communication campaign for methods of public relations and/or propaganda. But, first, I will begin with a discussion of the findings from the previous chapter.

Discussion

As the researcher and coder, I analyzed each of the seven selected publications and presented them in the previous chapter. Now, this section will include a discussion of the seven selected publications, which are in line with the ATAA’s persuasive communication campaign, and its relations to either the public relations or propaganda models. This will address RQ1 and RQ2.

After conducting a close reading of the seven selected publications, I came to the following conclusions. In regard to the credibility of the publications, many of them made significant arguments, however few of the articles used evidence to support the claims. Only a handful of authors come to mind, in regard to using supporting evidence, such as McCarthy, Delen and Lowry. And, only one author – Lowry – comes to mind when I think of which publication’s evidence was attributed to actual sources. Lowry was the only author who provided an appendix, with his article. While the appendix is not as credible a factor as the bibliography, it is still the only document to incorporate supporting evidence. Still, the authors established

credibility for themselves and their arguments through the use of the themes, especially the theme of history and truth. The authors [McCarthy, Delen and Lowry] used the notion that history should be left to the historians to decide. Most notably, Lowry not only provided the reader with the reasons and evidence that the Hitler quotation is used out of context and highly misused, he also provides examples of the consequences. However, Lowry was the only one who had the evidence to back up his claims. I realized that each time I read a publication, I could not get past the fact that they did not have a bibliography or reference. I know that I keep coming back to this point, but I cannot help it. As a researcher and someone who has been taught for years the importance of research and attribution, I cannot believe arguments and claims that do not have the sources to back them up.

All seven publications discuss the danger and warn of the use of Armenian propaganda. However, only some of the authors [McCarthy, Delen and Lowry] really make discrediting the Armenian propagandists a priority. There is a difference between simply accusing the Armenians of propaganda and providing examples of how they use propaganda. These three authors provide evidence of the Armenian use of propaganda, but most importantly discuss the consequences of Armenian propaganda. They tell the reader that the proliferation of this one-sided story will not only effect the Armenians and Turks for years to come, but will also continue to effect the legislatures and parliaments and the way politicians do their work. The use of “ethnic partisan politics” in an attempt to please voters will prevail and historical decisions will continue to be made by individuals with no knowledge of the history of an event.

One of the most important elements in studying and discussing history is to remember that history should be a representation of truth and not sides. Historical facts should not be taken out of context, and while the ATAA’s communication efforts are focused on showing how the

Armenians have taken history out of context, the ATAA also takes history out of context by providing claims that are not backed up with supporting evidence. The use of the coding sheet, while part of my research and methodology, sheds light on the fact that all of the articles are nothing but arguments and claims supported by the ATAA. The theme of blaming the accuser is seen throughout every article and leads to an endless amount of finger pointing. As some of the authors [McCarthy, Delen and Lowry] suggest, we must leave history to the historians, but even these historians must be able to objectively discuss the events of the late Ottoman Empire. These authors/historians end up taking a side too, and that is the reason the ATAA has chosen to include their publications in its reference library.

Remember that these publications have been analyzed individually, but collectively they serve a purpose. They are used by the ATAA to build a persuasive communication campaign that supports the ATAA's mission to educate the public about the history of the Turks. The ATAA also works hard to take up for the Armenian lobby's accusations of genocide. Remember that the Turks are the ones being accused of genocide, thus while the Armenian lobby's job has been to make accusations, allegations and get the government's of various countries involved, the Turks must be able to respond time and again to the accusations. That is the reason the ATAA has built this extensive reference library and filled it with the arguments of these authors.

Their arguments are strong as they incorporate key elements of the coding sheet and weave their themes of blaming the accuser, history and truth and even ethnic and racial conflict throughout their arguments. They also do a fine job in using discourse that raises doubt on the Armenian side, dispels doubt on the Turkish side and allows the reader to make a decision through the use of their rational and irrational appeals. Note that when the author wants the reader to believe what the Armenians are doing is wrong, he appeals to their irrational thought

process. On the other hand, when he wants the reader to believe in what the Turks are saying, he uses the rational appeal to make the reader see how what the Armenians are doing is wrong.

Overall, the publications and their themes serve as the messages of the ATAA's persuasive communication campaign. While the ATAA did not author all of the publications, the use and support of the seven authors and their publications supports my assessment that these are the messages the ATAA incorporates into its persuasive communication campaign against the Armenian allegation of genocide.

As I continued to read into the articles and analyze the coding sheet, I realized that there was a mixture of both public relations and propaganda in the ATAA's persuasive communication campaign. This is an unexpected finding and an important one at that. From the very beginning of the study, I figured that the ATAA's persuasive communication messages would be public relations or propaganda. I never expected to find a mixture of both (a paired opposition). While I did find a mixture of both, especially because I found both appeals to rationality and irrationality, I find the mixture interesting because the ATAA uses a mixture of public relations and propaganda to make a statement. For example, when the author wants the reader to believe the Turks, he uses a rational approach, but when the author wants the reader to distrust the Armenians, he uses irrational messages, themes and appeals. This paired opposition exists to make the reader associate the Turks as rational and civilized people and the Armenians as irrational and uncivilized people. Another thought about this mixture is that while the ATAA does use elements of both public relations and propaganda, the overall use of this mixture is irrational and thus more along the lines of propaganda. This use of irrational and rational appeals combined allows the reader to make an irrational decision since the messages have not all been clear, direct and rational.

Thus, now the time has come to take this discussion of the seven publications and make the connection, as a whole, to either the synthesized propaganda model or the public relations model. In order to distinguish the ATAA's efforts as public relations or propaganda, I will use the operational definition of both persuasive communication tactics. Remember that in the beginning of this thesis, I presented the conceptual and operational definition of public relations and propaganda. The operational definition of public relations states that public relations is the management of ethical communication between an organization and its publics (Grunig and Hunt, 1984; Cutlip, Center and Broom, 2000; and Public Relations Society of America, 2006). In contrast, the operational definition of propaganda states that propaganda is the dishonest dissemination of information or an opinion through the manipulation of words, symbols, ideas and events with the intention of attacking an interest, cause, project, institution or person to produce a certain emotional reaction based on the viewpoint of the disseminator (Lasswell, 1927, Taylor, 1942; Lee, 1945; Fellows, 1959; Bobrakov, 1966; Herman and Chomsky, 1988; Pratkanis & Aronson, 1992, Ross 2002). While neither definition states the inclusion or exclusion of socially responsible behavior, the distinguishing factor between public relations and propaganda is the fact that public relations is aimed at being socially responsible while propaganda intentionally withholds socially responsible information.

Along with the operational definitions of public relations and propaganda, I must also use the elements and objectives of the synthesized propaganda model and public relations model to assess the efforts of the ATAA's persuasive communication campaign (Grunig and Hunt, 1984; Lasswell, 1927; Herman and Chomsky, 1988). The elements of the synthesized propaganda model come from the war-time propaganda models of Lasswell (1972) and Herman and Chomsky (1988) which are highly regarded, but not completely applicable to the ATAA. Thus, I

synthesized elements of the theorists' models using objectives two and three from Lasswell's (1972) propaganda model and the third filter from Herman and Chomsky's (1988) propaganda model. Objectives one and two from Lasswell's (1972) model state that: 1) the propagandist aims to preserve the friendship of allies, and 2) if possible, procure the co-operation of neutrals (Lasswell, 1972, p. 195). Herman and Chomsky's (1988) third filter states that the media is reliant upon the expert information funded by the government, business or other agents of power (Herman and Chomsky, 1988, p. 2). While the two models differ in scope, as one is a wartime model and the other focuses on media bias, they both have elements that can be applicable to various persuasive communication campaigns and organizations.

The elements of the public relations model state that the asymmetric model of public relations is the most applicable in the study of the ATAA's campaign because the model is effective in serving the public interest and represents the top-down approach the ATAA takes with its publics. The ATAA does allow for two-way communication in the form of questions and answers, but does not provide for feedback in the ideal sense, much like the asymmetric model. The organization focuses on its stance against the Armenian allegation of genocide and discredits the opposition, stating that the opposition touts accusations and lies. The asymmetric model provides for persuasive communication and attempts to influence the public, but the organization does not attempt to change to please the public (Grunig, 1933; Grunig and Hunt, 1984; Fawkes, 2001).

The ATAA's persuasive communication information is available via the reference library and Web site to influence public opinion. The Internet allows for an abundance of information to be present for an individual to peruse, read and look further into. However, it is imperative that the information be presented through clear and direct messages, supported by evidence so that

the person can make up their own mind about what has been presented. While the purpose of persuasive communication is to influence public opinion, effective communicators present the information in the best possible manner and allow the public to come to a decision on their own, through a rational thought process. I do not see this in the case of the ATAA.

The close reading and analysis of the publications [ie – the ATAA’s persuasive communication message] reveals the following about the ATAA. The ATAA’s persuasive communication campaign has been created to influence public opinion through the use of expert information, including information from individuals already associated with the cause. I found that the ATAA’s affiliation with university professors and historians such as Justin McCarthy and Heath Lowry makes their information and claims seem more credible; but, in reality, the lack of supporting evidence in each of the publications destroys the notion of publications’ credibility. This raises concerns surrounding the media’s reliance on information funded by governments, businesses and other agents of power (Herman and Chomsky, 1988, p. 2). The ATAA does not own a mainstream mass media outlet in America, but the ATAA does make these documents and messages available to anyone via the Internet. While the arguments are sound and examples are provided in each publication, the of evidence leads me to question the organization’s use of experts and arguments. As the “Assembly” of Turkish American associations nationwide, I would imagine they would rather have their messages carefully crafted and supported to increase the amount of credibility.

Instead, when I think of the seven publications and their messages, I think of nothing but finger pointing as the themes of blaming the accuser and truth and history, as well as the negative and positive discourse is used to pit one side against the other. In other words, when the ATAA’s sources want to cast a negative light on the Armenians, the information is presented irrationally

and depicts the Armenians as terrorists and propagandists. However, when the ATAA's sources want to portray the Turks as positive and mature people who want an end to the propaganda and its consequences, the rational appeal and positive words are used to portray the Turks.

Let me also say that organizationally speaking, the ATAA uses the asymmetric model of public relations and that is noted through the organization's top-down approach to communication. The organization does not allow for much feedback and is definitely not interested in changing internally. Instead, the ATAA, as an organization, is interested in continuing to speak out against the proliferation of Armenian propaganda. Thus, in response to RQ1 and RQ2, as the answer to one affects the answer to the second, by taking into consideration the definition of both public relations and propaganda and the elements of the synthesized propaganda model and public relations model, I have found that the ATAA's efforts are more along the lines of propaganda because they meet the criteria of the synthesized propaganda model.

The ATAA uses its messages to appeal to the masses – its allies and neutrals. In fact, many of the references to the Armenian ignorance of the Muslim deaths and the continued need to link the Armenian Genocide to the Jewish Holocaust provides the Armenians with the emotional connection to lure people over to their side. Also, the ATAA's messages include references frequently to the fact that anyone who knows anything about the late Ottoman Empire would know that the Armenian story is one-sided; but, the ATAA's authors also conclude that there has not been enough research and study on the late Ottoman Empire. Thus, as I noted in the analysis, I have seen many contradictions in their messages. The messages are not in line with the messages created with a public relations purpose. They are not clear and direct and they are

not socially responsible – as they do not attempt to provide the public with the information needed to make a rational and thoughtful decision.

As an organization the ATAA does provide a top-down approach to communication, but in regard to its messages, the use of propagandist behavior takes precedence as it presents information that is responsive and one-sided. The ATAA's messages do address the Armenian accusations, but they also do not attempt to seek an objective answer because they almost always reply with the opposite answer. In fact, some of the authors who suggest a search for the truth by historians, provide answers and accusations in response to the Armenian claims. The product then becomes a game of finger pointing and accusations that go back and forth between the two sides.

If history should be left to the historians and these authors [McCarthy and Delen] are claiming that more study needs to be done in regard to the late Ottoman Empire, then how can they possibly come to a conclusion that finds the Armenians guilty of propaganda. It is definitely not socially responsible for an organization, regardless of its claims, to communicate blame and irrational messages, which make the public make their decisions based on emotions and fear. This is what the ATAA does and any lobbying group would do. While I did not study the Armenian lobby, I am sure the finger pointing goes on there as well and the same types of messages are created to point blame in the other direction. Regardless, these persuasive communication tactics are anything but socially responsible. They do not allow the public to come to the decision based on clear and rational thought. Thus, in regards to RQ1 and RQ2, and judging by my finding in RQ1, that the ATAA uses propaganda in its campaign, the ATAA is clearly not a socially responsible organization.

Implications

This study has many implications, namely that it differentiates public relations from propaganda, which is a powerful tool that can be used to further assess an organization's actions. After all, an organization cannot be held responsible for public relations or propagandist actions until the tactics have been assessed. Only then can an organization be held responsible for its actions. Once an organization's conduct as public relations or propaganda is assessed, attention can be turned to whether the organization acts ethically and socially responsible. If an organization's efforts are ethical, the tactics appear to be in congruence with public relations; on the other hand, if an organization's actions are deemed unethical, then chances are the organization is using propaganda-like tactics.

Thus, this study allows for and calls for a more aware public. People must know and realize that they cannot believe everything they see and hear; not only must there be evidence to back up claims, allegations and accusations, but there must also be sources to back up the evidence. Also, people must be more aware of the use of propaganda and its appeal to irrational thoughts and behavior and use of emotional language. While no one will read publications and think along the thought process of the coding sheet, they will use the ideas from the coding sheet, such as a notion of the themes, appeals and discourse, to mentally assess whether the text is appealing to rational or irrational decision-making. This is extremely important, today, especially with the advent and widespread use of the Internet.

So much of what we read and research online is posted by anyone from professors to students. We must learn to sift through the information that does not appeal to rational decision-making. In this world of politicking, accusations and allegations we must be aware of the messages that are carefully crafted to move us to action. Thus, I hope that this study makes us all

wake up and realize that persuasive communication – public relations and propaganda – are used to influence public opinion. I hope this study will allow readers to realize that they are both out there and that as a socially responsible society we owe it to ourselves to realize that there is a difference, which we must understand before we begin to see the difference.

This study also has implications for the ATAA, PRSA and the organization's Code of Ethics and public relations practitioners, educators and students. In regard to the ATAA, this study can make them more aware of the fact that appearing credible and actually being credible are two very different things. While the ATAA uses credible sources such as Justin McCarthy, Heath Lowry and other professors and historians, when their articles lack evidence the organization [ATAA] lacks credibility. The ATAA and its choice of sources go hand in hand, when one lacks credibility that directly affects the ATAA. Thus, I urge the ATAA to be careful in what they put up on their Web site for the world to read. It is ironic that the ATAA uses these powerful sources and words to convey a message that lacks tangible evidence.

Other implications for this study include the PRSA and Code of Ethics and the effect that has on public relations practitioners, educators and students. I have come to realize that ethics are not important to everyone and while most people think ethics are common sense, they seem to forget that when the discussion ends. The discussion of ethics should never end; it should never be something that is just talked about out of social responsibility. In fact, it would defeat the purpose in that case. As a public relations practitioner, I have realized that ethics are discussed, but never put to the test. This happens both in the classroom and in the real world. Ethics are part of the PRSA's Web site and mentioned in a conference seminar or two, but rarely do you see someone put an organization's ethical behavior to the test. I feel like this study does just that and

it will, in turn, make public relations practitioners more aware of the fact that they must be held accountable for their actions and must be able to police the actions of their colleagues.

As an educational tool, this study can also help public relations educators realize that they must not only instruct their students in an ethics courses, but really make them realize that as future professionals and practitioners, they too will be held accountable for their actions and the messages they construct, regardless of who they work for and what they are asked to do. These implications will surely make for a more aware public, especially among the people who are involved in creating and disseminating the messages on a daily basis. It will also make for a more aware general public. There is nothing more dangerous to an individual than the thought that they are being covertly coerced into making an irrational decision. That is truly a scary thought and something I hope will be eliminated when people read this study and become aware of the fact that it is their job to make sure they are not being inappropriately influenced.

Limitations of Study

The limitations of this study include the fact that I am an Armenian American, who has an interest in distinguishing public relations from propaganda, with a regard for ethics and social responsibility. While some may think that as an Armenian American, I have preconceived notion of whether what happened to the Armenians was really genocide, I am actually not concerned with that matter and have stated that from the very beginning. Yes, I am an Armenian American, but I have been so inundated with information from both sides, that I am more interested in taking an objective, third-party look at the messages that each side uses to react to the other. I am, after all, a public relations practitioner who is really interested in the dissemination of information. Let's face it, we are all in the business of influencing public opinion, and I am fascinated at how people accomplish just that. I am very concerned that individuals do not fact

check, disseminate the truth and detailed information so that individuals can make decisions based on reason and thought. Thus, as an interested public relations practitioner, I believe that I provided the study with a different scope and interest that some may not see from the surface and origin of my name.

Another limitation is that this study only seeks to uncover that which is public relations and that which is propaganda on the surface through a close reading. The methodology does not allow for a scientific answer to the question of persuasive communication messages as public relations or propaganda. While the study does not prove that the ATAA uses public relations or propaganda throughout its persuasive communication messages, it does highlight the efforts of the ATAA through the use of the seven publications in its reference library as public relations or propagandist efforts. Also, remember that this study only takes a look at seven publications. As I stated in the discussion previously, I did not anticipate the mixture or paired opposition that resulted in the ATAA's use of public relations and propaganda (rational and irrational appeals), I did anticipate that I would not be able to pin point the ATAA's persuasive communication campaigns as wholly public relations or propaganda because I was only studying seven of their publications and only ones from the reference library. I was not studying the press releases, action items or other publications available on their site.

Finally, I am the researcher as well as the coder, and this can be a plus and a minus in that I am completely familiar with the definitions of each persuasive communication tactic, as well as the coding sheet. I am so familiar with the tools that I can be seen as a limitation, but I believe it makes me a less biased judge because I have solidified that which is public relations and that which is propaganda through the study and understanding of the conceptual and operational

definitions of both, as well as the research and models that have been composed for both methods of persuasive communication.

Conclusion

Regardless of the ATAA's desire to influence and shape public opinion, the organization must act ethically and allow individuals to come to their decisions through rational appeals. The ATAA must not use emotion and fear to appeal to the individuals and withhold socially responsible information, as this type of communication would result in irrational decision-making – a product of propaganda.

I have assessed the ATAA's persuasive communication campaign and found that it is in line with the efforts of propaganda, as stated in the operational definition of propaganda and in the objectives of the synthesized propaganda model. The ATAA uses its messages to appeal to the masses – its allies and neutrals. I have noted various contradictions and attempts to confuse the reader and leave the reader wondering why the ATAA has chosen to continue finger pointing and creating messages that are not clear, direct or socially responsible – as they do not attempt to provide the public with the information needed to make a rational and thoughtful decision.

REFERENCES

- Antaki, C., Billig, M. & Edwards, D., & Potter, J. Discourse analysis means doing analysis: a critique of six analytic shortcomings. *Discourse Analysis Online*. Retrieved March 1, 2006, from http://www.usq.edu.au/users/patrick/PAPERS/Discourse_analysis_means_doing_analysis.pdf - search='charles%20antaki%2C%20michael%20'.
- Armenian National Committee of America. (2005). Retrieved October 25, 2005, from <http://www.anca.org>.
- Armony, A.C. & Armony, V. (2005, Winter). Indictments, myths, and citizen mobilization in Argentina: a discourse analysis. *Latin American Politics & Society*, (47)4. p. 27-54.
- Assembly of Turkish American Associations. The Armenian allegation of genocide: facts. Washington, DC: Author.
- Assembly of Turkish American Association's. (2005). Retrieved October 20, 2005, from <http://www.ATAA.org>.
- Ataov, T., Ph.D. Hitler and the Armenian question. Retrieved September 10, 2005, from <http://www.ataa.org/>.
- Berelson, B. (1959, Spring). The state of communication research. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, (23)1. p. 1-6.
- Bernays, E. (1952). *Public Relations*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Bernays, E. (1891). *The Engineering of Consent*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Blommaert, J. & Bulcaen, C. Critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, (29). p. 447-466.
- Bobrakov, Y. (1966, Summer). War Propaganda: a serious crime against Humanity. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, (31)3. p. 473-478.
- Creel, G. *Saturday Review of Literature*, (25)10. p. 7.
- Cunningham, S. B. (2002). *The Idea of Propaganda: A Reconstruction*. Westport, CN: Praeger.
- Cutlip, S. M., Center, A. H. & Broom, G. M. (2000). *Effective Public Relations*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Cutlip, S. M. & Center, A. H. (1958). *Effective Public Relations*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Delen, D. Perpetuating the genocide myth. Retrieved September 10, 2005, from <http://www.ataa.org/>.

- Dijk van, T. A. *Ideological Discourse Analysis*. University of Amsterdam. p. 135-161.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Fawkes, J. (2001). What is public relations? In A. Theaker (Ed.), *The Public Relations Handbook* (p. 3-12). London: Routledge.
- Fellows, E. W. (1959). 'Propaganda:' history of a word. *American Speech*, (34)3. p. 182-189.
- Fein, B. Differences are Overwhelming. Retrieved November 26, 2006, from <http://www.ataa.org/>.
- Fremaux, I. & Albertazzi, D. (2002). Discursive strategies around 'community' in political propaganda: the case of Lega Nord. *National Identities*, (4)2. p. 145-160.
- Garber, W. (1942, September). Propaganda analysis – to what ends? *The American Journal of Sociology*, (48)2. p. 240-245.
- George, A. L. (1956, Spring). Prediction of political action by means of propaganda analysis. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, (20)1. p. 334-345.
- Goodwin, J. (1994, March). What's right (and wrong) about left media criticism? Herman and Chomsky's propaganda model. *Sociological Forum*, (9)1. p. 101-111.
- Grunig, J. E. (1992). Communication, public relations, and effective organizations: an overview of the book. In J. E. Grunig (Ed.), *Excellence in Public Relations and Communication Management*. p. 1-28. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Grunig, J. E. (1993, Summer). Public relations and international affairs: effects, ethics and responsibility. *Journal of International Affairs*, (47)1. p. 137-162.
- Grunig, J. E. & Grunig, L. A. (1992). Models of public relations and communication. In J. E. Grunig (Ed.), *Excellence in Public Relations and Communication Management*. p. 285-325. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Grunig, J. E. & Hunt T. (1984). *Managing Public Relations*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Herman, E. S. & Chomsky, N. (1988). *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Jackowski, M. (2006). Conceptualizing an improved public relations strategy: a case for stakeholder relationship marketing in Division I-A intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Business and Public Affairs*, (1)1.

- Janowitz, M. (1968-1969, Winter). Harold D. Lasswell's contribution to content analysis. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, (32)4. p. 646-653.
- Jones, A. (1999). Case study: the Armenian Genocide, 1915-1917. p. 1-9.
- Kinzer, S. (2005, December 4). Courting Europe, Turkey Tries Some Soul-Cleansing. *The New York Times*. p. 1-2.
- Lasswell, H. D. (1972, Autumn). Communications research and public policy. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, (36)3. p. 301-310.
- Lasswell, H. D. (1972). *Propaganda Technique in the World War*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Lasswell, H. D. (1928, April). The function of the propagandist. *International Journal of Ethics*, (38)3. p. 258-268.
- Lasswell, H. D. (1980). The future of world communication and propaganda. In H. D. Lasswell, D. Lerner & H. Speier (Eds.), *Propaganda and communication in world history: Volume 3. A pluralizing world in formation*. Honolulu: East-West Center.
- Lasswell, H. D. (1931, May). The measurement of public opinion. *The American Political Science Review*, (25)2. p. 311-326.
- Lasswell, H. D. (1927, August). The theory of political propaganda. *The American Political Science Review*, (21)3. p. 627-631.
- Lasswell, H. D. & Blumenstock, D. (1939). *World Revolutionary Propaganda: A Chicago Study*. New York: Knopf.
- Lasswell, H. D., Lerner, D. & Speier, H. (Eds.). (1979). *Propaganda and communication in world history: Volume 1*. Honolulu: East-West Center.
- Lee, A. M. (1945, April). Interest criteria in propaganda analysis. *American Sociological Review*, (10)2. p 282-288.
- Lewy, G. (2005, Fall). Revisiting the Armenian Genocide. *Middle East Quarterly*, (12)4. p. 3-12.
- Lowry, H. W. (1985). The U.S. Congress and Adolf Hitler on the Armenians. *Political Communication and Persuasion*, (3)2. Retrieved September 10, 2005, from <http://www.ataa.org/>.
- Lutz, R. H. (1933, December). Studies of World War Propaganda, 1914-33. *The Journal of Modern History*, (5)4. p. 496-516.

- Lye, J. (1996). Critical reading: a guide. *Scout Report Selection*. Retrieved March 1, 2006, from <http://www.brocku.ca/english/jlye/criticalreading.html>.
- Marquis, A. G. (1978, July). Words as weapons: propaganda in Britain and Germany during the First World War. *Journal of Contemporary History*, (13)3. p. 467-498.
- Marvick, D. (1980). The work of Harold D. Lasswell: his approach, concerns, and influence. *Political Behavior*, (2)3. p. 219-229.
- McCarthy, J. (2001, April). Let historians decide on so-called genocide. *Turkish Daily News*. Retrieved September 10, 2005, from <http://www.ataa.org/>.
- McCarthy, J. The First Shot. Retrieved September 10, 2005, from <http://www.ataa.org/>.
- McDourgal, M. S. & Reisman, W. M. (1979, October). Harold Dwight Lasswell (1902-1978). *The American Journal of International Law*, (73)4. p. 655-660.
- Melson, R. (1982). A theoretical inquiry into the Armenian massacres of 1894-1896. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 24(3). p. 481-509.
- Ozer, A. Facts and discussion points in the Armenian allegations. Retrieved September 10, 2005, from <http://www.ataa.org/>.
- Park, Y. (2005, September). Culture as deficit: a critical discourse analysis of the concept of culture in contemporary social work discourse. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, (32)3. p. 11-33.
- Pimlott, J. (1951). *Public Relations and American Democracy*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Pratkanis, A. & Aronson, E. (1992). *Age of Propaganda: The Everyday Use and Abuse of Persuasion*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Public Relations Society of America. (2006). Retrieved May 2, 2006, from <http://www.prsa.org>.
- Rose, D. (2005, September). An inconvenient patriot. *Vanity Fair*. p. 264-282.
- Ross, S. T. (2002, Spring). Understanding propaganda: the epidemic merit model and its application to art. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, (36)1. p. 16-30.
- Rowe, D. N. (1939, October). Japanese propaganda in North China, 1937-1938. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, (3)4. p. 564-580.
- Schuler, E. A. Recent works on propaganda. *Social Forces*, (15)2. p. 292-298.
- Stein, S. (Undated). A lecture on the Armenian Genocide. p. 1-14.

- Taylor, W. (1942, March). "What is propaganda?" *College English*, (3)6.
- Tyson, R. W. (1942, November). More about propaganda. *College English*, (4)2. p. 135-136.
- United Human Rights Council. (2006). Retrieved February 7, 2006, from <http://www.unitedhumanrights.org/>.
- United Nations. (1948). Retrieved April 20, 2006, from <http://www.un.org/millennium/law/iv-1.htm>.
- United Nations. (2004). Retrieved April 20, 2006 from <http://www.un.org/icty/krstic/Appeal/judgement/krs-aj040419e.htm>.
- Walker, C. (1991) *Armenia: The Survival of a Nation*. England: Mackays of Chatham PLC.
- White, B. (2005, July). *Congressional Revolving Doors: The Journey from Congress to K Street*. Public Citizen: Congress Watch. p. 1-49.
- Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis and the study of doctor-patient interaction. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, (28). p. 173-200.

APPENDIX A

GENOCIDE AND THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The Term Genocide

The word genocide is a very specific term and was first introduced in 1944 in Raphael Lemkin's description of the Nazi policies of systematic murder and the destruction of the European Jewry. It was used as a descriptive term until the United Nations established it as an "international crime" at the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide in 1948 (United Nations, 2004, ¶10). The convention defines genocide as any act committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group by any of the following methods: killing members of the group, causing them serious bodily or mental harm, trying to bring about the group's physical destruction in whole or in part, or by imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group by transferring children of the group to another group. The convention states that genocide is an "international crime," which signatory nations must then "undertake to prevent and punish." (United Nations, 1948, ¶2).

The Armenian Genocide

According to most genocide scholars such as Stein (Undated), Jones (1999) and Walker (1991), in the years between 1915-1923, 1.5 million Armenians living in the present-day Republic of Turkey were massacred under Ottoman Turkish rule. Occurring during World War I, sources such as the United Human Rights Council, claim it was the first "modern" genocide of the 20th Century. Beginning on April 24, 1915, Armenian political, religious, educational and intellectual leaders in Istanbul were arrested, deported and put to death. Next, the Turkish government, under the direction of the Committee of Union and Progress and their leader Talat

Pasha, ordered the deportation of the Armenian people to "relocation centers" in the barren deserts of Syria and Mesopotamia (ANCA, 2005, ¶2).

There remain, however, two conflicting sides to this historical event. Most Turks, following the lead of the Turkish government, claim that the Armenians died during the "intercommunal fighting and during a relocation necessitated by security concerns" (Lewy, 2005, p. 3). Lewy (2005) writes that the claims of the Armenians have become an undeniable historical fact, but that many Western and Turkish historians question the "appropriateness of the genocide label" (p. 3). The debate, however, does not surround the actual deportation and resulting deaths of the Armenian people. Both sides agree that the Armenian population was deported and died on the journey. Thus, the debate focuses on whether the events were premeditated and organized by the CUP, which would make the genocide label appropriate or inappropriate (p. 3). Regardless, due to a lack of recognition between the U.S. and Turkish government, the debate concerning the Armenian deportation remains unanswered.

APPENDIX B

THE HISTORY OF PUBLIC RELATIONS

Public relations came into existence in the 1900s when practitioners were employed to defend individuals and their established monopolies against both government regulation and muckraking journalists (Cutlip, Center & Broom, 2000, p. 2). The practitioners launched counterattacks on behalf of the accused businessmen to influence public opinion and prevent public policy changes that would lead to an increase in business regulation (p. 2). Therefore, developments in the field are directly tied to the power struggles evoked through political reform movements. These reform movements reflect the strong tides of protest against the entrenched power groups that fostered the growth of public relations as political and economic groups fought for dominance, creating the need to garner public support (p. 105). Public relations grew in response to the need to gain public acceptance and utilization of advancing technology.

One of the first examples for the need of public relations was Andrew Jackson's presidential campaign. During the 1820s and 1830s, the idea of the "common man" came into existence, and as both literacy and democracy spread, practitioners such as Amos Kendall created events to mold public opinion and garner support (p. 105). Then in the 1900s, press-agentry, political campaigning and business practices paved the way for public relations (Cutlip & Center, 1958, p. 23). In 1904, Ivy Lee noted that the business policies of secrecy and silence were not working and suggested that businesses become "articulate, open their books, and take their case directly to the people" (p. 33). Lee's discovery was put to the test when the anthracite coal industry went on strike and he released a "Declaration of Principles" on behalf of the industry. Many believe that this "Declaration of Principles," led press-agentry to publicity and finally to the development of public relations. His approach opened the communication channels between the coal miners and the press.

Then, in 1917 when the country became involved in World War I, public relations as a one-way form of persuasive communication became a dominant force. President Woodrow Wilson created the Committee on Public Information (CPI) and George Creel and his staff of “young propagandists,” who later went on to establish the first public relations firms, staffed the CPI to unite public opinion behind the war through a nationwide propaganda campaign. Public relations took on the form of publicity as Creel and the CPI demonstrated the power of publicity to mobilize public opinion (p. 3). The CPI’s press agents, scholars, journalists, editors and other so-called manipulators of the symbols of public opinion succeeded in uniting the country toward a single purpose (p. 122). The term public relations, however, had yet to be coined.

During World War I, another public relations pioneer, Edward Bernays (1981) worked for the Creel Committee where he envisioned the possibility of “engineering public consent” (p. 40). Bernays coined the term public relations in his book *Crystallizing Public Opinion* in 1923 (p. 40). Then, with the beginning of World War II, public relations developed into a form of communication that included the notion of two-way communication and the formation of relationships (Cutlip, Center & Broom, 2000, p. 3). *Public Opinion Quarterly* founder Harwood L. Childs introduced his definition of public relations as the need of organizations to adjust their environments, suggesting a management-level, policy-influencing role with a call for corrective action and communication (p. 3). The development of public relations and numerous attempts to define it, finally, resulted in the definition of public relations from the Public Relations Society of America. “Public relations is the management function that establishes and maintains mutually beneficial relationship between an organization and the publics on whom its success or failure depends” (p. 6). Most practitioners and individuals use this definition of public relations today.

APPENDIX C
SINGLE PUBLICATION CODING SHEET

Author:
Title:
URL:
Last date accessed:

Format:

- ☐ Skeleton of Argument
- ☐ Fleshed-out Argument

Theme

- Blaming the accuser
- Ethnic/racial identity
- History and truth
- Other

Appeal

- Appeal to Rationality:
- Appeal to Irrationality:
- Other:

Discourse

- Modifiers that Dispel Doubt:
- Modifiers that Raise Doubt:
- Nouns with a Negative Connotation and Denotation:
- Nouns with a Positive Connotation and Denotation:
- Other:

Notes/Observations:

APPENDIX D PRE-TEST CODING SHEET

Pre-test⁸

Author: Bruce Fein

Title: “Differences are Overwhelming”

URL: http://www.ataa.org/ataa/ref/b_fein.html

Last date accessed: 11/26/06

Format: Fleshed-out argument

Theme

- Blaming the accuser:
Armenian allegation of genocide, perpetrated by the Turks
- Ethnic/racial identity:
Nazi’s hated the Jews, Turks “favored” the Armenians
- History and truth:

Appeals

- Appeal to Rationality:
Comparison of Holocaust and alleged Armenian genocide, but the comparison does not hold water – Jews are a race, Armenians are a religion?? (false comparison)
Experts – Lewis, McCarthy and Morgenthau
Political reasons – political allegiance (not genocide)
- Appeal to Irrationality:
Race – triggers emotion/ is an emotional subject
Jews are hated, Hitler is racist, Armenians are not hated (they are a religious minority). Armenians are favored, not disfavored...
- Other:

Discourse

- Modifiers that Dispel Doubt:
Armenians were a “religious minority”
It was “political” not a “race” issue, it was an “unfortunate fall-out”
Morgenthau “hearsay” and “highly suspect” evidence
- Modifiers that Raise Doubt:

⁸ This article did not serve in the sample and analysis in Chapter 6, but it did serve its purpose in testing the coding sheet for functionality and applicability.

- Nouns with a Negative Connotation and Denotation:
“guerilla,” “exterminated,” “genocide,” “counter-massacre” – not very dominant in the article – does not set a theme or tone for the piece
- Nouns with a Positive Connotation and Denotation:
“liked” and “favored” – meaning the Armenians were liked and favored and it was politics and not a “race” issue – meaning the Turks aren’t racist (like Hitler was) – not dominant in respect to numbers (liked – 1) (favored – 1) but these terms capture the themes – race, politics (not genocide) much more than the nouns with a negative connotation and denotation

Notes/Observations:

- Fein’s article incorporates race and ethnic identity to showcase how the Armenians were a favored race and the Jews were not a favored race.
- He really appeals to rationality and irrationality in this article.
- He focuses most of his attention on showing how the Armenian comparison to the Jewish Holocaust makes no sense.
- The article provides a good look into the rest of the sample because it also carries on the comparison to the Jewish Holocaust.

APPENDIX E

SINGLE PUBLICATION CODING SHEET

Author: ATAA

Title: The Armenian Allegation of Genocide: Facts

URL: <http://www.ataa.org/ataa/news/13-nisan-2005-facts.html>

Last date accessed: 3/6/2006

Format: Skeleton of an Argument

Theme

Blaming the accuser-

- Armenians isolate their history from others.
- Armenian reports are false
- Believe they were inferior to non-Christians
- Armenians allege genocide/genocide not proven
- Not allowing Turks the right to disagree

Ethnic racial identity-

- Not the reason the Armenians were “relocated”
- Armenians believe they are an inferior race and the lives of non-Christians are unimportant
- “It was ethical dispute”

History and truth-

- The allegations of the Armenians were/are result of biased reports of Armenian sources
- 1.5 million Armenians died not possible because of population numbers at the time.

Others-

- “Armenian Americans have attempted to extricate and isolate their history from the complex circumstances in which their ancestors were embroiled.”
- “infusing history with myth”
- the years 1912-1922 constitute a humble period for humanity not just for Armenians.

Appeal

Appeal to Rationality

- Use of “facts” – appeals to rationality
- All facts and discussion points are backed up with information and stats.
- Period of conflict existed in OE
- Genocide as a term did not exist until 1944/ Armenian deaths do not constitute genocide
- Genocide is a crime of “specific intent”

Appeal to Irrationality

- Armenian reports are false
- Lack of real debate
- Allegation of genocide is illogical
- Armenians suffered terribly, but the allegation of genocide does not constitute genocide.
- Armenians isolate their history.

Other

- They suffered terribly, but it was an ethnic dispute
- No connection between Holocaust and the Armenians
- “Morgenthau professed that the Turks were an inferior race thus his accounts can barely be considered objective.

Discourse

Modifiers that Dispel Doubt

- Protect relocated Armenians
- Armenian experience – many died at this time.
- Relocation, ethnic dispute – external/internal problems

Modifiers that Raise Doubt

- Armenians suffered a high mortality
- Their (Armenians) attempts to use the Armenian massacres to diminish the worth of the Jewish Holocaust and to relate to it instead as unethical dispute.
- Challenge the credibility of witness and authenticity of documents.
- Century of ever increasing conflict
- Armenians vilify the Turks

Nouns with a Negative Connotation and Denotation

- Challenge the credibility of witness and authority of documents
- Relocation ethnic dispute
- “suffered a high mortality”

Notes/Observations:

Main Pt. The article is a facts/discussion points that seems to be based around the fact that the Armenians allegation of genocide is built around the Armenians using their history and really isolating it to make it seem as though what happened to them constitutes genocide – when history and documentation shows that the non-Christians died in larger numbers. Also, the Armenian figures of 1.5 million dead cannot be true because there were estimates that there were only 1.5 million Armenians in Ottoman Empire at the time – so it can’t be true. Also- Armenians not allowing debate – genocide denier labelers lack of real debate – limits “free speech.

APPENDIX F

SINGLE PUBLICATION CODING SHEET

Author: Prof. Justin McCarthy

Title: The First Shot

URL: http://www.ataa.org/ataa/ref/mccarthy_firstshot.html

Last date accessed: 3/6/2006

Format: Fleshed out argument

Theme

Blaming the accuser

- The article points the finger at the Armenians
- This is a recurring theme.
- The Armenians claim to be like the Jews/Holocaust- this is not true

Ethnic/racial identity

- Definitely- Armenians were well liked as a religious minority unlike the Jews.

History and truth

- This a historians who says historians have a duty to tell the truth.
- This duty translates to the Turks as well as he says they had a moral duty to respond to the Armenians attacks.
- No one should ever say the Turks were completely innocent, but the truly guilty were those who began to kill the innocent.

Appeal

Appeal to Rationality

- History/truth/love/report the truth.
- Yes the Turks were over dramatic at times but they did as they had to do.

Appeal to Irrationality

- Armenians aren't studying the whole picture – they are distorting the truth.
-

Other

- All historians make mistakes
- Political measure

Discourse

- 1890's rebellions, WWL, Azerbaijan/Armenia

Modifiers that Dispel Doubt

- "Turkey is mature enough, confident enough, to accept disagreement"
- "Historians should love the truth"
- "Duty to truth"
- "Uncomfortable facts"
- "Historians should love the truth"
- "duty to truth"
- "uncomfortable facts"

Modifiers that Raise Doubt

- "political pressure groups
- "All historians can make mistakes"
- "Study the whole issue".
- "Emotional reasons have also been invented".
- "Guilt has their heads"
- "Mythology of the AG"
- "Bad history"
- "historically and morally important"

Nouns with a Positive Connotation and Denotation:

- "one look at a map to prove this"
- "Turks felt all men were equal"

Notes/Observations:

- This publication definitely more credible from the Automatic credible start than publication one because it is not authorized by the ATAA or a Turkish source – prof. of history. Armenian – he even begins his article without using all the type/ kind of source.
- The Armenians started it, the Turks responded because they had a moral obligation to do so – as the majority protecting what was theirs as a majority the Armenians as a minority.
- There is no connections to the Jewish Holocaust because that was the Germany Nazi attack on the Jews- When the Turks were not the ones who attacked the Armenians- The Armenians attacked the Turks.

APPENDIX G

SINGLE PUBLICATION CODING SHEET

Author: Ayhan Ozer

Title: Facts and Discussion Points in the Armenian Allegations

URL: <http://www.ataa.org/ataa/ref/facts.html>

Last date accessed: 3/6/2006

Format: Skeleton of an argument

Theme

Blaming the accuser

- Ayhan Ozer blames Armenians for the brutal attacks/ terrorism propagandist nature in UN report.

History and truth

- UN report false, but Armenians still try to propagandize the report as truth, but is not.

Others

- Third party credibility – UN report.

Appeal

Appeal to Rationality

- Source was not UN/studied
- Impressive title to credible report
- UN report is not true

Appeal to Irrationality

- Armenians are terrorists
- Armenians are propagandists.
- Other:

Discourse

Modifiers that Dispel Doubt

- Not very many more that appear to me because so many moods that raise doubt and nouns with negative conn;
- “mythical convictions”

Modifiers that Raise Doubt

- “yellow journalism”
- “war time propaganda”
- Fictions add a stones

Nouns with a Negative Connotation and Denotation

- Maimed and wounded
- Blood shed and violence
- Death threat
- Endless terrorism
- Savage operations
- Senseless terrorism

Notes/Observations:

- This publication article by Ayhan Ozer is formulated in complete para, but does not really fall into a particular category in terms of format because there are two discussion points that make up the Armenian allegation of Genocide.
- These 2 points are not formulated as complete articles/thoughts in fact, the two points seem to be 2 pts that could have been pulled from another source.
- They are points/ideas not really comprising an article – full fledged article with complete thoughts.

APPENDIX H

SINGLE PUBLICATION CODING SHEET

Author: Dr. Turkkaya Ataov

Title: Hitler and the “Armenian Question”

URL: <http://www.ataa.org/ataa/ref/hitler.html>

Last date accessed: 3/6/2006

Format: Fleshed out argument

Theme

Ethnic/racial identity

- Armenians were favored by the Turks.
- The Turks were tolerable (Jews)

History and truth

- No truth behind the Hitler quote shows why Hitler would not agree as well as other Jews – if they only know that the Armenians were anti Semitic.

Appeal

Appeal to Rationality

- The story/events behind the connection to the Hitler quote makes sense because of the ethnic/religious tolerance

Appeal to Irrationality

- Armenian use of propaganda
- It was clear

Discourse

Modifiers that Dispel Doubt

- No primary source found for quote
- Hitler says the Armenians answered unreliable/trials

Modifiers that Raise Doubt

- Armenian propaganda
- Disseminate biased opinions

Nouns with a Negative Connotation and Denotation

- Undistorted truth
- Persecuted minority
- Ill-treated, hounded, exterminated.

Notes/Observations:

- Defines propaganda
- Hitler, examines comparison between Turks-Armenians and Jews- Germans and Armenian/Turk/Jews

APPENDIX I

SINGLE PUBLICATION CODING SHEET

Author: Dr. Turkkaya Ataov

Title: Perpetuating the Genocide Myth

URL: http://www.ataa.org/ataa/ref/arm_fcta.html

Last date accessed: 3/6/2006

Format: Fleshed out argument

Theme

Blaming the accuser

- Armenians began the conflict/ more Muslims died than Armenians.
- Armenians are “rewriting history” propaganda

Ethnic/racial identity

- Armenians were not the same or parallel to the Jews comparisons are absurd.

History and truth

- Holocaust/ Jews
- Armenians/Turks no logical comparison because the Jews were selected and hurt on purpose.

Appeal

- Repetition of “no evidence” no proof”
- Use of hyperlinks/tables/evidence/proof

Appeal of Rationality

- Most definitely an appeal to rationality lessons should be learned...
- Facts 700,000 Armenians/2 million muslims
- Facts –tragic events
- Armenians are terrorists/falsifications and are exposed in this booklet.

Other

- Anyone who has studied the OE sick man of Europe – knows that the empire was struggling – because the Armenians acted out the Turks had no choice but to relocate them.

Discourse

Modifiers that Dispel Doubt

- No case – no evidence, no proof- complete failure
- No parallel between Holocaust and tragic events in OE
- No reliable witnesses

Modifiers that Raise Doubt

- Rewriting history – Armenian terrorists
- Influencing politicians- organized campaigns – Attempting to poison young minds.
Constant propaganda and accusation by agitations

Nouns with Negative Connotation and Denotation

- Genocide deniers
- Armenian propaganda
- Forgeries and falsifications

Notes/Observations:

- Introduction
- Subheads
- Conclusion
- Quotes explication
- First one w/tables actually in text
- First to have bulleted list
- Treaty of Serves/Lausanne

APPENDIX J

SINGLE PUBLICATION CODING SHEET

Author: Justin McCarthy

Title: Let Historians Decide on So-called Genocide

URL: <http://www.ataa.org/ataa/ref/mccarthy.html>

Last date accessed: 3/6/2006

Format: Fleshed out argument

Theme

Blaming the accuser

- Definitely throughout the article McCarthy explains the difference between a historians version of the truth and the Armenians are nationalists.

Ethnic/racial identity

- Armenian/Russian alliance- Turks were majority needed to protect themselves form the threat of

History and truth

- Historian vs. nationalist.

Other

- Why are Turks accused – the answer is both emotional and political
- No claim of genocide can stand in the light of the facts
- Government stats – twisted

Appeal

Appeal to Rationality

- Professor McCarthy teaches at...
- Historians must apply all the facts are rational nationalists are irrational.

Appeal to Irrationality

- Nationalists aka the Armenians are irrational and do not consider and apply historical facts.
- Naturalists do have goals- a different set of goals they want their cause to triumph – not the truth.

Discourse

Modifiers that Dispel Doubt

- Two warring sides – result of war fare
- Defend the inferior

Modifiers that Raise Doubt

- Undisputed evil.
- Political goals
- Weapons of choice
- Political agenda
- Terrorism was their deliberate distortion of the truth.
- Merciless conflicts

Nouns with a Negative Connotation and Denotation

- Man mortality of ethnic groups
- Practical politician Armenian rebels.

Nouns with a Positive Connotation and Denotation

- Normal tools of history
- Ethnic peace
- Historical study

Notes/Observations:

- Repetitions- It was not genocide
- People – graduate students – should study the Armenian question
- Joint commission

APPENDIX K

SINGLE PUBLICATION CODING SHEET

Author: Heath W. Lowry

Title: The U.S. Congress and Adolf Hitler on the Armenians

URL: http://www.ataa.org/ataa/ref/arm_uscongress/arm_uscongress.html

Last date accessed: 3/6/2006

Format: Fleshed out argument

Theme

Blaming the accuser

- Very well documented and supported
- By far the most credible
- Yes- why the Armenian propagandists use the Hitler statement

History and truth

- Most definitely proof that the statement was not in regard to the Jews- but the poles and theirs not the Armenian as a genocide.
- Points out why US congress agrees because they are Jewish
- Points out how document and much of Armenian claims propaganda are leave history to the historians.

Appeal

Appeal to Rationality

- Step by step he goes through his points until he discredits the statement.

Appeal to Irrationality

- The statement has no primary source till he reveals lochner who is never revealed

Discourse

Modifier that Dispel Doubt

- Full of modifiers/statements that dispel doubt about Hitler's reference to the Armenians/Jews.
- Soul source
- Real source

Modifiers that Raise Doubt

- No primary source
- No proof
- Spurious Hitler quote
- Tools of ethnic pressure groups
- Purported Adolf Hitler quote
- Tools of ethnic pressure groups

APPENDIX L
THE ARMENIAN ALLEGATION OF GENOCIDE: FACTS

The
**Armenian
Allegation
of Genocide**

facts

The issue:

Whether during the collapse of the Ottoman Empire genocide was perpetrated against Ottoman Armenian citizens in Eastern Anatolia.

The Ottoman Empire ruled over all of Anatolia and significant parts of Europe, North Africa, the Caucasus and Middle East for over 700 years. Lands once Ottoman dominions today comprise more than 30 independent nations.

A century of ever-increasing conflict, beginning roughly in 1820 and culminating with the founding of the Republic of Turkey in 1923, characterized the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire. The imperiled empire contracted against an onslaught of external invaders and internal nationalist independence movements. In this context must the tragic experience of the Ottoman Armenians of Eastern Anatolia be understood. For during these waning days of the Ottoman Empire did millions die Muslim, Jew and Christian alike.

Yet Armenian Americans have attempted to extricate and isolate their history from the complex circumstances in which their ancestors were embroiled. In so doing, they describe a world populated only by white-hated heroes and black-hated villains. Infusing history with myth, Armenian Americans vilify the Republic of Turkey, Turkish Americans, and ethnic Turks worldwide. Bent on this prosecution, Armenian Americans choose their evidence carefully, omitting facts that tend to exonerate those whom they presume guilty, ignoring important events and verifiable accounts, and sometimes relying on dubious or prejudiced sources and even falsified documents.

Any attempt to challenge the credibility of witnesses, or the authenticity of documents is either wholly squelched or met with accusations of genocide denial. Moreover, attempts to expose the suffering and needless death of millions of innocent non-Christians enmeshed in the same events as the Anatolian Armenians

are greeted with sneers, as if to say that some lives are inherently more valuable than

others and that one faith is more deserving than another. The lack of real debate ensures that any consideration of what genuinely occurred nearly a century ago in Eastern Anatolia will utterly fail as a search for the truth.

Ultimately, whether to blindly accept the Armenian American portrayal is an issue of fundamental fairness and the most cherished of American rights - free speech. Simply put, in America every person has the opportunity to tell his or her story. However, Armenian Americans seek to deny this very right to others by branding anyone who disagrees with their portrayal a "genocide denier." The complete story of the vast suffering of this period has not yet been written. When that story is told, the following facts must not be forgotten.

Demographic studies prove that prior to World War I fewer than 1.5 million Armenians lived in the entire Ottoman Empire. Thus, allegations that more than 1.5 million Armenians from eastern Anatolia died must be false.

Figures reporting the pre-World War I Armenian population vary widely, with Armenian sources claiming far more than others. British, French and Ottoman sources give total figures of 1.05-1.50 million. Only certain Armenian sources claim a pre-war population larger than 1.50 million. Comparing these to post-war figures yields a rough estimate of losses. Boghos Nubar, head of the Armenian delegation at the Paris Peace Conference in 1920, noted that significant numbers survived the war. He declared that after the war 280,000 Armenians remained in the Anatolian portion of the occupied Ottoman Empire while 700,000 Armenians had emigrated to other countries. Historian and demographer, Dr. Justin McCarthy of the University of Louisville, calculates the actual losses as slightly less than 600,000. This figure agrees with those provided by British historian Arnold Toynbee, French missionary, Monseigneur Touchet, and others.

Over 2.5 million Muslims died during the same period from similar causes.

Armenians suffered a high mortality. But one must likewise consider the number of non-Christian dead. The statistics tell us that more than 2.5 million Anatolian Muslims also perished. Thus, the years 1912-1922 constitute a horrible period for humanity, not just for Armenians. Documents of the time describe intercommunal violence, forced migration of all ethnic groups, disease, and famine as causes of death.

Armenian American evidence of genocide is derived from dubious and prejudicial sources.

Armenian Americans purport that the wartime propaganda of the enemies of the Ottoman Empire constitutes objective evidence. Oft-quoted Ambassador Henry Morgenthau stated in correspondence with President Wilson that he intended to uncover or manufacture news that would goad the U.S. into joining the war, and thus he sought to malign the Ottoman Empire, an enemy of the Triple Entente. Moreover, Morgenthau relied on politically motivated Armenians; his primary aid, translator and confidant was Arshag Schmavonian, his secretary was Hagop Andonian. Morgenthau professed that the Turks were an inferior

race. Thus, his accounts can hardly be considered objective.

Compare the wartime writings of Morgenthau and the oft-cited J.G. Harbord to the post-war writings of Admiral Mark L. Bristol, U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Turkey 1920-1926. In a March 28, 1921 letter he wrote, "[R]eports are being freely circulated in the [U.S.] that the Turks massacred thousands of Armenians in the Caucasus. Such reports are repeated so many times it makes my blood boil. The Near East Relief have the reports from Yarrow and our own American people which show absolutely that such Armenian reports are absolutely false. The circulation of such false reports in the United States, without refutation, is an outrage and is certainly doing the Armenians more harm than good.... Why not tell the truth about the Armenians in every way?"

The Armenian deaths do not constitute genocide.

A. Boghos Nubar addressed a letter to the Times of London on January 30, 1919 confirming that the Armenians were indeed belligerents in World War I. He stated with pride, "In the Caucasus, without mentioning the 150,000 Armenians in the Russian armies, about 50,000 Armenian volunteers under Andranik, Mazarbekoff, and others not only fought for four years for the cause of the Entente, but after the breakdown of Russia they were the only forces in the Caucasus to resist the advance of the Turks...."

Between 1893 and 1915 Ottoman Armenians in eastern Anatolia rebelled against their government -the Ottoman government -- and joined Armenian revolutionary groups, such as the notorious Dashnaks and Hunchaks. They spearheaded a massive Russian invasion of Eastern Anatolia. On November 5, 1914, the President of the Armenian National Bureau in Tblisi declared to Czar Nicholas II, "From all countries Armenians are hurrying to enter the ranks for the glorious Russian Army, with their blood to serve the victory of Russian arms." In the service of the Russians, traitorous Armenians massacred over 60,000 Muslims in the city of Van alone.

B. The allegation of genocide is illogical. In the words of eminent historian Bernard Lewis, speaking to the Israeli daily Ha'aretz on January 23, 1998, "The Armenians want to benefit from both worlds. On the one hand, they speak with pride of their struggle against Ottoman despotism, while on the other hand they compare their tragedy to the Jewish Holocaust. I do not accept this. I do not say that the Armenians did not suffer terribly. But I find enough cause for me to contain their attempts to use the Armenian massacres to diminish the worth of the Jewish Holocaust and to relate to it instead as an ethnic dispute." (translation)

C. None of the Ottoman orders commanding the relocation of Armenians, which have been reviewed by historians to date, orders killings. To the contrary, they order Ottoman officials to protect relocated Armenians. Unfortunately, where Ottoman control was weak, Armenian relocatees suffered most. The stories of the time give examples of columns of hundreds of Armenians guarded by as few as two Ottoman gendarmes. When local Muslims attacked the columns, Armenians were robbed and killed. These Muslims had

themselves suffered greatly at the hands of Armenians and Russians. Conversely, where Ottoman control was strong, Armenians went unharmed. In Istanbul and other major Western Anatolian cities, large populations of Armenians remained throughout the war, their churches open.

D. The term "genocide" did not exist prior to 1944. It was later defined quite specifically by the 1948 U.N. Convention on the Prevention of the Crime of Genocide. The standard of proof in establishing the crime of genocide is formidable given the severity of the crime, the opportunity for overlap with other crimes, and the stigma of being charged with or found guilty of the crime. While presenting the Convention for ratification, the Secretary General of the U.N. emphasized that genocide is a crime of "specific intent," requiring conclusive proof that members of a group were targeted simply because they were members of that group. The Secretary General further cautioned that those merely sharing political aims are not protected by the convention.

Under this standard of proof, the Armenian American claim of genocide fails. First, no direct evidence has been discovered demonstrating that any Ottoman official sought the destruction of the Ottoman Armenians as such. Second, Ottoman Armenian revolutionaries confessedly waged war against their own government. Under these circumstances, it was the Ottoman Armenians' violent political alliance with the Russian forces, not their ethnic or religious identity, which rendered them subject to the relocation.

The British convened the Malta Tribunal to try Ottoman officials for crimes against Armenians. All of the accused were acquitted.

In 1919 The British High Commission in Istanbul, utilizing Armenian informants, arrested 144 high Ottoman officials and deported them to the island of Malta for trial on charges of harming Armenians. While the deportees were interned in Malta, the British appointed an Armenian scholar, Mr. Haig Khazarian, to conduct a thorough examination of the Ottoman, British, and U.S. archives to substantiate the charges. Though granted complete access to all records, Khazarian's corps of investigators discovered an utter lack of evidence demonstrating that the Ottoman officials either sanctioned or encouraged killings of Armenians. The British Procurator General exonerated and released all 144 detainees - after two years and four months of detention without trial. No compensation was ever paid to the detainees.

Despite the acquittals by the Malta Tribunal, Armenian terrorists have engaged in a vigilante war that continues today.

In 1921, a secret Armenian network, named Nemesis, took the law into its own hands and hunted down and assassinated several former Ottoman Ministers, among them Talat Pasha and Jemal Pasha. Following in Nemesis' footsteps, during the 1970's and 1980's the Armenian terrorist groups ASALA (Armenian Secret Army for the Liberation of Armenia) and JCAG (Justice Commandos of the Armenian Genocide) committed over 230 armed attacks, killing 71 innocent people, including 31 Turkish diplomats, and

seriously wounding over 520 people in a campaign of blood revenge.

The Holocaust bears no meaningful relation to the Ottoman Armenian experience.

1. Jews neither demanded the dismemberment of the nations in which they had lived nor did they kill their fellow citizens. By contrast, Ottoman Armenians openly agitated for a separate state in lands in which they were numerically inferior. With determination they committed mass treason, and took up arms against their government. They also massacred local Muslim and Jewish civilians.

2. The guilt of the perpetrators of the Holocaust was proven at Nuremberg. By contrast, those alleged to have been responsible for the maladministration of the relocation policies were exonerated at Malta by the World War I victors.

3. Hitler did not refer to the Armenians in plotting the Final Solution; the infamous quote is fraudulent. For this reason it was rejected as evidence by the Nuremberg tribunal.

4. Armenians collaborated with the Nazis, forming the 812th Battalion of the [Nazi] Wehrmacht, and its successor, the Armenian legion. Armenians published Anti-Jewish, pro-Nazi propaganda in the Armenian-language Hairenik daily and the Armenian weekly journal.

The depth and volume of scholarship on the Holocaust is tremendous. By contrast, much about the late Ottoman Empire has yet to be learned and many conclusions have yet to be drawn.

Suggested reading

Armenian Atrocities and Terrorism, ed. by the Assembly of Turkish American Associations (Assembly of Turkish American Associations, Washington, DC, 1997);

Death and Exile: the Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922, by Justin McCarthy (Darwin Press, Princeton, New Jersey. 1995);

Muslims and Minorities, The Population of Ottoman Anatolia and the End of the Empire, by Justin McCarthy (New York University Press, New York, 1983);

Pursuing the Just Cause of Their People, by Michael Gunter (Greenwood Press, New York, 1986);

The Armenian File: The Myth of Innocence Exposed, by Kamuran Guriin (K. Riistem & Bro. and Weidenfeld & Nicolson Ltd., London, 1985);

The Armenian Question 1914-1923, by Mim Kemal Oke (K. Rustem & Bro. London, 1988);

The Story Behind Ambassador Morgenthau's Story, by Heath W. Lowry (Isis Press, Istanbul, 1990);

The Talat Pasha Telegrams: Historical Fact or Armenian Fiction, by Sinasi Orel and SQreyyaYuca (K. Rustem & Bro., London, 1986);

The U.S. Congress and Adolf Hitler on the Armenians, by Heath W. Lowry (Vol. 3, No. 2, Political Communication and Persuasion, 1985);

Proceedings of Symposium on Armenians in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey (1912-1926), (Bogazigi University Publications, Istanbul, 1984) and

History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey, by Stanford and Ezel Shaw (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 1977).

Assembly of Turkish American Associations
1526 18th St, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036 Telephone: (202) 483-9090, Fax: (202) 483-9092 email: assembly@ataa.org

Copyright © ATAA

APPENDIX M THE FIRST SHOT



The First Shot

By Prof. Justin McCarthy
University of Louisville

(First Presented During A Conference at YEDITEPE University, Istanbul)

Historians should love the truth. A historian has a duty to try to write only the truth. Before historians write they must look at all relevant sources. They must examine their own prejudices, then do all they can to insure that those prejudices do not overwhelm the truth. Only then should they write history. The historians creed must be, "Consider all the sides of an issue; reject your own prejudices. Only then can you hope to find the truth."

Do historians always follow this creed? They do not, but good historians try.

There are ways to tell if a historian has been true to his craft. All important sources of information must be studied: A book on American history that does not draw upon American sources and only uses sources written in French cannot be accurate history. All important facts must be considered: a book on the history of the Germans and the Jews that does not mention the death of the Jews in the Holocaust cannot be true.

Uncomfortable facts, facts that disagree with one's preconceptions and prejudices must be considered, not avoided or ignored: Any book on the history of the Turks and the Armenians that does not include the history of the Turks who were killed by Armenians cannot be the truth. This is obvious. It should be so obvious that it need not be said. But we know it must be said, because so many have forgotten the rules of honest history.

Like historians, politicians also have a duty to truth. If they make pronouncements on history, they assume the duties of historians. They must look honestly at the historical record, the whole historical record. They must not accept that what they are told is true because political pressure groups tell them it is true. They must not accept that something is true because their fathers believed it was true. They must not accept as truth what their own prejudices tell them is true. If politicians speak on history, if politicians pass resolutions on history, then they must follow the rules of history. Otherwise, what the politicians proclaim will not be the truth. It may be good politics. It may win votes. But it will never be the truth.

Again, this should be obvious. If politicians believe they are historians, they must follow the rules of historians. This is not, however, a lesson that has been learned by the parliaments that have passed resolutions on what is called the "Armenian Genocide." The appalling historical pronouncements of politicians are easy to recognize as bad history. When they passed their resolutions on the Armenians did the French Parliament or the European Union Parliament consider any evidence that disagreed with their prejudices? No. When President Jacques Chirac declared recently that all governments should accept the "Armenian Genocide" did he make a detailed study of all the sources, including what the Ottomans recorded? No. Did those who attempted to pass "genocide resolutions" in the American Congress acknowledge that millions of Turks died in the same conflict? No. In the counterfeit history of these self-proclaimed historians the only dead were Armenians.

It can be argued that members of the French Parliament or the European Union government could never follow the rules of historians. They have no time for detailed research on historical issues. They have little or no training in the study of history. To them I offer this unsolicited advice: if you cannot do the work necessary to find the truth, say nothing.

I will admit that as a historian I am angered by those who refuse to study the whole issue, but speak freely from their own prejudices or for their own political advantage. I am also angered by the hypocrisy of those who falsely proclaim that they are indeed studying all sides of the Armenian Question, when in fact they are doing no such thing.

Historical knowledge depends on debate. No matter how hard we try to see all sides of an issue, each of us is fallible. All historians can make mistakes. We learn our mistakes through debate. We listen to others who disagree with us, consider our evidence, and sometimes change our minds. Someone who will not study the evidence brought by others is not a scholar. Someone who will not listen to the judgments of others is only pretending to be a historian.

Recently there have been meetings on the Armenian Question held in Germany and America. The meetings in America were mainly held behind closed doors. They were secret. No one but the participants knows what went on in these meetings. Some few meetings have allowed the public to listen, but have never included speakers who have doubted the existence of the "Armenian Genocide." Nevertheless, these meetings have been widely publicized, because there have been both Turks and Armenians at these meetings. The Armenian nationalists say, "You see, Turkish scholars agree with us."

Who are these Turks? They are those who have passed a test before they are allowed into the club. Before they can be a part of the gatherings, the Turks must agree that there was an Armenian genocide. The Armenian nationalists will not meet, or even speak, with anyone who disagrees with them. So these meetings are not scholarly inquiries. They are political gatherings of those who wish to condemn the Turks, and some of those who condemn the Turks happen to be Turks themselves.

There is nothing strange in this. I need not tell you that there are Turks whose ideology drives their historical judgment or that there are Turks who honestly disagree with the large majority of other Turkish scholars. It is a good thing to have disagreement, because wisdom comes out of debate. That is the problem with these meetings--they are not debates.

I have recently read many e-mails and letters that condemn the Turks who meet with the Armenians. Other Turks condemn them for in some way betraying their country. This is not right. No scholar should ever be attacked because he says what is unpopular. Freedom is the basis of all good scholarship, and that includes the freedom to be wrong. Attacking those who disagree with you is the way of the Armenian nationalists who bomb professor's houses, kill diplomats, threaten scholars, and take advantage of unjust French laws to sue professors who dare to speak out.

I hope this is never the way of the Turks. I go into bookstores in Istanbul and Ankara and see books in Turkish, written by Turkish citizens. These books state that the Turks did commit genocide. I read Turkish newspapers that include interviews with men whose words sound as if they were been written by Armenian nationalists. Sometimes I laugh at their arguments.

Sometimes they anger me. But I know that it is a good thing that they are able to speak. It shows that Turkey is mature enough, confident enough, to accept disagreement.

So are these scholars not to be criticized? Yes, I do rebuke them—not for disagreeing with me, not for being wrong, surely not for betraying Turkey. I accuse them of betraying scholarship. I condemn their closed meetings. I accuse all those who only speak to their friends, then pretend they are holding dialogues. I rebuke anyone who refuses to listen to disagreement.

I ask only one question of those, whether Turks or Armenians, who hold their secret meetings. I ask only one question of those, whether Turks or Armenians, who will only talk with their ideological friends. I ask only one question of those, whether Turks or Armenians, who refuse all scholarly debate. What are you afraid of?

I renew the call for honest debate. Those who believe in their cause should be willing to defend it with their words. They must be willing to argue, not just to preach to those who agree with them.

To the parliamentarians and the historians I offer one more piece of advice: Forget the politics and ask the real historical questions. No study of the history of the Armenians and the Turks can be undertaken unless one central question is asked: Whatever they believe the Turks did, whether genocide or self-defense, why would the Turks do it?

One of the main problems with the Armenian nationalist explanation has always been the question of why the Turks would attack the Armenians. The Turks and other Muslims were a large majority in a Muslim Empire. They had lived with the Armenians for centuries, and allowed the Armenians to keep their customs and religion. Yet, if one believes the Armenian nationalists, the Turks suddenly decided to attack the Armenians. Worse, the Turks suddenly decided to destroy all the Armenians in a planned genocide. The Armenian nationalists have invented many supposed reasons for the imaginary Turkish plan: The Turks supposedly planned to steal Armenian property. They supposedly desired to link the Turks of Anatolia with the Turks of Central Asia and Armenians stood in the way. Or the Ottomans needed Armenian land to house the Turkish refugees from the Balkan Wars. More emotional reasons have also been invented: The Turks allegedly desired to kill the Armenians out of jealousy, because the Turks felt the Armenians were superior. Or the Turks purportedly acted out of what was called "religious hatred."

Did the Turks wish to seize the property of the Armenians? If so, it would indeed be odd that the Turks fought against Armenians in Eastern Anatolia, where the Armenians were relatively poor, and did not touch the property of rich Armenians in Istanbul, Edirne, and Izmir. Of course, we can never prove that in their hearts Turks did not covet Armenian property. We can ask, however, who had stolen whose property? Who was the thief? Who was the victim? When World War I began Armenians were living in seized Turkish property in Erivan, Karabag, and Kars. Turks had not stolen Armenian property; Armenians had stolen Turkish property.

During World War I, when the Russians invaded Eastern Anatolia, it was the Armenians who once again first stole the property of Turks and Kurds. Only after 100 years of losing their homes and farms did the Muslims of Anatolia finally take their revenge and seize Armenian property.

Map #1

The desire to join with Central Asian Turks was indeed a mad dream of some Ottoman leaders, particularly Enver Pasa. It never was considered seriously, except perhaps for Azerbaijan. In any case, how would the Armenians have stood in the way of such a plan? The path to Central Asia, had the Ottomans been mad enough to take it, was through Iran, not Armenia. It only takes one look at a map to prove this. A Turkish army advancing north through Armenia to reach Central Asia would have had to pass over the highest point of the Caucasus Mountains, then over desert and steppe, and finally around the Aral Sea to the South. Not even Enver Pasa would have tried that. Even Cengiz Han took the coast road. Would the other Armenians, those who lived in Ottoman Anatolia, have stood in the way of Ottoman conquest to the East? They would only have been a problem if they took up arms to prevent the advance. They did indeed take up arms against the Ottomans, but the Armenian revolt had nothing to do with Central Asia.

The theory that the Ottomans planned to take Armenian lands for Balkan War refugees has an evident problem. The refugees were all housed before the beginning of World War I and they were almost all housed in Thrace and Western Anatolia, not in Eastern Anatolia.

Did the Turks hate the Armenians and try to kill them because they felt the Armenians were superior? There is of course no evidence of this in any Ottoman document or speech, but the evidence I prefer is what is

evident to anyone who has lived with Turks. I have known many Turks over the past 35 years. Most of those Turks felt that all men were equal. No Turk ever felt that Turks were inferior to anyone. I very much doubt if the Ottoman Turks felt any different.

As for "religious hatred," history shows this to be a laughable lie. Is one to believe that the Muslims, having accepted the Armenians for 700 years, would decide to violate the principles of Islam and no longer accept the Christian right to exist? Is one to forget that the history of the Ottomans was one of exemplary tolerance, much better than the record of Christian states? No, the Muslims of the East did indeed begin to hate and fear Armenians, but that was a result of Armenian and Russian actions.

In the final analysis, the arguments of the Armenian nationalists come down to one assertion--the Turks were crazy. After 700 years of coexistence the Turks suddenly began to hate the Armenians and resolved to kill them. No other explanation can satisfy the Armenian nationalist desire to blame the Turks. All the explanations that are given for the supposed genocide depend on the Turks acting completely irrationally.

I have heard it argued that this explanation makes sense. After all, the Germans acted irrationally when they killed the Jews. The differences are worth considering. The Nazis called upon a long tradition of hatred of the Jews. The history of Europe had been filled with attacks on Jews. There was also a long German tradition of evil literature written against the Jews. Hitler and his followers thus called upon a long tradition of hatred. They used prejudice against Jews as a tool to aid their rise to power.

Was anything similar ever seen in the Ottoman Empire? Before the beginning of Armenian revolts had there been attacks on Armenians like the German attacks on Jews? No. Was there a long tradition of Ottoman popular writings against Armenians? No. Did any Turkish political parties base their campaigns on animosity to Armenians? No. In fact, even while Armenian nationalists were rebelling against the Ottomans other Armenians were welcomed into the Ottoman Government. Armenians rose to high positions in the Ottoman State. European-style racial hatred was foreign to the Ottoman Empire. The sort of prejudice that resulted in the deaths of the German Jews was virtually unknown in the Ottoman Empire. Any claim that "racial hatred" led to aggression against Armenians is pure fantasy.

It is better to look for rational reasons for the conflict that developed between Turks and Armenians. The real reason the Turks fought the Armenians is easily explained and completely rational. The Turks were defending themselves.

This brings the next question: Who started the conflict between the Armenians and the Turks? Who was the attacker? Who was defending himself?

Other historians and I usually avoid those questions. When I have spoken and written on the history of the Turks and Armenians I have described it as a sad chapter in the history of humanity. I have even said that who was at fault was not the real issue. I have said that the real issue is the suffering of humanity, whether Turks or Armenians. That is still the most important consideration.

But the question of who was the attacker must now be considered, because the politicians who condemn the Turks have never been satisfied to pity all suffering humanity. When Armenian nationalists have admitted any Turkish suffering they have said that Turkish deaths were the result of war and Armenian deaths were the result of genocide. They have said that Turks persecuted Armenians, then suffered because of what the Turks started. Was this true? Did the Turks suffer because they attacked the Armenians? Was what happened the fault of the Turks, and so should we feel less pity for the Turks? To answer this, we must study who started the conflicts between Turks and Armenians.

Map #2

Contrary to what is usually told, the conflict began not in the Ottoman Empire in the late 19th century, but in what was then the Persian Empire in the eighteenth century. Armenians, including officials of the Armenian

Church, allied themselves with Russian invaders. In 1796, Armenians living in Derbend were instrumental in the Russian defeat of the khan of Derbend and the capture of the city by the Russians. An Armenian bishop of the 1790s preached that Armenians should join the Russians to, "free the Armenians from Muslim Rule. Most Armenians of Azerbaijan did not take any side, but those who did take sides supported the Russians. Armenian volunteers fought alongside the Russians throughout the Russian conquest of Azerbaijan and Erivan.

More than anything else, Armenian loyalty to the Russians was shown by their desire to live under Russian rule. When the Russians took Karabag and Erivan, they killed or evicted Muslims, mostly Turks, who lived there. Their empty homes and farms were taken by Armenians from Persia and Ottoman Anatolia. As more Turks were evicted in the coming decade, more Armenians came to take their place. It must be remembered that a majority of the population of what is today the Armenian Republic were Turks before the Russians conquered. Soon the majority was no longer Turkish.

Armenians had lived with Turks in the Southern Caucasus region for 700 years. Their lives had not been perfect, nor had the lives of the Turks. Yet the proof that they must have been treated with tolerance is the fact that 700 years after the arrival of the Turks the Armenians were still there. They were not hiding in the mountains, fiercely defending their independence. They were living all over the region and working in the cities, where they could easily have been eradicated. Yet they lived in peace. The Armenians were a scattered people, living all over the region. In no province of the Southern Caucasus were they a majority. When the Russians arrived, many of the Armenians joined the invaders against their governments. Those who joined the Russians wanted a minority, the Armenians and Russians, to rule over a majority, a Muslim majority under whose rule they had lived for 700 years. They did not wish democracy. They did not wish the will of the people. They wished to rule. And the Muslims who stood in the way of the Armenian nationalists were to be removed.

It was not the Turks who attacked the Armenians. It was the Armenians who attacked the Turks.

The Russians carried the invasions into Eastern Anatolia in a war in 1828-29 and in the Crimean War. Ottoman and Russian Armenians joined the Russian side when they invaded Anatolia, and they acted as spies and scouts for the Russians. When the Russians were forced to withdraw, thousands of Armenians left with them. They had taken the side of their country's enemy.

1877-78 Russo-Turkish War

At the beginning of the 1877-78 war between Russia and the Ottoman Empire the Ottomans should have been able to depend on their subjects, whether Muslim or Christian. Indeed, 84 Christians of Erzurum had volunteered for military service on the first day that Christians were accepted into the Ottoman Army. However, the Russian consul at Erzurum notified the Christian bishops that Russia did not look kindly on Christians fighting for their country. The bishops told the Christians not to serve, and the Christians no longer enrolled.

All who live on a battleground suffer, but the Armenians of the East were neither selected out nor persecuted by the Ottoman government during the war. Instead, there is plentiful evidence from European sources that civil and Muslim officials protected Armenians from Kurdish attacks. Sadly, when the Ottomans lost the war they were not able to protect the Muslims from the Armenians.

When Kars fell to the Russians, local Armenians attacked both Ottoman soldiers and the local Turks. The British reported that the Armenians were assisting the Russians in murdering the Turkish wounded. Upon conquering Erzurum, the Russians placed an Armenian in charge of the police. The persecution of the Turks began. 6,000 Turkish families were forced to flee the city. The British ambassador wrote, "There is no doubt that when the Russians occupied Erzurum the Armenians availed themselves of the protection they received to molest, ill-treat, and insult the Mohammaden population."

During the war, many Armenians in the Ottoman East joined the Russian side. Ottoman Armenians acted as

scouts and spies for Russian invaders. None so wholeheartedly allied themselves with the Russians as the Armenians of the Eleskirt Valley. They confidently expected that the Russians would retain all they had conquered. This was not to be. Other European Powers forced the Russians to withdraw from Eleskirt. Between 2 and 3,000 Armenian families joined the Russians in their withdrawal. There was no lack of houses and farms to give the Armenians who joined the Russians, because the Russians had forced 70,000 Turks from the region they conquered.

Armenian Revolutionary Organizations

The Dashnaktsuthiun Party, the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, known usually as the Dashnaks, was founded in Tiflis in the Russian Empire in 1890. It joined earlier Armenian nationalist parties in planning the downfall of the Ottoman Empire in Anatolia. The party was socialist and nationalist in ideology. Its Manifesto declared a "people's war against the Turkish government." It spoke of "the scared task of securing national freedom." Amidst calls for redistribution of land, communal brotherhood, and good government, the Dashnak Program of 1892 set forth its revolutionary intentions. These included organizing revolutionary committees and fighting bands and arming "the people. The Dashnaks declared their intention "to stimulate fighting and to terrorize government officials . . ." and "to expose government establishments to looting and destruction." In the ensuing years they carried out their plan.

The Dashnak motto (1896) was "Arms! Battle! The victory is ours!"

There is neither the time nor the need to describe here the organization and philosophy of the Dashnaks and the other Armenian revolutionary movements. Their own words indicate their purpose--bloody rebellion against the Ottoman Empire. It is more important to consider their deeds than to study their words. One thing must be understood about the purpose of the Armenian revolution, however: The aim of the Armenian revolutionaries was very different than the aim of other nationalist revolutionaries. The people of Italy were Italian. Italian revolutions wanted a state where the majority ruled. Polish nationalists wanted to create a state for the Poles, who were an oppressed majority, ruled by a Russian minority. The same was true all over the world--whatever their methods, good and bad, nationalists at least fought for a state in which the majority would rule themselves. Map #4 It was not so with the Armenian nationalists. Armenian revolutionaries fought to conquer a land in which they were less than 20% of the population. In the region they claimed, the so-called "Six Vilâyet," Muslims outnumbered them by more than four to one. Unlike the Poles, the Italians, the Uzbeks, the South Africans, the Algerians, or the Irish, the Armenians were not a large majority ruled by an imperial master. They were a small group who wished to defeat the majority and seize their land. They were a small group that enlisted the aid of the enemies of their country, because they could never conquer the large majority of Muslims without outside help.

What would the Armenian nationalists have done if they had succeeded? History teaches from the sad example of the fate of the Turks of the Balkans. The only way to create an "Armenia" was to exile or kill the majority. There could never have been an Armenia state in Anatolia unless the revolutionaries had rid themselves of the Muslims.

This fact must be remembered whenever one considers the Ottoman response to the Armenian revolutionaries. The Ottomans were not only defending their government. They were defending the majority of their people against those who would deny majority rule. Moreover, they were defending those who would be dead or exiled if the revolutionaries succeeded.

1890s Rebellions

Armenian rebellions took place in Eastern Anatolia in the 1860s and earlier. But it was in the 1890s that the Armenian revolutionary organizations truly began to put their plans into effect.

In 1894, Armenians in the Sasun region rebelled against the government. Large rebel bands concentrated their attacks on symbols of the Ottoman State--tax collectors, government officials, official buildings. They

also fought battles with Kurdish tribesmen. There had always been animosity between the Armenians and the Kurdish tribes. This much is understandable. Whether or not one approves of Armenian rebellion, it is understood that rebels attack the government and their old enemies. What happened next is not in any way excusable. The Ottoman army advanced on the rebels. As the rebels retreated they slaughtered the Muslim inhabitants of the villages in their path. In response, the army and local Muslims killed Armenians.

It was not the Muslims who began to kill Armenians. It was Armenians who began to kill Muslims. The result was horrible for both.

The actions of Armenian rebels in Zeytun and Maras in 1895 were all too similar. Their rebellion was a mass murder of Muslims of the region. The Armenian leader himself claimed to have killed 25,000 Muslims. The Ottoman army was not even allowed to punish the murderers. The European Powers protected them.

In Van in the same year the rebels, and many innocent Muslims and Armenians, died when the Armenian nationalists once again rebelled. In Adana in 1909 it was the same; Armenians rebelled, confident of European support that never came. Although the Armenians suffered the greater mortality, Armenian rebel forces unquestionably began the conflict. The Turks responded. They were not only protecting their state; they were protecting their people.

In Sasun, in Van, in Zeytun, in Maras, and in Adana, it was Armenian rebels who began the slaughter. It was the Armenian rebels who began to murder their fellow Ottoman citizens. It was not the Turks who attacked the Armenians. It was the Armenians who attacked the Turks.

World War I

The events of World War I cannot be understood without first looking at the Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913. Those wars gave revolutionaries a reason to believe that their methods would be successful. Nationalist rebel bands killed the Turks of the Balkans and drove them from their homes. Invading armies finished the job of murder and exile. Muslims, most of them Turks, had been a slight majority in Ottoman Europe in 1912. By the end of the Balkan Wars they were a distinct minority. 27% of the Muslims of the Ottoman Balkans had died. What remained were Bulgarian, Greek, Montenegrin, and Serbian states that had rid themselves of their Muslim populations. Lands that had Muslim majorities now had Christian majorities. This was exactly what the Armenian revolutionaries would have to do on a greater scale, and it had worked in the Balkans.

Both sides learned the lessons of the Balkan Wars. The Turks knew what would happen to them if revolutionaries succeeded. The intentions of the Armenian rebels were the same as the intentions of those who had forced the Turks from the Balkans. They wished to rid Eastern Anatolia of its Muslim majority, so that it could become "Armenia." To do so they would use the same tactics that had been effective in the Balkans.

Even before the first world war began, Armenian guerilla bands had begun to organize in the Russian Empire. These included Armenians from both Russia and the Ottoman Empire. Approximately 8,000 Ottomans went to Kagizman to train and organize. 6,000 went from Anatolia to Igdir, more to other training camps. They returned to fight the Turks and to aid the Russian war effort. Large caches of guns, ammunition, supplies, and even uniforms had been hidden in depots in Anatolia, ready for use.

These were not small units of guerillas. They were not a few men committing random acts of terrorism. There were indeed innumerable such individual acts, but the main Armenian attack came from well-armed and trained rebel bands. They may have numbered as many as 100,000 men. In Sivas Vilâyeti alone Ottoman officials estimated 30,000 Armenian partisans.

The mythology of Armenian history holds that peaceful Armenians were attacked without provocation by Turks. The reality was far different. To understand the situation, one should attempt to visualize the situation

on the Ottoman-Russian border in Spring of 1915. The Ottoman Army on the Russian Front was in ruins. Enver Pasa had tried to defeat the Russians with a bold but ill-conceived attack at Sarikamis. He had failed badly. 3/4 of his army had been lost. All that stood between the Ottoman heartland and Russian invaders were the remnant of the Ottoman Army in the East. Some of these were very good troops. The gendarmerie divisions, made up of gendarmes from the East who knew the territory well, were particularly effective. But the Ottoman forces were few. The Russians were more numerous and better equipped. The only chance the Ottoman forces had was to hold their defensive positions. Every man was needed at the front.

However, thousands of men could not advance to the front. They were needed to fight behind the lines. Indeed, some of the best soldiers were withdrawn from the front and sent to fight internal enemies, Armenian rebels. The Russian Front was in danger. Ultimately it collapsed. Ultimately the Russians invaded and conquered Eastern Anatolia, bringing with them triumphant Armenian rebels.

The Russian invasion of Anatolia in 1915 was spearheaded by units made up of Armenians from both Ottoman Anatolia and Russia. Armenians served as scouts for the Russian Army. Most important, bands of Armenians hampered transportation and cut military communications throughout the Ottoman East.

The internal threat from Armenian guerillas, Armenian "chette" bands, was a serious threat to the existence of the Ottoman Empire and a real threat to the lives of the Muslims of Anatolia.

Before any Armenians were deported, before any Armenian nationalist politician was hung, before any Armenian died at the hands of an Ottoman soldier, even before war was officially declared, Armenian nationalists had begun to organize their rebellion. The actions of the Armenian rebels were not simply rebellion. Ottoman Armenians acted as agents of the Russian Army. They made war on their own country, the Ottoman Empire, and fought on the side of its main enemy, the Russian Empire. As they freely admitted at the time, they were traitors who had enlisted with their country's worst enemy.

In order to see the effect of the Armenian Rebellion, one need only look at the map. Only the main centers of rebellion are shown. Armenian bands were actually traveling throughout Eastern Anatolia, hindering transportation, cutting communications lines, and attacking isolated Muslim villages. Only the regions of major activity by large bodies of men can be shown on the map.

At first glance, some of the regions of rebellion seem to be oddly chosen. Why Sivas? It seems an unlikely place for a rebellion. Only 13% of the population of Sivas Vilâyeti was Armenian. Sivas was far from the front, far from possible Russian support. But look at the roads. In order to reach the battle with the Russians, troops and supplies had to pass through Sivas. Retreating soldiers also were forced to pass through Sivas. Sivas was also the hub for the telegraph system that extended to the battle zone. The city and province of Sivas were transportation and communication bottlenecks. Any disruption in Sivas was a blow against the Ottoman war effort.

The regions of Armenian rebellion in Cilicia and Urfa were also in regions with great strategic importance. Because the Taurus tunnels had not been completed, war materials and soldiers for the theater of war in Iraq had to be trans-shipped in Cilicia, then travel on through the Urfa Region. The British seriously considered attacking in Cilicia rather than Gallipoli (and would have been far more successful if they had.)

Armenian forces in Van and in the Russian border areas also had a potential strategic effect. The Russians had moved into Western Iran. They threatened Ottoman positions in the East and ultimately intended to attack into Iraq and join with the British. (No one expected that the Ottomans would defeat the British in Iraq.) In order to check the Russian advance, the Ottomans should have moved East. There were only two possible roads from Anatolia into Iran--the routes through Bayezit in the North or through Van in the South. Is it only coincidence that these two were major centers of Armenian rebellion?

Until someone is able to research Russian army orders to Armenian units, we will not know how much of the

Armenian rebellion was well planned to aid the Russians. It seems unlikely that such strategic points were chosen at random. The important point, however, is not why they were chosen but the grave danger they presented to the Ottoman forces. The Ottomans needed to put down the revolt. They needed to do so because Armenian forces were slaughtering Muslims, but they also needed to do so for military reasons. The Armenian rebels were enemy forces that were contributing to Ottoman defeat.

The main Armenian contribution to the Russians was the fact that their rebellion occupied so many Ottoman soldiers and gravely hindered the Ottoman war effort. But from the standpoint of humanity, the worst effect of the Armenian rebellion was the mortality of the innocent Muslim civilians killed by the Armenian rebels and, it should not be forgotten, the mortality of the innocent Armenian civilians who were killed in revenge. It was Armenian rebels who began the killing. By far the greatest number of dead were Muslims.

Why did the Ottomans deport the Armenians? They did it to remove a civilian population that would surely aid and comfort the enemy, as had been proven. Perhaps most of the Armenians would not have acted against the Ottomans, but how could anyone know who would and who would not aid the Russians, the British, and the French? I believe that, in the heat of war and in their desire to defend their Empire and its people, the Ottomans went too far and deported many who were no threat. But it should never be forgotten that the Ottomans had good reason to act as they did. Nor should it be forgotten that it was the Armenians and Russians who first forced Muslims from their homes. One fact cannot be doubted. During World War I, as for 100 years before, it was not the Turks who first attacked the Armenians. It was the Armenians who first attacked the Turks.

Azerbaijan and Armenia

At the end of World War I, it was the turn of the Turks of Azerbaijan to be attacked. Allied with Bolsheviks in Baku, Armenian nationalist forced nearly half of the Turkish population of Baku to flee the city. Between 8 and 10,000 Muslims, almost all Turks, were killed in Baku alone. The Armenian guerilla leader Andranik destroyed villages in Nahçivan and Southern Azerbaijan, forcing more than 60,000 Turkish refugees to flee.

420 villages were destroyed. Hundreds of villages were ruined and many thousand more Turks were killed in Kars Province. Two-thirds of the Turks of Erivan Province disappeared. Turks took revenge in Baku and elsewhere, but it was Turks who most suffered mortality and exile.

The Turks of the provinces of Erivan, Kars, and Azerbaijan had been completely under the control of the Russians. Almost all unarmed, they had neither the ability nor the desire for war. It was Armenians who initiated the conflicts. It was not the Turks who attacked the Armenians. It was Armenians who attacked the Turks.

The Armenian Claims

Those who claim there was an "Armenian Genocide" are in the habit of taking their facts selectively and out of their historical context.

We are told that the Ottoman Government deported the Armenians, and that many died during the deportation. This is true, although the number who died are always grossly exaggerated. What facts are ignored? The fact that most of the Armenians who were deported survived, indicating there was no plan of genocide.

We are told that in the 1890s tens of thousands of Armenians were killed by Muslims. This is true. What is never told is that tens of thousands of Muslims were killed by Armenians, and that the Armenians began the killing.

You know well the main fact about World War I that always goes unmentioned--the millions of Muslim dead. Any war in which only one side's dead are counted appears to be a genocide.

And one incontrovertible fact that is never mentioned is the truth we have discussed today--Armenians died because of conflicts started by Armenians. The Turks responded to Armenian attacks. Sometimes the Turks overreacted; sometimes they acted out of revenge, sometimes the actions of Turks and Kurds were wrong. But the Turks did not start the bloodshed. They did not start the long conflict between Armenians and Muslims that began in the 1790s. They did not start the conflict between Turks and Armenians in World War I.

In 1796, was it Turks who attacked Armenians? No, it was Armenian rebels who allied themselves with the enemies of their country.

In 1828, it was not the Turks who attacked the Armenians. It was the Armenians who took the homes and farms of the Turks.

In 1878, was it the Turks who attacked the Armenians? No, it was Armenian rebels who once again helped the Russian invaders. It was Armenians who oppressed the Turks of Erzurum.

In the 1890s did the Turks first attack the Armenians? No, it was Armenian revolutionaries who first attacked the Turks.

In 1909 did the Turks first attack the Armenians? No, it was Armenian revolutionaries who began to attack Muslims.

In 1915, did the Turks first attack the Armenians? No, it was Armenian rebels who seized Van and killed Van's Muslims. It was Armenians who raided Muslim villages and killed Muslims on the roads. It was Armenians who killed Ottoman officials, destroyed Ottoman Army communications, and acted as spies, guerillas, and partisan troops for the Russians.

In 1919 was it the Turks of Baku who first attacked the Armenians? No, it was the Armenians who attacked the Turks.

Some will argue that the actions of the Armenian rebels were justified, because they were not properly governed by the Ottomans. It is true that in many periods of history Ottoman Eastern Anatolia was poorly ruled. But it is also true that the time of Armenian rebellion was also the time when Ottoman rule was greatly improving. Nineteenth century reforms, begun by Mahmud II, passing through the Tanzimat period, and culminating in the reforms of the Committee of Union and Progress, had improved governmental control in the East. It often was this improvement that caused Armenians such as those in Zeytun to revolt, because a stronger central government collected taxes more efficiently.

At the time of the Armenian revolts life was becoming better. The exception to this occurred in the regions that suffered due to Russian invasion and expulsion of Muslim peoples, and those Russian actions had been supported by the Armenian nationalists. The Armenian nationalists had themselves and their Russian friends to blame.

Whatever the reason for the Armenian revolts, reaction from the Ottomans and local Muslims was justified. Muslim excesses, like Armenian excesses, were never justified, but opposition to the Armenian revolt was morally and politically necessary. The Armenians who rebelled were a minority that planned to dominate a Muslim majority. It was the duty of the sultan's government to fight against such an injustice.

A minority has the right to live in peace. It should be allowed equality under the law, with all legal rights. Its religious freedom should be absolute and always protected. All these rights should be guaranteed to any minority. But a minority should never have the right to rule over a majority. A minority should never have the right to deny rights and freedom to a majority. A minority should never have the right to evict a majority from its homeland. And a minority should never have the right to become a majority through murder and exile of the real majority. This is exactly what the Armenian nationalist rebels attempted to do.

The Turks who opposed the Armenian rebels were doing the moral thing. Their methods were not always good. In the heat of war, crimes were committed and mistakes were made. But the Turks were absolutely right to oppose the rule of a minority. The Turks had the right to defend themselves.

I have said it before, but it is worth saying again. The Ottomans acted rationally in opposing the Armenian revolutionaries. The Armenians were just like other rebels. In the nineteenth century, the Ottomans had fought against Muslim rebels in Eastern Anatolia, Arabia, and Bosnia and against Christian rebels in the Balkans. They had fought to defend their Empire and its people. Of course they also fought against rebel Armenians. That was their duty and, despite many failings, the Ottomans tried to do their duty.

Were the Turks and the Kurds innocent babes who hurt no one? They were not. Attacked, they fought back. Often they killed in passion, and the innocent suffered. Both innocent Armenians and innocent Muslims suffered. Did the Armenians sometimes suffer more than the Turks? Yes. In a century of warfare, sometimes the Turks lost more, sometimes the Armenians. That is the way of war.

However, there is a moral difference between the actions of those who begin a war and those who respond. No one should ever be excused for killing innocent civilians, but the primary guilt is the guilt of those who begin the slaughter. My country, America, responded to the evil of Adolph Hitler and the Nazis by bombing German cities and, in the process, killing civilians. Some actions, such as the bombing of Dresden, were inexcusable. But does anyone doubt who was truly at fault? It was Hitler and his followers who were guilty. The guilty were those who first began to kill for their cause

No one should ever try to say that Turks were completely innocent, but the truly guilty were those who began to kill the innocent.

The question of who started the conflicts is important, both historically and morally important. In more than 100 years of warfare, Turks and Armenians killed each other. The question of who began the killing must be understood, because it is seldom justifiable to be the aggressor, but it is always justifiable to defend yourself. If those who defend themselves go beyond defense and exact revenge, as always happens in war, they should be identified and criticized. But those who should be most blamed are those who began the wars, those who committed the first evil deeds, and those who caused the bloodshed. Those who always began the conflicts were the Armenian nationalists, the Armenian revolutionaries.

The guilt is on their heads.

Justin McCarthy

Assembly of Turkish American Associations
1526 18th St, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036 Telephone: (202) 483-9090, Fax: (202) 483-9092 email: assembly@ataa.org

Copyright © ATAA

APPENDIX N

FACTS AND DISCUSSION POINTS IN THE ARMENIAN ALLEGATIONS



ASSEMBLY OF TURKISH AMERICAN ASSOCIATIONS

Facts and Discussion Points in the Armenian Allegations

By Ayhan Ozer

Armenian Terrorism

On 27 January 1973, the Armenians in the United States as well as around the world launched a brutal terrorism campaign against the Turks and the Turkish institutions to validate forcibly a mythical genocide believed only by themselves. through blood-shed and violence. That day, an old Armenian man by the name Yanikian invited two Turkish diplomats from the Los Angeles Consulate to a luncheon in Santa Barbara. It turned out that the invitation was a dastardly ambush; he killed both diplomats brutally in the restaurant. For two decades this senseless terrorism claimed the lives of more than seventy Turkish diplomats (four in the U.S.) and their family members, and maimed and wounded several innocent bystanders in the carnage staged by the Armenians all over the world. The Armenian terrorists, mostly drop-outs from Middle Eastern terrorism, recognize no boundary to their savage operations. They even carried the terror to the college campuses, ravishing the sanctified atmosphere of the higher-learning institutions. The American historians who refused to share the distorted Armenian version of history were targeted for harassment and threat. The Turkish History professor Stanford Shaw of U.C.L.A. was one of them, and on October 3, 1977, the Armenian bullies threw a bomb, and blew up the front portion of his house. He and his family had to leave the campus under a death threat.

A closing paragraph can go as follows: Today, the Armenians are counting on the scant sense of history of people. They rely on the war-time propaganda materials long refuted by the U.S., the British and the French authorities; and on yellow journalism, fictions as well as add-on stories. They have romanticised their history and embroidered the truth. The Armenians obstinately ignore or refuse to believe the preponderance of evidence that shatters their mythical convictions.

U.N. Report

When the Holocaust Council was formed in 1980, the Armenians were represented by Seth Moomjian, a first-generation Armenian-American whose parents had been orphaned in 1915 in Turkey. Moomjian served as an adviser to President Carter, a representative to the United Nations, and also a White House representative to the United Nations Human Rights Commission! In 1980, Moomjian pledged \$1,000,000 to the Holocaust Museum. However, on September 24, 1981 he backed down on this pledge, and offered instead a payment of \$100,000. For a long time no money was forthcoming. When in December 1988 an earthquake devastated Armenian Republic the Armenian community grabbed this event as an excuse not to fulfill its pledge, they claimed that the earthquake victims needed money. As a result only part of the pledge was fulfilled.

In 1990 a report was prepared by Benjamin Whitaker, an obscure U.N. reporter, repeating the familiar allegations plied by the Armenians "the tragic events during the First World War involving the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire constituted the first case of genocide in the 20th century." Obviously, this

distorted version of history had been spoon-fed to that reporter by some Armenians, whose names figured prominently in the prologue of the Report for recognition. Apparently, Mr. Seth Moomjian was behind this scheme, as he carried the impressive title of "White House Representative to the United Nations Human Rights Commission" using his influence he had that Mr. Whitaker prepare this Report. Like all Armenian falsehoods, it was far from being a serious work, and the U.N. had nothing to do with it. It was a private venture undertaken by a mercenary to play into the hands of the Armenians in their wicked ethnic politics venture. The purpose was to use insidiously the name of the U.N. to invest the Report with a certain authenticity. Historically, the Armenians have had no qualm to validate their spurious allegations; they can desecrate the truth, or corrupt venerated institutions, be it the U.N., the schools, the universities, or the U.S. Congress.

During the 35th session of the Commission on Human Rights there was a pressure brought to bear on the U.N. Economic and Social Council for the inclusion of a paragraph to that effect in the Sub-Commission's study of "The Question of the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide". The Human Rights Sub-Commission rightly resisted such efforts during its deliberations, and refused to transmit it to the higher Human Rights Commission mainly because the contention was not based on historical facts, but rather on malicious propaganda and fabrications. As it has been pointed out by the independent observers, eminent history professors and the archival materials, those tragic events were part of an upheaval created by the Armenians amidst a world conflagration. The Armenian riots, betrayals and treachery aggravated these conditions and turned it into a civil war within a global war.

Given the spurious nature of that Report, the United Nations took a right action with respect to this report to protect its universally accepted ideals and lofty principles from diminishing in a petty ethnic politics.

The Armenians, counting on the short memory of the people, keep heating up this old dish and try to foist it upon the public as a truth.

Assembly of Turkish American Associations
1526 18th St, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036 Telephone: (202) 483-9090, Fax: (202) 483-9092 email: assembly@ataa.org

Copyright © ATAA

APPENDIX O

HITLER AND THE “ARMENIAN QUESTION”



[About Us](#) | [Membership](#) | [Report](#) | [Events](#)
[The Turkish Times](#) | [Bookshop](#) | [Reference](#) | [Links](#)
[Suggestions](#) | [Guestbook](#)

REFERENCE

Hitler and the "Armenian Question"

Prof.Dr. Turkkaya Ataov

Chairman, International Relations Division, Faculty of Political Science, Ankara University.

Propaganda is deliberate manipulation, by means of symbols (like words or images) of others thoughts. The propagandist tries to offset resistance to himself by presenting his thoughts as if they are rational or moral. The symbols are chosen in such a way that the reactors are expected to be influenced by their strong emotion-laden experiences. The propagandist tries to seize an emotional initiative and maintain an ascendancy that can create animosity.

The publicity of some Armenian circles strives to serve such a purpose. In various Armenian newspapers, periodicals and books there are frequent references to a supposedly Adolf Hitler statement. The notorious German dictator is presumed to have said the following on August 22, 1939: "I have given orders to my Death Units to exterminate without mercy or pity men, women and children belonging to the Polish-speaking race. It is only in this manner that we can acquire the vital territory which we need. After all, who remembers today the extermination of the Armenians?"

This "statement" appears (in more or less these words) in the leaflets handed out by a group of demonstrating young Armenians (see Annex 1), on the cover of book (Annex 2) (1) or in articles written by Armenian authors, (2) quoted by still others. (3)

Armenian propaganda greatly relies on the use of to disseminate biased opinions. For instance, there has also been the assertion that Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the founder of the Turkish Republic, had "confessed Ottoman state responsibility for the Armenian genocide." The claim has already been proved (4) to be false and ill-intentioned.

In many human records there may be contradictions, and interpretations may be disputed by different parties. But a "statement", a single sentence attributed to a man; i.e., Hitler, whose opinions are now in utter disrespect, is a detestable piece of propaganda. It is ugly and loathsome to expect any gain from words, supposed to have been uttered by someone whose uniqueness in history has been to lead a great nation off to war, conquest and ruin. How can just ten words summarize a controversial phenomenon of the last century and the beginning of

the present one? Hitler was the man who boasted that the Third Reich would endure for a thousand years. It is astonishing to witness some circles linking the "Armenian question" with the name of Hitler, who promised jobs for the workers, better business for the well-to-do, a big army for the militarists -and even a husband for every German girl (as he stated in a speech at the Lustgarten in Berlin) but brought quick dead failure and disaster.

Hitler had started as a failure. A lung ailment which he suffered later necessitated his dropping out of school for over a year. It was at this point that he subscribed to the Library of Adult Education in Linz and joined the Museum Society, whose books on German history and German mythology he borrowed. He could not enter as well the Vienna Academy of Fine Arts. William L. Shirer, in his brilliant history of Nazi Germany, describes the ideas acquired by such reading as "shallow and shabby, often grotesque and preposterous and poisoned by outlandish prejudices." He adds: "... They were to form part of the foundation for the Third Reich which this bookish vagrant was soon to build." (5) Hitler's basic ideas were thus formed in Vienna when he was a little over twenty; the little that he learned afterward altered nothing in his thinking. For instance, he was completely ignorant about economics, and he never bothered to learn anything about it. In *Mein Kampf*, nevertheless, he insists on expressing his thoughts on every conceivable subject from history to the movies or from culture to syphilis. To syphilis, for instance, he devotes ten pages, describing it as the most important problem of the country.

Likewise, Hitler was no historian, certainly no expert on Turkish-Armenian relations or on the "Armenian question". His views, if any, on the latter may be as "meritorious" as his opinions on democracy and republicanism or his convictions about the Jews. For years, he did not even concern himself much with foreign affairs. (6) His greatest concern was, first, to keep his own absolute control over the party, then over the German state and after that rearmament and economic expansion.

Neither was any of his aides or associates a master hand on the "Armenian question". One may even suggest that they were completely ignorant of it. Hitler was surrounded by the disreputable Streicher, the mediocre pseudo- "philosopher" Rosenberg, "Putzi" Hanfstaengl with a shallow mind, the ruthless Roehm who organized the first Nazi squads, the drunkard Eckert, the "free slanderer" Strasser, the colourless police officer Frick, the doggedly loyal Hess, the neurotic Goebbels, the former flying ace Goering, the terroristic Himmler and the intriguing Bormann. Such were the men around the Fuehrer- a misshapen mixing of misfits.

Hitler is often quoted as having referred to the Armenians in the manner cited above while delivering a secret talk to members of his General Staff, just a week prior to his attack on Poland. I have added to the end of this booklet the original texts of the two Hitler speeches, delivered on August 22, 1939 (Annex 3). They are photocopies of the pages of the official texts, published in the certainly reliable Nuremberg documents. (7) Curiously enough, there is no reference in them to the Armenians. One may rightly assume that Hitler spoke to his generals on that day in German, which is his and their native tongue. The Nuremberg documents are the most authoritative, perhaps the only authentic sources. I am aware of a few English translations, (8) some of which carry an additional sentence that does not occur in the authorized German texts. One wonders whether who might have added it and for what

purpose! In terms of "methodology", the use of a supposedly Hitler statement on the Armenians brings to mind several Nazi "craft", such as the Reichstag fire, exploited for a certain political end.

While the statement in question has appeared in hundreds of publications and has been quoted several times, none of the publishers have ever consulted the primary sources. Among the Armenian writers, Professor Richard G.Hovannisian refers to it basing his citation on the "Nuremberg trial transcripts". Professor Hovannisian's citation appears U.S. Senator Carl Levin's speech on April 24, 1984. (For a photocopy of the Congressional Record, Senate, Proceedings and Debates of the 98th Congress, Second Session, Vol. 130, No.4, Tuesday, April 24, 1984, see Annex 4.) The British writer Christopher J.Walker also seems to accept that the quotation was "evidence produced in Nuremberg". (9) But whatever published so far on the so-called Hitler "statement" has been built not on original but on secondary sources at best. The truth is that the Nuremberg trials have never accepted that version of the Hitler speech with a reference to the Armenians as evidence. The documents approved by the Nuremberg prosecutors as the official minutes of the Hitler talk on August 22, 1939, were given the numbers of USA-29 (or later PS-798) and USA-30 (or later PS-1014). These documents also appear in Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression, Vol. III, pp. 581-596, pp. 665-666 and in Documents on German Foreign Policy: 1918-1945, Series D. Vol. VII, pp. 200-206. The prosecution did not introduce a third document, initially numbered as USA-28, as evidence. But none of these versions contain the sentence in quotation" is false. They do, however, establish that Hitler has not made that "statement".

Even in its forged version, the "statement" does not refer, directly or indirectly, to the Jewish people. Even in the way it is quoted, the reference is to the Poles, instead. Hence, the following allusion, like many others, of a publication by the World Council of Churches, is unfounded: "When Hitler began his pogroms he was warned that the nations of the world would not tolerate his actions and would not forgive or overlook the atrocities. To this warning he replied, who today remembers the Armenians." (10)

As a matter of fact, Hitler had probably made only one reference to the Armenians- in a talk delivered on December 12, 1942, (11) in which he described them as unreliable (unzuverlässig) and dangerous (gefährlich). Specification of this kind by someone like him ought to be taken as flattery. Likewise, Hitler's only reference to Turkey in his speech on August 22 1939, was in the following words: "After Kemal's (Atatürk) death, Turkey will be ruled by morons and half idiots". In assessing subsequent events the reader will agree with me that Hitler's assertion actually suited himself and his Nazi entourage quite well. One can say, on the other hand, that Turkey's leadership during the Second World War was crowned with success. (12)

Whether the war was brought about by German aggression or caused by other's refusal to grant Germany her place, it should be common knowledge now that Hitler bore the greatest responsibility for acts of immeasurable evil. He regarded men as base matter for the strong hands of "power philosophers and artist tyrants" -to quote Nietzsche. Setting up concentration camps for political opponents, he effected complete uniformity (Gleichschaltung). All other parties were liquidated, all labour unions were outlawed, education was placed under control

and all newspapers were either Nazified or closed down. Hitler stood for an anti-democratic, totalitarian and imperialistic policy. A dictator as he was, he led a nation off to war and conquest. But the Third Reich swiftly collapsed in the Spring of 1945. It is generally accepted now that the lesson of Hitler and Nazism is how far a society can fall once rationalism, moral restraints and constitutional government have been destroyed.

The Nuremberg trials were inevitable. There are works (13) which show what the basis was for the jurisdiction of the International Military Tribunal. It is clear that a group of leaders were tried for offences against international law and morality, against compacts and treaties, and against the peace of nations.

A totalitarian dictatorship, by its very nature, works in great secrecy. But hundreds of thousands of captured Nazi documents were assembled at Nuremberg as evidence in the trial of the major Nazi war criminals. These tons of records illuminated the events in the Third Reich: Hitler's accession to power, the Anschluss with Germany, the occupation of Czechoslovakia, the attacks on Poland, Scandinavia, the West, the Balkans and the Soviet Union, the horrors of the Nazi occupation and the extermination of the Jews and the democrats. One cannot find the oft-repeated "statement" in the celebrated Nuremberg documents.

Why, then, do the militant Armenians and their cooperators cling to the so-called "Hitler statement"? Because they want to set it into motion as a "connecting link" with the Jewish genocide (which was truly a genocide) and thus benefit from the influence of the Jewish community. Although a greater proportion of the Jews is not moved by this defamation campaign, some sections have indeed lent a listening ear.

One should pose, at this point, the following questions: What do the Jewish communities all over the world know about the Armenians, the Turks and the Turkish-Armenian relations as well as Turkish-Jewish relations? And also what do they not know about them all?

The Jews have been, no doubt, a persecuted minority. Several times throughout history, they were oppressed, abused, ill-treated, hounded, injured and exterminated. The militant Armenians are exerting every effort to make the Jews and others believe that they are also another persecuted minority. The Jews have so far heard twisted stories, misconstrued interpretations and grotesquely exaggerated views or at times outright falsifications. Those who cooperate with the militant Armenians apparently accept their version of the episode as complete truth. The Armenians play on certain Jewish sensitivities; the so-called "Hitler statement" is one. Some Jews take this to be true. Hence, the Armenians exploit it fully. The same Armenian circles try to create the impression that the Turks persecuted not only the Armenians, but all the minorities, including the Jews. Quite a number of Jews also believe this to be true.

Undistorted truth, however, is otherwise. While the Turks stand out as a nation stretching a helping hand to the Jews in the most distressing periods of their history, pages of the Armenian annals, on the other hand, reveal serious inclinations of anti-semitism. The Armenian (and Greek) attacks on the Jewish people were prevented or curtailed, several times, by the firmness

of the Turkish governments of the time. There are events, nevertheless, in which the Armenian extremists have been successful in spilling Jewish blood as well. The massacre of Jews in Erzurum and in Batum in 1913 illustrates the point. (14)

Anti-Semitism extended in the Armenian circles during the rise of Nazism. A publication of the Armenian Information Service in New York, entitled Dashnak Collaboration with the Nazi Regime, purports to show that Armenian sympathies with racism have reached dangerous proportions. The following quotations from the August 19, 20 and 21 1936 issues of the (Armenian daily) Hairenik (See Annexes 5, 6, 7 and 8) expose something much more than prejudice and bigotry:

"Jews being the most fanatical nationalists and race-worshippers.... are compelled to create an atmosphere... of internationalism and world citizenship in order to preserve their race... As the British use battleships to occupy lands.... Jews use internationalism or communism as a weapon.... Sometimes it is difficult to eradicate these poisonous elements when they have struck deep root like a chronic disease. And when it become necessary for a people to eradicate them.... these attempts are regarded revolutionary. During a surgical operation, the flow of blood is a natural thing.... Under such conditions, dictatorships seem to have a role of saviour." (15)

The above statements are incredible in terms of their malevolence, hatred and cruelty. The description of the flow of blood as a "natural thing" and those accountable for such barbarity as "saviours" were not mere narratives. Not only did the Armenians attack the Jews of Bucharest in May 1935 and the Jews of Salonica in August of the same year, but also the volunteer Armenian troops under the wings of Hitler's Germany during the Second World War were used in rounding up Jews and other "undesirables" destined for the Nazi concentration camps. The same circles published a German-language magazine, which was fascist and anti-semitic, supporting Nazi doctrines in respect to the extermination of the "inferior" races. Since the Jews had more deadly enemies at the time, they might have missed that "junior partner" of the Nazi anti-semites.

Christopher J. Walker reminds us of this partnership, nevertheless, in the following words (for a photocopy, see Annex 9).

"There remains the incontestable fact that relations between the Nazis and the Dashnags living in the occupied areas were close and active. On 30 December 1941 an Armenian battalion was created by a decision of the Wehrmacht, known as the Armenian 812th Battalion. It was commanded by Dro, and was made of a small number of committed recruits, and a larger number of Armenians from the prisoners of war taken by the Nazis in their sweep eastwards. Early on the total number was 8,000; this number later grew to 20,000. The 812th Battalion was operational in the Crimea and the North Caucasus.

"A year later, on 15 December 1942, an "Armenian National Council" was granted official recognition by Alfred Rosenberg, the German minister of the occupied areas. The Council's president was Professor Ardashes Abeghian, its vice-president Abraham Giulkhandanian, and it numbered among its members Nzhdeh and Vahan Papazian. From that date until the end of

1944 it published a weekly journal, Armenian, edited by Viken Shant (the son of Levon), who also broadcast on Radio Berlin." (16)

The Turks, on the other hand, have a noble tradition of offering their land and all the opportunities in it to the Jewish people. In the Ottoman Empire, each religious community established and maintained its own institutions. The Ottomans followed the traditional Islamic policy of tolerance toward the "people of the Book" (thimmis), that is, the Christians, Jews and others who accepted the same God. Many Ottoman citizens, formerly under Christian rule, found in Turkish sovereignty deliverance from oppression. The Ottomans recognized three such basic communities in addition to that of the Moslems. The largest was the Christian Orthodox, which included the Slavs plus those of Greek and Romanian heritage. The Jews were given the right to form their own community led by the Grand Rabbi (Haham Basi). After having escaped from the Spanish inquisition (1492), they were allowed tremendous autonomy which improved their status markedly. The Jews settled in Istanbul, Salonica, Edirne, Bursa, Amasya, Tokat and other cities in the Ottoman Empire. Not all Jews are properly informed of this historical fact, nor of the similar helping hand of the Turks extended to groups of German democrats, including Jews, who were trying to escape the horrors of Hitler's Germany. The year of 1992, or the 500th anniversary of the expulsions from Spain may be a good occasion to remember the significance of the Ottoman offer of refuge.

The Ottoman state assured the religious and civil autonomy of all the non-Moslems. Thus was created the system of self-government of the Christians and Jews living with the Turks. Many Jews were further attracted to the Ottoman society as they were subjected to new waves of persecution. The unfettered freedom that they have enjoyed and the respected place that their leaders occupied in the state hierarchy may be seen in the publications authored by the Jews themselves. (17) It is important to know that the Ottoman Empire was probably the only country that has no black spot in the history of so many centuries of relations with the Jewish people. Anti-semitism never existed in Turkey. What is more, it was a haven when life elsewhere was hell for the Jew. This is how a prominent man of arts, of Jewish origin, describes a fact of crucial importance: The Ottoman territories "knew an unparalleled epoch of religious tolerance at the time." (18) This is the truth-totally and absolutely!

When I had summarized, in an article that appeared in a leading Swiss daily, (19) the Turkish views on the Armenian issue and included in them a reference to Ottoman respect for Jewish rights as well, a reader (Beatrice Favre) replied me in writing, four days later, apparently seeing no connection between the two issues. The Armenians feel free to play to Jewish sensitivities, but don't the Turks have the right to remind the third parties of some historical facts that shed light on Turkish attitudes towards the Jew? What an hypocrisy facts that shed light on Turkish attitudes towards the Jews? What an hypocrisy! My answer to the Swiss reader was sent to the same paper but was not published. It is through such methods that some Jews are made to support a community with many black spots in their history in connection with the Jewish people -and against a nation (the Turks) proud on account of a brilliant record set at times of unusual distress for the Jews.

The majority of the Jewish people also do not know that the Armenian religious community enjoyed similar autonomy, with no adverse event with the Turks until the revolutionary

Armenian societies started campaigns of terror. It is also of great import to distinguish between the law-abiding Jewish citizens of Germany, who contributed their labour and genius to that country but were nevertheless subjected to a genocide, on the one hand, and the Armenians, having lived with the Turks in peace for centuries, opting for terrorism since the 1880's and joining the ranks of the invading enemies, as exemplified not only with Turkish, but also with Armenian documents, on the other hand. The Jews also do not know that when the Armenians formed their own government after the First World War, they exterminated the Turks living on territory then controlled by the Dashnak Government.

If the Jews had known the particulars of these historical facts, would any of them supported the Armenian "cause"?

Footnotes

1. The fact that the so-called Talat Pasha "order" that appears on top of the Hitler "statement" is fake has been dealt with in the following booklet: T,rkkaya Ata-v, The Andonian "Documents", Attributed to Talat Pasha, Are Forgeries!... Ankara, Siyasal Bilgiler Fak,ltesi, 1984. Based on a recent (1983) research by the Turkish Historical Society, this booklet in English, French and German evaluates the Andonian "documents", hitherto attributed to Talat Pasha by Armenians and ill-informed Western writers and concludes that they are fake. These documents, first printed in 1920, had since been used as "proof" of deep Ottoman Government involvement in the 1915 events. Had these "documents" not been concerned with the Turkish and Armenians, no commentator would have even touched them.
2. For instance: George Adomian, "Armenia-No Room at the Inn". The Armenian Weekly, Boston, Vol. L-60-2568 (June 11, 1983), p.20.
3. For instance: Arman Arabian, "Time to Remember the 'Other'", Los Angeles Times, April 22, 1979, part iv, p.5 quoted in Normal Ravitch, "The Armenian Catastrophe: of History, Murder and Sin", Encounter, London, Vol. LVII, No 6 (December 1981), p. 72 Also see: T,rkkaya Ata-v, "The Armenian Question", Encounter London, Vol. LVIII, No.5 (May 1982), pp.91-94; T,rkkaya Ata-v, "Hitler and the Armenians", ibid., Vol. LIX, No. 6,(December 1982), p.92.
4. T,rkkaya Ata-v, A "Statement" Wrongly Attributed to Mustafa Kemal, Ankara, Siyasal Bilgiler Fak,ltesi, 1984.
5. William L.Shirer, The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich, New York, Crest, 1060, p. 41.
6. A.J.P. Taylor, The Origins of the Second of the Second World War, Middlesex, Penguin, 1963, p. 101 .
7. Tribunal Militaire International, Proces des Grands Criminels de Guerre devant le Tribunal Militaire International: Nuremberg, 14 November 1945-1er October 1946, Vol. XXVI, pp. 338f and 5231.
8. For instance: The New York Times and The London Times, November 24, 1945, pp. 7 and 4 respectively.
9. Armenia: the Survival of a Nation, Letchworth, Hertfordshire, Garden City Press, 1980, p. 362.

10. World Council of Churches, Commission of the Churches on International Affairs, Armenian: the Continuing Tragedy, Geneva, 1984, p. 28.
11. Helmut Heiber, Lagebesprechungen im Führerhauptquartier: Protokollfragmente aus Hitlers militärischen Konferenzen: 1942-1945, München, Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, n.d., p. 46.
12. For instance, see: T, rkaya Ata-v, Turkish Foreign Policy: 1939-1945, Ankara, Siyasal Bilgiler Fak, ltesi, 1963.
13. For instance: Robert K. Woetzel, The Nuremberg Trials in International Law with a Postlude on the Eichmann Case, London, Stevens, 1962.
14. Reference to the events in 1913 (and to those in 1935 below) are from the following source: Kerim C. Kevenk, "Defamation Campaign", (U.S.A., unpublished manuscript, pp. 2-3).
15. Quoted in to following Armenian source: James G. Mandalian, Who Are the Dashnags? Boston, Hairenik Press, 1944, pp. 13-14. Mandalian's book is written to be a reply to another Armenian author Avedis Deroonian's (alias John Roy Carlson) book entitled Undercover and his articles in the Propaganda Battlefront, both of which are now difficult to find even in the U.S. libraries. The quotation is originally from A. Deroonian, who apparently includes the Armenian Revolutionary Federation in his list of fascist organizations operating in the U.S.
16. Walker, op. Cit., p. 357.
17. Avram Galante, Histoire des Juifs d'Istanbul, Istanbul, t. I-II, 1941-1942; Avram Galante, Histoire des Juifs d'Anatolie, Istanbul, 1939.
18. Peter Ustinov, Dear Me, Middlesex, U.K., Penguin Books, 1977, p.22.

Assembly of Turkish American Associations
 1526 18th St, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036
 Phone: (202) 483-9090 Fax: (202) 483-9092

APPENDIX P

PERPETUATING THE GENOCIDE MYTH

[Home](#) | [About](#) | [Membership](#) | [Component Associations](#) | [Events Calendar](#) | [The TurkishTimes](#) | [Bookshop](#) | [Reference](#)

Reference

Perpetuating the Genocide Myth

By Demir Delen - A Publication of the Federation of Canadian Turkish Associations

INTRODUCTION

It is a fact that approximately 700,000 Armenians were killed or died of starvation and disease during the First World War in eastern Anatolia. It is also a fact that more than 2 million Turks and Muslims were massacred by the Armenians at the turn of the century or died during the First World War in eastern Anatolia, fighting Armenians and Russians.

These were tragic events from which lessons should be learned, so that similar incidents of ultra-nationalism that result in the total uprooting and devastation of communities are not allowed to occur again. The Turkish community in Canada and the U.S, as well as the Turks in Turkey recognize the Armenian deaths and suffering during this period. What they deeply object is the propaganda and distortion of facts by Armenian activists who are misleading the public in order to further their political agenda by crying "genocide", while ignoring the death and suffering of more than twice as many Turks and portraying a completely one-sided version of the events of more than 85 years ago.

Armenians, in their attempts to convince the world opinion about the existence of a genocide perpetrated against them during the First World War, resort to forgeries and falsifications. A few of such forgeries and falsifications frequently referred to in Armenian publications are exposed in this booklet.

The Armenian propaganda and allegations have not been countered in North America until the late 1980's. There were no recognizable population of Turks in Canada and the United States until then. Armenian activists were unopposed for decades in their one-sided depiction of history to the North American public, who were not expected to be knowledgeable about the events of long time ago in a far away country. Now that the Canadian and U.S. citizens are becoming aware of the Armenian massacres of the Turkish and Muslim population, the Armenian activists are changing tactics and talking about things like "psychology of genocide denial and deniers" or "rewriting of history", in order to discredit anyone who opposes their propaganda.

It is absurd for Armenian spokespeople to talk about "genocide deniers" when they completely ignore the 2 million Turkish deaths in the same period and in the same geographical area. No Armenian publication, propaganda literature, conference or seminar ever mentions the Armenian massacres of the Turkish and Muslim population by the armed revolutionary committees at the beginning of the 20th century. Otherwise, they would not be able to claim a so-called Armenian genocide. In the kind of genocide Armenians claim,

the alleged perpetrators ended up having more dead than the victims!

The history of the Ottoman empire -"the sick man of Europe"- during the First World War, when it was defending its own lands at three separate fronts against the allied forces and its dismal economic condition are well documented. The existence of Armenian terrorist organizations and revolutionary committees (Armenakan, Hunchak Dashnaktsutun, etc.) since late 19th century and their armed rebellions resulting in the massacres of the Turkish population in the eastern provinces, as well as the Armenian cooperation with the Russians whom the Ottomans were fighting against, are also well documented by historians.

It is ironic that Armenians accuse anyone who opposes their allegations of a so-called genocide by exposing the historical facts, as "rewriting history". Yet Armenians are rewriting history more than 80 years later, in Parliaments of western countries and in the Legislatures of several states and provinces in the U.S. and Canada where they have a considerable population, by lobbying, donating to election campaigns and influencing politicians.

Comparison of Armenian Claims with the Jewish Holocaust

Armenians want to cash in on the worldwide sentiment regarding Jewish Holocaust by claiming that they were the ones who were subjected to the first genocide of the 20th century and that if the world paid more attention to their suffering, there would not have been a Holocaust. In publications and conferences they frequently attempt to draw a parallel with the Jewish Holocaust, hoping that public reaction to the terrible suffering of the Jews would also associate it with the Armenians.

For anyone who is familiar with the European and Ottoman history of the 20th century, such comparisons are absurd and an insult to the Jews. The following are some facts to consider:

- Jews who were law-abiding citizens and innocent civilians, were subjected to the Holocaust by systematic actions and policies of the Nazi government during peace time. Jews posed no threat to the State.
- Armenians had formed several revolutionary committees who were attacking Ottoman villages and massacring Turks, as well as actively assisting the Russians with whom the Ottoman Empire was at war. The only government policy was to relocate the Armenians in the eastern provinces where they were close to the Russians.
- Nazis had superior economic and military resources and power which they used towards eradicating the Jews in the lands they occupied in Europe.
- Ottomans were in a state of decline both economically and militarily and were so frail as to be referred to as "the sick man of Europe". In 1914 and 1915, they were defending their own lands in the south, against the British in the middle east; in the west, against the Allied Forces at the Dardanelles and Gallipoli and in the east, against the Russians whom the Armenians were siding with.
- No one was punished by Nazis for inhuman treatment of the Jews.
- The Ottoman administration executed 62 persons for inhuman treatment of Armenians during the relocations.

After the First World War the Ottoman capital was under Allied occupation and all State archives were under the control of the British Authorities in Istanbul. As a result of constant propaganda and accusations by Armenian agitators, the British finally decided to transport more than 140 Ottoman high officials,

officers and cabinet members to Malta for a trial, almost like an anticipation of the Nuremberg Trials. The prisoners were held in Malta for 30 months while the British, French and the Americans searched feverishly for evidence. If there were any credible witness or evidence regarding the alleged Armenian massacres, they could have been found easily.

No evidence could be found in Paris, Istanbul or in Anatolia to support the charge that the Ottomans had planned a mass slaughter of the Armenians. The British High Commission was unable to forward any legal evidence to London. There was nothing in the British archives that corroborated the wild accusations of the Armenians.

In America, there were already powerful Armenian lobbies. In America, certain Protestant circles had been carrying on an anti-Turkish smear campaign for decades. Surely in America there would be something to unearth, evidence to be found. On

June 2, 1921 Sir Aucland Geddes, the British Ambassador in Washington, replied to Lord Curzon informing him that the State Department could not produce any evidence against the prisoners in Malta either.

The meticulous search conducted by the British for more than two years with utmost zeal to vindicate the Armenian allegations, produced nothing. The main source of information of the British High Commission in the capital city of Istanbul was a massive Armenian propaganda machinery orchestrated by the Armenian Patriarchate.

From a political standpoint, it was highly desirable for the British Government that at least some of the Turkish deportees to Malta should be brought to trial. The British Foreign Office left no stone unturned in order to prove that the so-called "Armenian massacres" actually took place. Yet all efforts and zeal in this regard ended-up with a complete failure. There was no evidence, no reliable witness, no proof and no case. On October 25, 1921 after 30 months of imprisonment, the accused Ottomans left the British colony of Malta as free men.

Now 80 years later, Armenians are attempting to rewrite history through organized campaigns to influence politicians who put forward motions of genocide recognition in different legislatures.

The term "genocide" was specifically coined after the Second World War to describe the Nazi atrocities towards Jews. Armenian opportunism tries to link the Holocaust with their claim of a so-called genocide, so that they can tap into the world sentiment, influence public opinion and obtain recognition for their propaganda.

There is no parallel between the Jewish Holocaust and the tragic events in eastern Anatolia where more than 2 million Turks and 700,000 Armenians died.

Uprising and Massacres of Turks by the Armenians:

Armenians established the Hunchak Committee in Geneva in 1887 and the Dashnak Committee at Tiflis in 1890, both of which declared their basic goal to be "the liberation from Ottoman rule of the territories of Eastern Anatolia and the Ottoman Armenians".

According to Louise Nalbandian, a leading Armenian researcher, the Hunchak program stated the following:

"Agitation and terror were needed to elevate the spirit of the people. The party aimed at terrorizing the Ottoman Government, thus contributing toward lowering the prestige of that regime and working toward its complete disintegration. The Hunchaks wanted to annihilate the most dangerous of the Armenian and Turkish individuals who were then working for the government as well as to destroy all spies and informers. To assist them in carrying out all of these terrorist acts, the party was to organize an exclusive branch specifically devoted to performing acts of terrorism. The most opportune time to institute the general rebellion for carrying out the immediate objectives was when Turkey was engaged in war". [Nalbandian, Louise, Armenian Revolutionary Movement, University of California Press, 1963]

K.S. Papazyan wrote as follows of the Dashnak Society:

"The purpose of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation (Dashnak) is to achieve political and economic freedom in Turkish Armenia by means of rebellion. Terrorism has, from the beginning, been adopted by the Dashnak Committee of the Caucasus, as a policy or a method for achieving its ends. Under the heading "means" in their program adopted in 1892, Method No. 8 is as follows: "To wage fight and to subject to terrorism the government officials, the traitors...". Method No 11 is: "To subject the government institutions to destruction and pillage". [Papazian, K.S., Patriotism Perverted, Boston Baker Press, 1934]

The Armenian Hunchak and Dashnak Committees organized numerous uprisings and rebellions in various parts of the Ottoman Empire, from the time they were founded in 1890 until the end of the First World War, massacring Turks and other Muslims. A chronological list of the Armenian uprisings and rebellions where countless atrocities were perpetrated against Turks, are shown on Table 1.

Captain Emory Niles and Mr. Arthur Sutherland were Americans ordered by the United States Government in 1919, to investigate the situation in eastern Anatolia. Their report was to be used as the basis for granting relief aid to the Armenians by the American Committee for Near East Relief. The following is an excerpt from their report:

"In the entire region from Bitlis through Van to Bayezit we were informed that the damage and destruction had been done by the Armenians, who, after the Russians retired, remained in occupation of the country and who, when the Turkish army advanced, destroyed everything belonging to the Musulmans. Moreover, the Armenians are accused of having committed murder, rape arson and horrible atrocities of every description upon the Musulman population. At first we were most incredulous of these stories, but we finally came to believe them, since the testimony was absolutely unanimous and was corroborated by material evidence. For instance,

Table 1: Turkish Massacres by the Armenians	
Date	Location
1890	Erzurum
1892	Merzifon
1893	Kayseri
1895	Zeytun
1895	Istanbul
1896	Van
1896	Istanbul, Ottoman Bank
1904	Sasun
1905	Istanbul, Yildiz
1909	Adana
1915	Van
1915	Zeytun
1918	Erzurum
1918	Erzincan

the only quarters left at all intact in the cities of Bitlis and Van are the Armenian quarters, as was evidenced by churches and inscriptions on the houses, while the Musulman quarters were completely destroyed. Villages said to have been Armenian were still standing whereas Musulman villages were completely destroyed" [U.S. 867.00/1005].

Conclusion:

In terms of civilian and military losses, the wars fought in the east between 1914 and 1920 were among the worst in history. The result of Ottoman weakness, Russian imperialism, European meddling and Armenian revolutionary nationalism was widespread devastation. After the wars, cities such as Van, Bitlis, Bayezit and Erzincan were largely rubble. Thousands of villages were destroyed. Approximately 2 million Turks and 700,000 Armenians were dead. The Armenians, who revolted to gain a nation, were left with a Soviet Republic in which they were not their own masters. The Turks, who ultimately won the wars, were left with a country in ruins. (Prof. Justin McCarthy, *Death and Exile; The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821 to 1922*)

In the definition of the "crime of genocide" approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 9, 1948, the essential element is that there has to be an intent of destroying a national, ethnical, racial or religious group. Such an intent is clearly absent in the tragic events during the First World War in eastern Anatolia. All sources, including the most ardent advocates of the Armenian cause, accept that none of the relocation measures imposed by the Ottoman government were applied to the Armenians in the areas distant to the war fronts or to the Armenians who had settled in big cities such as Istanbul and Izmir. All civil servants of Armenian descent maintained their positions during the conflict.

The aims of the still active Armenian Revolutionary Federation (Hai Heghapokhagan Dashnaktsutiune) are well known:

- To force Turkey to accept the so-called "Armenian genocide"
- To force Turkey to apologize from the Armenians
- To force Turkey to pay retribution
- To annex eastern Turkey into Armenia.

The Dashnaktsutiun Committee (A.R.F.) is now attempting to obtain what they couldn't obtain by armed rebellion in eastern Anatolia during the First World War, by influencing politicians and the public opinion in western countries to believe that an Armenian genocide existed.

At the Treaty of Sevres in 1920 after the First World War, Armenians were given a large part of Eastern Anatolia by the Allied Powers, to form their own independent country. However, this treaty was never put in force. It was replaced by the Treaty of Lausanne on July 24, 1923 after the Turkish War of Independence, which drew the borders of the modern Republic of Turkey. The Armenian Revolutionary Federation could not accept this fact and is trying to obtain today, through devious means, what they were promised at Sevres by the British, French, the U.S. etc.

The atrocities Armenians perpetrated against the Turks at the beginning of the 20th century and their recent acts of terrorism in the 1970's and 1980's, during which they murdered 42 Turkish diplomats and civil servants around the world, are now transformed into political activism using falsifications and propaganda.

As recently as in October 1999, the President of the Armenian National Committee of America, Murad Topalian, was arrested in the U.S. and charged with five different counts of terrorism and weapons related offences. He was also known to be a member of ASALA, an Armenian terrorist organization. Together with another Armenian Terrorist Organization JCAG (Justice Commandos for the Armenian Genocide), ASALA was responsible for the vast majority of the 191 acts of terrorism against Turkish Diplomats and their families as well as Turkish businesses around the world, between January 1973 and November 1986. Mr. Topalian, as the President of the ANC, had many high level contacts at the White House and contributed substantially to the U.S. presidential election campaigns.

A list of the Turkish diplomatic personnel and other citizens murdered by the Armenian terrorists in an organized campaign around the world, is shown in Table 2. This list does not include the additional 16 Turkish Diplomats and numerous Turkish and other citizens wounded in the Armenian terrorists' attacks. A full chronological list of the Armenian Terrorism during the 1970's and 1980's, is shown in Appendix C of this booklet.

The confessions of the 19 year old Armenian terrorist Hampig Sassounian, who murdered the Turkish consul-general in Los Angeles on January 28, 1982 and the 20 year old Levon Ekmekjian, who was the surviving Armenian terrorist in the attack in Ankara's Esenboga Airport on August 7, 1982, where they massacred 9 Turkish citizens and wounded 82 others, clearly illustrate how young Armenian minds are indoctrinated by false teachings and pushed into terrorism by diabolical men who have their own political agenda.

When Armenian terrorist organizations can openly and proudly murder so many Turkish citizens all around the world and in front of the world's modern electronic media in the 1970's and 1980's, one can easily understand the extent of the massacres the Armenian revolutionary committees inflicted on the Turkish population during the first 20 years of the 20th century, in a far away land and with the encouragement of the Russian and other western allied forces.

The majority of the Canadians and Americans of Turkish origin are still the first generation immigrants with old established Turkish cultural roots and traditions. "Blowing your own horn" is not looked upon favourably in the Turkish culture. The expectation ingrained in the Turkish psyche is that the facts would speak for themselves, decent people would see the truth and silence would be rewarded. There are old proverbs people grow up with, such as "if words are silver, silence is golden".

The well-known French writer and member of the Academie Francaise, Pierre Loti wrote the following words about Turks in 1928 in his book "Fantome d'Orient":

"One should be blind to history not to understand the Turks. The dignified silence of the Turks against the mounting unjustified attacks and mean slanders can only be explained by their pity for the blind. How beautifully this attitude of theirs answers the undignified calumnies".

The Turkish community in North America realizes that the time has come to expose the truth in order to respond to the decades of propaganda and misinformation by Armenian activists. Such activists are now pressuring different Boards of Education in Canada and the U.S., into including in their curricula, the so-called Armenian genocide. Under the disguise of some noble objectives, they are attempting to poison the young minds of children, into believing that the Armenians were the innocent victims of the first genocide

of the 20th century. Armenian activists are also planting the seeds of hatred among different ethnic groups, which should not be tolerated within the Canadian multicultural mosaic.

Several articles are reproduced in this booklet, all written by non-Turkish writers and observers, as well as some historical documents included in the Appendix. They illustrate objectively and factually, the Armenian campaign against the Turkish population and the tragic conditions in eastern Anatolia during and after the First World War. They demonstrate clearly that Armenians were not the innocent victims of a "genocide", however, did suffer the tragic consequences of the activities of their armed revolutionary committees, just as did more than twice as many Turks.

Prof. Justin McCarthy's words in his article about Armenian Terrorism, reprinted in this booklet, sums up the feeling of the Turks in North America; *"The lesson is obvious - silence does not work. Historical lies, unless they are countered, will perpetuate themselves"*.

Table 2: Turkish and Other Citizens Murdered by Armenians

Date	Location	Name	Position/Location
January 27, 1973	Santa Barbara	Mehmet Baydar	Turkish Consul General
January 27, 1973	Santa Barbara	Bahadir Demir	Turkish Consul
October 22, 1975	Vienna	Danis Tunaligil	Turkish Ambassador
October 24, 1975	Paris	Ismail Erez	Turkish Ambassador
October 24, 1975	Paris	Talip Yener	Turkish Ambassador's chauffeur
February 16, 1976	Beirut	Oktar Cirit	First Secretary in Turkish Embassy
June 9, 1977	Rome	Taha Carim	Turkish Ambassador
June 2, 1978	Madrid	Necla Kuneralp	Turkish Ambassador's wife
June 2, 1978	Madrid	Besir Balcioğlu	Retired Turkish Ambassador
June 2, 1978	Madrid	Antonio Torres	Spanish chauffeur
October 12, 1979	The Hague	Ahmet Benler	Turkish Ambassador's son
December 22, 1979	Paris	Yilmaz Colpan	Turkish Tourism Attache
March 10, 1980	Rome	1. Italian citizen	Turkish Tourism Bureau
March 10, 1980	Rome	2. Italian citizen	Turkish Tourism Bureau
July 31, 1980	Athens	Galip Ozmen	Turkish Administrative Attache
July 31, 1980	Athens	Neslihan Ozmen	Turkish Administrative Attache's daughter
August 5, 1980	Lyon	1. French citizen	Turkish Consulate
August 5, 1980	Lyon	2. French citizen	Turkish Consulate
December 17,	Sydney	Sarik Ariyak	Turkish Consul General

1980			
December 17, 1980	Sydney	Engin Sever	Turkish Consul General's bodyguard
March 4, 1981	Paris	Resat Morali	Turkish Labour Attache
March 4, 1981	Paris	Tecelli Ari	Religious Affairs Officer in Turkish Embassy
March 12, 1981	Teheran	1. Guard	Turkish Embassy
March 12, 1981	Teheran	2. Guard	Turkish Embassy
June 9, 1981	Geneva	Mehmet Yerguz	Secretary in the Turkish Embassy
September 24, 1981	Paris	Cemal Ozen	Security Guard in the Turkish Embassy
January 28, 1982	Los Angeles	Kemal Arikan	Turkish Consul General
March 26, 1982	Beirut	1. Lebanese citizen	Turkish movie theatre
March 26, 1982	Beirut	2. Lebanese citizen	Turkish movie theatre
May 4, 1982	Cambridge, Massachusetts	Orhan Gunduz	Turkish Honorary Consul
June 7, 1982	Lisbon	Erkut Akbay	Administrative Attache in Turkish Embassy
June 7, 1982	Lisbon	Nadide Akbay	Administrative Attache's wife
July 1, 1982	Rotterdam	Kemalettin Demirer	Turkish Consul General
August 27, 1982	Ottawa	Atilla Altikat	Turkish Military Attache
September 9, 1982	Burgaz, Bulgaria	Bora Suelkan	Administrative Attache in Turkish Embassy
February 28, 1983	Paris	Renee Morin	French Secretary at Turkish Travel Agency
March 9, 1983	Belgrade	Galip Balkar	Turkish Ambassador
July 14, 1983	Brussels	Dursun Aksoy	Administrative Attache in Turkish Embassy
July 27, 1983	Lisbon	Cahide Mihcioglu	Deputy Turkish Consul General's wife
April 28, 1984	Teheran	Isik Yonder	Turkish Embassy employee's husband
June 20, 1984	Vienna	Erdogan Ozen	Assistant Labour and Social Affairs Counsellor in Turkish Embassy
November 19,	Vienna	Enver Ergun	Deputy Director, Centre for Social

1984			Development and Humanitarian Affairs
March 12, 1985	Ottawa	Canadian citizen	RCMP officer at the Turkish Embassy

[Home](#) |
 [About](#) |
 [Membership](#) |
 [Component Associations](#) |
 [Events Calendar](#) |
 [The TurkishTimes](#) |
 [Bookshop](#) |
 [Reference](#)

Assembly of Turkish American Associations

Home of 54 Turkish-American Associations across U.S., Canada and Turkey
 1526 18th St, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036 Phone: (202) 483-9090, Fax: (202) 483-9092

APPENDIX Q

LET HISTORIANS DECIDE ON SO-CALLED GENOCIDE



Let Historians Decide on So-called Genocide

By Justin McCarthy (11 April 2001, Copyright © Turkish Daily News)

Part I: Nationalists who use history have different goals. They use events from the past as weapons in their nations' battles. They have a purpose -- to triumph for their cause, and they will use anything to succeed in this goal. Like other men and women, historians have political goals and ideologies, but a true historian acknowledges his error when the facts do not support his belief. The nationalist apologist never does so. The Armenian issue has long been plagued with nationalist studies. This has led to an inconsistent history that ignores the time-tested principles of historical research. Yet when the histories of Turks and Armenians are approached with the normal tools a logical and consistent account results.

Throughout the recent debate on the Armenian genocide question, one statement has characterized those who object to politicians' attempts to write history, "Let the Historians decide." Few of us have specified who we are referring to in that statement. It is now time to do so.

There is a vast difference between history written to defend one-sided nationalist convictions and real accounts of history. History intends to find that the truth is illusive. Historians know they have prejudices that can affect their judgment. They know they never have all the facts. Yet they always try to find the truth, whatever that may be.

Nationalists who use history have a different set of goals. They use events from the past as weapons in their own nation's battles. They have a purpose -- the triumph of their cause -- and they will use anything to succeed in this goal. While a historian tries to collect all the relevant facts and put them together as a coherent picture, the nationalist selects those pieces of history that fit his purpose' ignoring the others.

Like other men and women, historians have political goals and ideologies, but a true historian acknowledges his errors when the facts do not support his belief. The nationalist apologist never does so. If the facts do not fit his theories the nationalist ignores those facts and looks for other ways to make his case. True historians can make intellectual mistakes. Nationalist apologists commit intellectual crimes.

The Armenian issue has long been plagued with nationalist studies. This has led to an inconsistent history that ignores the time-tested principles of historical research. Yet when the histories of Turks and Armenians are approached with the normal tools of history a logical and consistent account results. "Let the historians decide" is a call for historical study like any other historical study, one that looks at all the facts, studies all the opinions, applies historical principles

and comes to logical conclusions.

Historians first ask the most basic question. "Was there an Armenia?" Was there a region within the Ottoman Empire where Armenians were a compact majority that might rightfully demand their own state?

To find the answer, historians look to government statistics for population figures, especially to archival statistics, because governments seldom deliberately lie to themselves. They want to know their populations so they can understand them, watch them, conscript them, and, most importantly to a government, tax them. The Ottomans were no different than any other government in this situation. Like other governments they made mistakes, particularly in under-counting women and children. However, this can be corrected using statistical methods. What results is the most accurate possible picture of the number of Ottoman Armenians. By the beginning of World War I Armenians made up only 17 percent of the area they claimed as "Ottoman Armenia," the so called "Six Vilayets." Judging by population figures, there was no Ottoman Armenia. In fact if all the Armenians in the world had come to Eastern Anatolia, they still would not have been a majority there.

Two inferences can be drawn from the relatively small number of Armenians in the Ottoman East: The first is that by themselves, the Armenians of Anatolia would have been no great threat to the Ottoman Empire. Armenian rebels might have disputed civil order but there were too few of them to endanger Ottoman authority. Armenian rebels needed help from outside forces, help that could only be provided by Russia. The second inference is that Armenian nationalists could have created a state that was truly theirs only if they first evicted the Muslims who lived there.

To understand the history of the development of Muslim-Armenian antagonism one must apply historical principles. In applying those principles one can see that the history of Armenians was a history like other histories. Some of that history was naturally unique because of its environment but much of it was strikingly similar to what was seen in other places and times.

1. Most ethnic conflicts develop over a long period. Germans and Poles, Finns and Russians, Hindus and Muslims in the Indian subcontinent, Irish and English, Europeans and Native Americans in North America -- all of these ethnic conflicts unfolded over generations, often over centuries.

2. Until very modern times most mass mortality of ethnic groups was the result of warfare in which there were at least two warring sides.

3. When conflict erupted between nationalist revolutionaries and states it was the revolutionaries who began confrontations. Internal peace was in the interest of settled states. Looked at charitably, states often wished for tranquility for the benefits it gave their citizens. With less charity it can be seen that peace made it easier to collect taxes and use armies to fight foreign enemies, not internal foes. World history demonstrates this too well for examples from other regions to be needed here. In the Ottoman Empire, the examples of the rebellions in Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria demonstrate the truth of this.

On these principles, the histories of Turks and Armenians are no different from other histories. Historical principles applied.

The conflict between Turks and Armenians did indeed develop over a long time. The primary impetus for what was to become the Armenian-Muslim conflict lay in Russian imperial expansion. At the time of Ivan the Terrible, circa the sixteenth century, Russians began a policy of expelling

Muslims from lands they had conquered. Over the next three hundred years, Muslims, many of them Turks, were killed or driven out of what today is Ukraine, Crimea and the Caucasus. From the 1770s to the 1850s Russian attacks and Russian laws forced more than 400,000 Crimean Tatars to flee their land. In the Caucasus region, 1.2 million Circassians and Abazians were either expelled or killed by Russians. Of that number, one third died as victims of the mass murder of Muslims that has been mostly ignored. The Tatars, Circassians and Abazians came to the Ottoman Empire. Their presence taught Ottoman Muslims what they could expect from a Russian conquest.

Members of the Armenian minority in the Caucasus began to rebel against Muslim rule and to ally themselves with Russian invaders in the 1790s: Armenian armed units joined the Russians, Armenian spies delivered plans to the Russians. In these wars, Muslims were massacred and forced into exile. Armenians in turn migrated into areas previously held by Muslims, such as Karabakh. This was the beginning of the division of the peoples of the southern Caucasus and eastern Anatolia into two conflicting sides -- the Russian Empire and Armenians on one side, the Muslim Ottoman Empire on the other. Most Armenians and Muslims undoubtedly wanted nothing to do with this conflict, but the events were to force them to take sides.

The 1827 to 1829 wars between Russians, Persians and Ottomans saw the beginning of a great population exchange in the East that was to last until 1920. When the Russians conquered the Erivan Khanete, today the Armenian Republic, the majority of its population was Muslim. Approximately two thirds, 60,000 of these Muslims were forced out of Erivan by Russians. The Russians went on to invade Anatolia, where large numbers of Armenians took up the Russian cause. At the war's end, when the Russians left eastern Anatolia 50 to 90,000 Armenians joined them. They took the place of the exiled Muslims in Erivan and else where, joined by 40,000 Armenians from Iran.

The great population exchange had begun, and mutual distrust between Anatolia's Muslims and the Armenians was the result. The Russians were to invade Anatolia twice more in the nineteenth century, during the Crimean War and the 1877-78 Russo-Turkish War. In both wars significant numbers of Armenians joined the Russians acting as spies and even occupation police.

In Erzurum, for example, British consular officials reported that the Armenian police chief appointed by the Russians and his Armenian force "molested, illtreated, and insulted the Mohammadan population," and that 6,000 Muslim families had been forced to flee the city. When the Russians left part of their conquest at least 25,000 Armenians joined them, fearing the vengeance of the Muslims. The largest migration though was the forced flight of 70,000 Muslims, mainly Turks, from the lands conquered by the Russians and the exodus of Laz in 1882.

By 1900, approximately 1,400,000 Turkish and Caucasian Muslims had been forced out by Russians. One third of those had died, either murdered or victims of starvation and disease. Between 125,000 and 150,000 Armenians emigrated from Ottoman Anatolia to Erivan and other parts of the Russian southern Caucasus.

This was the toll of Russian imperialism. Not only had one-and-a-half million people been exiled or killed, but ethnic peace had been destroyed.

The Muslims had been taught that their neighbors, the Armenians, with whom they had lived for more than 700 years, might once again become their enemies when the Russians next advanced. The Russians had created the two sides that history teaches were to be expected in conflict and mass murder.

The actions of Armenian rebels exacerbated the growing division and mutual fear between

Muslims and Armenians of the Ottoman East.

The main Armenian revolutionary organizations were founded in the 1880s and 1890s in the Russian Empire. They were socialist and nationalist in ideology. Terrorism was their weapon of choice. Revolutionaries openly stated that their plan was the same as that which had worked well against the Ottoman Empire in Bulgaria. In Bulgaria rebels had first massacred innocent Muslim villagers. The Ottoman government, occupied with a war against Serbs in Bosnia, depended on the local Turks to defeat the rebels, which they did, but with great losses of life. European newspapers reported Bulgarians deaths, but never Muslim deaths. Europeans did not consider that the deaths were a result of the rebellion, nor the Turk's intention. The Russians invaded ostensibly to save the Christians. The result was the death of 260,000 Turks, 17 percent of the Muslim population of Bulgaria, and the expulsion of a further 34 percent of Turks. The Armenian rebels expected to follow the same plan.

The Armenian rebellion began with the organization of guerilla bands made up of Armenians from both the Russian and Ottoman lands. Arms were smuggled in. Guerillas assassinated Ottoman officials, attacked Muslim villages, and used bombs, the nineteenth century's terrorist's standard weapon. By 1894 the rebels were ready for open revolution. Revolts broke out in Samsun, Zeytun, Van and elsewhere in 1894 and 1895. As in Bulgaria they began with the murder of innocent civilians. The leader of the Zeytun rebellion said his forces had killed 20,000 Muslims. As in Bulgaria the Muslims retaliated. In Van for example 400 Muslims and 1,700 Armenians died. Further rebellions followed. In Adana in 1909 the Armenian revolt turned out very badly for both the rebels and the innocent when the government lost control and 17,000 to 20,000 died, mostly Armenians. Throughout the revolts and especially in 1894 and 1897 the Armenians deliberately attacked Kurdish tribesmen, knowing that it was from them that great vengeance was not that likely to be expected. Pitched battles between Kurds and Armenians resulted.

But it all went wrong for the Armenian rebels. They had followed the Bulgarian plan, killing Muslims and initiating revenge attacks on Armenians. Their own people had suffered most. Yet the Russians and Europeans they depended upon did not intervene. European politics and internal problems stayed the Russian hand.

What were the Armenian rebels trying to create? When Serbs and Bulgarians rebelled against the Ottoman Empire they claimed lands where the majorities were Serbs or Bulgarians. They expelled Turks and other Muslims from their lands, but these Muslims had not been a majority. This was not true for the Armenians.

The lands they covered were overwhelmingly Muslim in population.

The only way they could create an Armenia was to expel the Muslims. Knowing this history is essential to understanding what was to come during World War I. There had been a long historical period in which two conflicting sides developed.

Russian imperialists and Armenian revolutionaries had begun a struggle that was in no way wanted by the Ottomans. Yet the Ottomans were forced to oppose the plans of both Russians and Armenians, if only to defend the majority of their subjects. History taught the Ottomans that if the Armenians triumphed not only would territory be lost, but mass expulsions and deaths would be the fate of the Muslim majority. This was the one absolutely necessary goal of the Armenian rebellion.

The preview to what was to come in the Great War came in the Russian Revolution of 1905. Harried all over the Empire, the Russians encouraged ethnic conflict in Azerbaijan, fomenting an inter-communal war. Azeri Turks and Armenians battled each other when they should have

attacked the Empire that ruled over both. Both Turks and Armenians learned the bitter lesson that the other was the enemy, even though most of them wanted nothing of war and bloodshed. The sides were drawn.

In late 1914, inter-communal conflict began in the Ottoman East with the Armenian rebellion. Anatolian Armenians went to the Russian South Caucasus for training, approximately 8,000 in Kagizman, 6,000 in Igdir and others elsewhere. They returned to join local rebels and revolts erupted all over the East. The Ottoman Government estimated 30,000 rebels in Sivas Vilayeti alone, probably an exaggeration but indicative of the scope of the rebellion. Military objectives were the first to be attacked.

Telegraph lines were cut. Roads through strategic mountain passes were seized. The rebels attacked Ottoman officials, particularly recruiting officers, throughout the East. Outlying Muslim villages were assaulted and the first massacring of Muslims began. The rebels attempted to take cities such as Zeytun, Mus, Sebin Karahisar and Urfa. Ottoman armed forces which were needed at the front were instead forced to defend the interior.

The most successful rebel action was in the city of Van. In March 1915 they seized the city from a weak Ottoman garrison and proceeded to kill all the Muslims who could not escape. Some 3,000 Kurdish villagers from the surrounding region were herded together into the great natural bowl of Zeve, outside the city of Van, and slaughtered. Kurdish tribes in turn took their revenge on any Armenian villagers they found.

Part II: Popular opinion today knows of only one set of deportations, more properly called forced migrations, in Anatolia, the deportation of the Armenians. There were in fact many forced migrations. For the Armenians, the worst forced migrations came when they accompanied their own armies in retreat. Starvation and disease killed great numbers of both, far more than fell to enemies' bullets.

It is true that the Ottomans had obvious reason to fear Armenians, and that forced migration was an age-old tool in Middle Eastern and Balkan conflicts. It is also true that while its troops were fighting the Russians and Armenians, the Ottoman Government could not and did not properly protect the Armenian migrants. Nevertheless, more than 200,000 of the deported Armenians reached Greater Syria and survived. Those who see the evil of genocide in the forced migrations of Armenians ignore the survival of so many of those who were deported. They also ignore the fact that the Armenians who were most under Ottoman control, those in Western cities such as Izmir, Istanbul, and Edirne, were neither deported nor molested, presumably because they were not a threat. If genocide is to be considered, however, then the murders of Turks and Kurds in 1915 and 1916 must be included in the calculation of blame. The Armenian molestations and massacres in Cilicia, deplored even by their French and British allies, must be judged. And the exile or death of two-thirds of the Turks of Erivan Province, the Armenian Republic, during the war must be remembered.

Historical principles were once again at work. Rebels had begun the action and the result was the creation of two warring sides. After the Armenian deeds in Van and elsewhere, Muslims could only have expected that Armenians were enemies who could kill them. Armenians could only have feared Muslim revenge. Most of these people had no wish for war, but they had been driven to it. It was to be a merciless conflict.

For the next five years, total war raged in the Ottoman East. When the Russians attacked and occupied the East, more than a million Muslims fled as refugees, itself an indication that they expected to die if they remained. They were attacked on the roads by Armenian bands as they fled. When the Russians retreated it was the turn of the Armenians to flee. The Russians attacked

and retreated, then attacked again, then finally retreated for good. With each advance came the flight of hundreds of thousands. Two wars were fought in Eastern Anatolia, a war between the armies of Russia and the Ottomans and a war between local Muslims and Armenians. In the war between the armies, civilians and enemy soldiers were sometimes treated with humanity, sometimes not. Little quarter was given in the war between the Armenians and the Muslims, however. That war was fought with all the ferocity of men who fought to defend their families.

Popular opinion today knows of only one set of deportations, more properly called forced migrations, in Anatolia, the deportation of the Armenians. There were in fact many forced migrations. For the Armenians, the worst forced migrations came when they accompanied their own armies in retreat. Starvation and disease killed great numbers of both, far more than fell to enemies' bullets. This is as should be expected from historical principles; starvation and disease are always the worst killers. It is also a historical principle that refugees suffer most of all.

One of the many forced migration was the organized expulsion of Armenians from much of Anatolia by the Ottoman government. In light of the history and the events of this war, it is true that the Ottomans had obvious reason to fear the Armenians, and that forced migration was an age-old tool in Middle Eastern and Balkan conflicts. It is also true that while its troops were fighting the Russians and Armenians, the Ottoman Government could not and did not properly protect the Armenian migrants. Nevertheless, more than 200,000 of the deported Armenians reached Greater Syria and survived. (Some estimate that as many as two-thirds of the deportees survived.)

Those who see the evil of genocide in the forced migrations of Armenians ignore the survival of so many of those who were deported. They also ignore the fact that the Armenians who were most under Ottoman control, those in Western cities such as Izmir, Istanbul, and Edirne, were neither deported nor molested, presumably because they were not a threat.

No claim of genocide can rationally stand in the light of these facts. If genocide is to be considered, however, then the murders of Turks and Kurds in 1915 and 1916 must be included in the calculation of blame. The Armenian murder of the innocent civilians of Erzincan, Bayburt, Tercan, Erzurum, and all the villages on the route of the Armenian retreat in 1918 must be taken into account. The Armenian molestations and massacres in Cilicia, deplored even by their French and British allies, must be judged. And the exile or death of two-thirds of the Turks of Erivan Province, the Armenian Republic, during the war must be remembered.

That is the history of the Conflict between the Turks and the Armenians. Only when that history is known can the assertions of those who accuse the Turks be understood.

In examining the claims of Armenian nationalists, first to be considered should be outright lies.

The most well-known of many fabrications on the Armenian Question are the famous "Talat Pasa Telegrams," in which the Ottoman interior minister and other officials supposedly telegraphed instructions to murder the Armenians. These conclusively have been proven to be forgeries by Sinasi Orel and Sureyya Yuca. However, one can only wonder why they would ever have been taken seriously. A whole people cannot be convicted of genocide on the basis of penciled scribbles on a telegraph pad.

These were not the only examples of words put in Talat Pasa's mouth. During World War I, the British Propaganda Office and American missionaries published a number of scurrilous works in which Ottoman officials were falsely quoted as ordering hideous deeds.

One of the best examples of invented Ottoman admissions of guilt may be that concocted by the

American ambassador Morgenthau. Morgenthau asked his readers to believe that Talat Pasa offhandedly told the ambassador of his plans to eradicate the Armenians. Applying common sense and some knowledge of diplomatic practice helps to evaluate these supposed indiscretions. Can anyone believe that the Ottoman interior minister would actually have done such a thing? He knew that America invariably supported the Armenians, and had always done so. If he felt the need to unburden his soul, who would be the last person to whom he would talk? The American ambassador. Yet to whom does he tell all? The American Ambassador! Talat Pasa was a practical politician. Like all politicians, he undoubtedly violated rules and made errors. But no one has ever alleged that Talat Pasa was an idiot. Perhaps Ambassador Morgenthau knew that the U.S. State Department would never believe his story, because he never reported it at the time to his masters, only writing it later in a popular book.

The use of quotes from Americans is selective. One American ambassador, Morgenthau, is quoted by the Armenian apologists, but another American ambassador, Bristol, is ignored. Why? Because Bristol gave a balanced account and accused Armenians as well as Muslims of crimes.

The most often seen fabrication may be the famous "Hitler Quote." Hitler supposedly stated, "Who after all is today speaking of the destruction of the Armenians?" to justify his Holocaust. The quote now appears every year in school books, speeches in the American Congress and the French Parliament and most writings in which the Turks are attacked. Professor Heath Lowry has cast serious doubt on the authenticity of the quote. It is likely that Hitler never said it. But there is a more serious question: How can Adolf Hitler be taken as a serious source on Armenian history? Were his other historical pronouncements so reliable that his opinions can be trusted?

Politically, "Hitler" is a magic word that conjures up an all too true image of undisputed evil. He is quoted on the Armenian Question for polemic and political purpose, to tie the Turks to Hitler's evil. In the modern world nothing defames so well as associating your enemies with Hitler. This is all absurdity, but it is potent absurdity that convinces those who know nothing of the facts. It is also a deliberate distortion of history.

Population has also been a popular field for fabrication. Armenian nationalists had a particular difficulty -- they were only a small part of the population of the land they planned to carve from the Ottoman Empire. The answer was false statistics. Figures appeared that claimed that Armenians were the largest group in Eastern Anatolia. These population statistics were supposedly the work of the Armenian Patriarch, but they were actually the work of an Armenian who assumed a French name, Marcel Leart, published them in Paris and pretended they were the Patriarch's work. Naturally, he greatly exaggerated the number of Armenians and diminished the number of Turks. Once again, the amazing thing is that these were ever taken seriously. Yet they were used after World War I to justify granting Eastern Anatolia to the Armenians and are still routinely quoted today.

The Armenian apologists quote American missionaries as if missionaries would never lie, omitting the numerous proofs that missionaries did indeed lie and avoided mentioning anything that would show Armenians to be less than innocent. The missionaries in Van, for example, reported the deaths of Armenians, but not the fact that those same Armenians had killed all the Muslims they caught in that city.

The main falsification of history by the Armenian apologists lies not in what they say, but in what they do not say. They do not admit that much of the evidence they rely on is tainted because it was produced by the British Propaganda Office in World War I. For example, the Bryce Report, "The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire," has recently been reproduced by an Armenian organization, with a long introduction that praises its supposed veracity. Nowhere does the reprint state that the report was produced and paid for by British Propaganda as a way to

attack its wartime enemies, the Ottomans. Nor does the reprint state that the other Bryce Report, this one on alleged German atrocities, has long been known by historians to be a collection of lies. Nor does the reprint consider that the sources in the report, such as the Dashnak Party, had a tradition of not telling the truth.

The basic historical omission is never citing, never even looking at evidence that might contradict one's theories. Nationalist apologists refer to English propaganda, missionary reports, statements by Armenian revolutionaries, and the like. They seldom refer to Ottoman documents, hundreds of which have been published in recent years, except perhaps to claim that nothing written by the Ottomans can be trusted although they trust completely the writings of Armenian partisans. These documents indicate that the Ottomans planned no genocide and were at least officially solicitous of the Armenians' welfare. The fact that these contradict the Armenian sources is all the more reason that they should be consulted. Good history can only be written then both sides of historical arguments are considered.

Worst of all is the most basic omission -- the Armenian apologists do not mention the Muslim dead. Any civil war will appear to be a genocide if only the dead of one side are counted. Their writings would be far more accurate, and would tell a very different story, if they included facts such as the deaths of nearly two-thirds of the Muslims of Van Vilayeti, deaths caused by the Russians and Armenians. Histories that strive for accuracy must include all the facts, and the deaths of millions of Muslims is surely a fact that deserves mention.

Those of us who have studied this question for years have seen many approaches come and go. The old assertions, based on the Talat Pasa telegrams and missionary reports, were obviously insufficient, and new ones have appeared.

For a while, Pan-Turanism was advanced as the cause for Turkish actions. It was said that the Turks wished to be rid of the Armenians because the Armenian population blocked the transportation routes to Central Asia. This foundered on the rocks of geography and population. The Anatolian Armenian population was not concentrated on those routes. The Armenian Republic's Armenians, those in Erivan Province, were on some of those routes. However, when at the end of the war the Ottomans had the chance to occupy Erivan they did not do so, but went immediately on to Baku to protect Azeri Turks from attacks by enough to believe that their chief concern was advancing to Uzbekistan.

Much was made of post-war courts martial that accused members of the Committee of Union and Progress Government of crimes against the Armenians.

The accusations did not state that the courts were convened by the unelected quisling government of Ferid Pasa who created the courts to curry favor with the allies. The courts returned verdicts of guilty for all sorts of improbable offenses, of which killing Armenians was only one. The courts chose anything, true or false, that would cast aspersion on Ferid's enemies. The accused could not represent themselves. Can the verdicts of such courts be trusted? Conveniently overlooked were the investigations of the British, who held Istanbul and were in charge of the Ottoman Archives, but who were forced to admit that they could find no evidence of massacres.

Part III: A German scholar has decided that the Ottomans reported and killed Armenians so that they would have space in which to settle the Turkish refugees from the Balkan Wars. Those with some knowledge of Ottoman history know that the Balkan refugees were almost all settled in Western Anatolia and Ottoman Europe, not in the East, and that the refugees were all settled before the World War I Armenian troubles began. Nationalist apologists first decide that the Turks are guilty, then look for evidence that will show they are correct ... The enemy of the nationalist apologists is the truth. They have thrown false telegrams, spurious statistics, sham courts and

anything else they could find, but the truth has advanced Campaigns were organized to silence historians. One professor was mercilessly attacked in the press because he advised the Turkish ambassador on responding to questions about the Ottoman Armenians. No one questioned the probity of the American Armenian scholar who became the chief advisor of the president of the Armenian Republic or doubted the veracity of the American Armenian professor whose son became the Armenian Foreign Minister Fewer and fewer historians are willing to write on this history. A very senior and respected scholar of Ottoman history, Bernard Lewis, was brought to court in France for his denial of the Armenian genocide. After a long and successful career, Professor Lewis could afford to confront those who accused him. Could a junior scholar afford to do the same? Applying the principles of history, we can see that what occurred was, in fact a long history of imperialism, nationalist revolt, and ethnic conflict. The result was horrible mortality on all sides. There is an explainable, understandable history of a two-sided conflict. It was not genocide.

A recent find of the nationalist is the Teskilat-I Mahsusa, the secret organization that operated under orders of the Committee of Union and Progress. We are told that the Teskilat must have organized Armenian massacres. The justification for this would astonish any logician:

It is alleged that because a secret organization existed it must have been intended to do evil, including the genocide of the Armenians. As further "proof," it is noted that officers of the Teskilat were present in areas where Armenians died. Since Teskilat officers were all over Anatolia, this should surprise no one. By this dubious logic Teskilat members must also have been responsible for the deaths of Muslims because they were also present in areas where Muslims died. Does this prove that no Teskilat members killed or even massacred Armenians? It does not. It would be odd if during wartime no members of a large organization had not committed such actions, and they undoubtedly did so. What it in no way proves is that the Teskilat was ordered to commit genocide.

A German scholar has decided that the Ottomans reported and killed Armenians so that they would have space in which to settle the Turkish refugees from the Balkan Wars. For those who do not know Ottoman history, this might seem like a reasonable explanation. Those with some knowledge of Ottoman history know that the Balkan refugees were almost all settled in Western Anatolia and Ottoman Europe, not in the East, and that the refugees were all settled before the World War I Armenian troubles began.

Such assertions are the result of the methods used. Nationalist apologists first decide that the Turks are guilty, then look for evidence that will show they are correct. They are like a man in a closed room fighting against a stronger enemy. As the enemy advances the man picks up a book, a lamp, an ashtray, a chair -- whatever he can find -- and throws it in the vain hope of stopping the enemy's advance. But the enemy continues on. Eventually the man runs out of things to throw, and he is beaten. The enemy of the nationalist apologists is the truth. They have thrown false telegrams, spurious statistics, sham courts, and anything else they could find, but the truth has advanced.

Some tactics have been all too successful in reducing the number of scholars who study the Armenian Question. When the fabrications and distortions failed, there were outright threats. When the historians could not be convinced, the next best thing was to silence them. One professor's house was bombed.

Others were threatened with similar violence. Campaigns were organized to silence historians. One professor was mercilessly attacked in the press because he advised the Turkish ambassador on responding to questions about the Ottoman Armenians. It is worth noting that no one questioned the probity of the American Armenian scholar who became the chief advisor of the president of the Armenian Republic or doubted the veracity of the American Armenian professor

whose son became the Armenian foreign minister. No one questioned the objectivity of these scholars or attacked them, nor should they. The only proper question is, "What is the truth!" No matter who pays the bills, no matter the nationality of the author, no matter if he writes to ambassadors, no matter his religion, his voting record, his credit status, or his personal life, his views on history should be closely analyzed and, if true, accepted.

The only question is the truth.

Such attacks have had their intended effect. Fewer and fewer historians are willing to write on this history. A very senior and respected scholar of Ottoman history, Bernard Lewis, was brought to court in France for his denial of the Armenian genocide. After a long and successful career, Professor Lewis could afford to confront those who accused him. He also could afford to hire the lawyers who defended him. Could a junior scholar afford to do the same? Could someone who depended on university rectors, who worry about funding, afford to take up such a dangerous topic? Could someone without Professor Lewis's financial resources afford the lawyers who defended both his free speech and his good name?

I myself was the target of a campaign, instigated by an Armenian newspaper, that attempted to have me fired from my university. Letters and telephone calls from all over the United States came to the president of my university, demanding my dismissal because I denied the "Armenian Genocide." We have the tenure system in the United States, a system that guarantees that senior professors cannot be fired for what they teach and write, and my university president defended my rights. But a younger professor might understandably be afraid to write on the Armenians if he knew he faced the sort of ordeal that has been faced by others.

To me, the worst of all is being accused of being the kind of politicized nationalist scholar I so detest. False reasons are invented to explain why I say this -- my mother is a Turk, my wife is a Turk, I am paid large sums by the Turkish government. None of these things is true, but it would not affect my writings one bit if they were. The way to challenge a scholar's work is to read his writings and respond to them with your own scholarship, not to attack his character.

When, despite the best efforts of the nationalist apologists, some still speak out against the distortion of history, the final answer is political: Politicians are enlisted to rewrite history. Parliaments are enlisted to convince their people that there was a genocide. In America, the Armenian nationalists lobby a Congress which refuses to even consider an apology for slavery to demand an apology from Turks for something the Turks did not do.

In France, the Armenia nationalists lobby a Parliament which will not address the horrors perpetrated by the French in Algeria, which they know well took place, to declare there were horrors in Turkey, about which they know almost nothing. The people of many nations are then told that the genocide must have taken place because their representatives have recognized it.

The Turks are accused of "genocide," but what does that appalling word mean? The most quoted definition is that of the United Nations: actions "committed with intent to destroy in whole or in part a national, ethnic, radical, or religious group as such." Raphael Lemkin who invented the word genocide, included cultural, social, economic, and political destruction of groups as genocide. Leo Kuper included as genocide attacks on subgroups that are not ethnic, such as economic classes, collective groups and various social categories. By these standards Turks were indeed guilty of genocide. So were Armenians, Russians, Greeks, Americans, British and almost every people that has ever existed. In World War I in Anatolia there were many such "genocides." So many groups attacked other groups that the use of the word genocide is meaningless.

Why, then, is such a hollow term used against the Turks? It is used because those who hear the

term do not think of the academic definitions. They think of Hitler and of what he did to the Jews. The intent behind the use of the word genocide is not to foster understanding. The intent is to foster a negative image of the Turks by associating them with great evil. The intent is political.

What must be considered by the serious historian is a simple question, "Did the Ottoman Government carry out a plan to exterminate the Armenians?" In answering this question it is important not to copy the Armenian apologists. When they declare that Armenians did no wrong, the answer is not to reply that the Turks did no wrong. The answer must be honest history. What cannot and should not be denied is that many Anatolian Muslims did commit crimes against Armenians. Some of those who committed crimes were Ottoman officials. Actions were taken in revenge, out of hatred or for political reasons. In total war men do evil acts. This again is a sad but real historical principle. The Ottoman government recognized this and tried more than 1,000 Muslims for war crimes, including crimes against Armenians, hanging some criminals.

Applying the principles of history, we can see that what occurred was in fact a long history of imperialism, nationalist revolt and ethnic conflict.

The result was horrible mortality on all sides. There is an explainable, understandable history of a two-sided conflict. It was not genocide. Throughout that history, both sides killed and were killed. It was not genocide.

Much archival evidence shows Ottoman government concern that Armenians survive. Also, it must be said that much evidence shows poor planning, government weakness and in some places criminal acts and negligence. Some officials were murderous, but a sincere effort was made to punish them. It was not genocide.

The majority of those who were deported survived, even though those Armenians were completely at the mercy of the Ottomans. It was not genocide.

The Armenians most under Ottoman control, the Armenian residents of Istanbul, Izmir, Edirne and other regions of greatest governmental power were neither deported nor attacked. It was not genocide.

Why are the Turks accused of a hideous crime they did not commit? The answer is both emotional and political. Many Armenians feel in their hearts that Turks were guilty. They have only heard of the deaths of their ancestors, not the deaths of the Turks. They have been told only a small part of a complicated story for so long that they believe it to be unquestionable truth. Their anger is understandable. The beliefs of those in Europe and America who have never heard the truth, which sadly is the majority, are also understandable. It is the actions of those who use the claim of genocide for nationalist political motives that are inexcusable.

Does any rational analyst deny that the ultimate intent of the Armenian nationalists is to first gain "reparations," then claim Eastern Anatolia as their own?

Finally, what is to be done? As might be expected from all I have said here today, I believe the only answer to false allegations of genocide is to study and proclaim the truths of history. Political actions such as the resolution recently passed by the French Parliament naturally and properly draw corresponding political actions from Turks, but political actions will never convince the world that Turks did not commit genocide. What is needed to convince the world that Turks did not commit genocide? What is needed to convince the world is a great increase in scholarship. Archives must remain open and be easy to use for both Turks and foreigners. Graduate students should be encouraged to study the Armenian question. No student's advisers should tell him to

avoid this subject because it is "too political," something I have heard in America and, unfortunately, in Turkey as well.

I suggest, as I have suggested before, that the Turkish Republic propose to the Armenian Republic that a joint commission be established, its members selected by scholarly academies in both countries. All archives should be opened to the commission -- not only the Ottoman Archives, but the archives of Armenia and of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation. (The call is often made for the Turkish Archives to be opened completely. It is time to demand that Armenians do likewise.) I have been told that the Armenians will never agree to this, but how can anyone know unless they try? In any case, refusal to fairly and honestly consider this question would in itself be evidence that the accusations against the Turks are political, not scholarly.

Whether or not such a commission is ever named, the study of the Armenian question must be continued. This is true not only because it is always right to discover accurate history. It is true because honor demands it. Honor is a word that is not often heard today, but a concept of honor is nonetheless sorely needed. I have been told by many that the Turks should adopt a political strategy to deal with the Armenian problem. This strategy would have the Turkish government lie about the past for present political gain.

The government would state that the Ottomans committed genocide, but that modern Turkey cannot be blamed because it is a different government. This, I have been told, would cause the world to think more kindly of the Turks. I do not believe this ultimately would satisfy anyone. I believe that calls for reparations and land would quickly follow such a statement. But that is not the reason to reject such easy political lies. They should be rejected purely because they are wrong. Even if the lies would bring great gains, they should be rejected because they are wrong. I believe the Turks are still men and women of honor. They know that it can never be honorable to accept lies told of their ancestors, no matter the benefits. I also believe that someday, perhaps soon, perhaps far in the future, the truth will be recognized by the world. I believe that the accurate study of history and the honor of the Turks will bring this to pass.

Professor Justin McCarthy teaches at the University of Louisville in Kentucky.

Assembly of Turkish American Associations
1526 18th St, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036 Telephone: (202) 483-9090, Fax: (202) 483-9092 email: assembly@ataa.org

Copyright © ATAA

APPENDIX R
THE U.S. CONGRESS AND ADOLF HITLER ON THE ARMENIANS



The U.S. Congress and Adolf Hitler on the Armenians

Heath W. Lowry
Institute of Turkish Studies, Inc. Washington, D.C.
Political Communication and Persuasion, Volume 3, Number 2 (1985)

Abstract This article traces the history of a purported Adolf Hitler quote which cites the pericent of the world's lack of reaction to the fate of Armenians during the First World War as a justification for his planned extermination of European Jewry in the course of the Second World War. By a detailed examination of the genesis of this quotation the author demonstrates that there is no historical basis for attributing such a statement to Hitler. Likewise, the author tarces the manner in which this purported quote has entered the lexicon of U.S. Congressmen, and the manner in which it continues to be used by Armenian-Americans in their efforts to established a linkage between their own history and the tragic fate of European Jewry during the Second World War. The author concludes with a plea to policy-makers that they focus their activities on the responsibilities of their offices and leave the writing of history to the historians.

A casual perusal of the pages of the Congressional Record (CR), of both the House and the Senate, on or about April 24, 1984, reveals a bipartisan group of our elected officials condemning the failure of the Republic of Turkey to acknowledge and assume responsibility for the "genocide" of the Armenian people allegedly perpetrated by the Ottoman Empire in the course of the First World War. In 1984, a total of sixty-six such statements, fifty-seven by members of the House and nine by Senators, wire read into the Congressional Record. Of these sixty-six tributes in support of Armenian Martyrs' Day remembrances, exactly one third-twenty-two-contained one or another version of a quote attributed to Adolf Hitler in which he purportedly responded to a query about his planned annihilation of European Jewry, by quipping: "Who, after all, speaks today of the extermination of the Armenians?".

The Hitler Quote: Its Source and Its Avowed Focus

While the quiver anti-Turkish invectives utilized by Armenian spokesmen contains a number of arrows, none is more frequently unleashed than this charge that Adolf Hitler was encouraged by his perception that the world had not reacted to alleged Ottoman mistreatment of its Armenian

population during the First World War. He thus felt justified in going forward with his plan to exterminate European Jewry during the Second World War.

Given the widespread utilization of this quotation by Armenian spokesmen and their supporters, perhaps we should not be too surprised at the fact that it has found its way into the lexicon of our lawmakers. Even the dean of Armenian-American historians, Professor Richard Hovannisian of UCLA, stated in a 1983 address to the World Affairs Council of Pittsburgh, "Perhaps Adolf Hitler had good cause in 1939 to declare, according to the Nuremberg trial transcripts, "Who, after all, speaks today of the extermination of the Armenians?" s(1) "Is it any wonder, then, that the following list of elected U.S. officials repeat the same charge?

Senator Rude Boschwitz, R-Minn.; Senator Carl Levin, D-Mich.; Senator Howard Metzenbaum, D-Ohio.; Congressman Les Aspin, D-Wis.; Congressman Howard Berman, D-Calif.; Congressman Thomas Bliley, R-Va.; Congressman Edward Boland, D-Mass.; Congresswoman Barbara Boxer, D-Calif.; Congressman Edward Feighan, D-Ohio.; Congresswoman Geraldine Ferraro, D-N.Y.; Congressman Hamilton Fish, R-N.Y.; Congressman William Ford, D-Mich.; Congressman Sam Gejdenson, D-Conn.; Congressman William Green, R-N.Y.; Congressman Richard Lehman, D-Calif.; Congressman Bruce Morrison, D-Conn.; Congressman Nicholas Mavroules, D-Mass.; Congressman Charles Schumer, D-N.Y.; Congressman James Shannon, D-Mass.; and Congressman Henry Waxman, D-Calif.

It is noteworthy that sixteen of the above-listed officials (with the exception of Boxer, Courter, Dymally, Feighan, Ford, and Schumer) all clearly state that That Hitler made his statement in support of this planned extermination of European Jewry. Equally noteworthy is the fact that the three Senators, Boschwitz, Levin, and Metzenbaum, and four of the members of the House, Berman, Gejdenson, Green, and Waxman, who made this linkage are themselves Jews.

The problem with this linkage is that there is no proof that Adolf Hitler ever made such a statement. Everything written to date has attributed the purported Hitler quote, not to primary sources, but to an article that appeared in the Times of London on Saturday, November 24, 1945. Said article, entitled "Nazi Germany's Road To War," (2) cites the quote and bases its attribution to Hitler on an address b, him to his commanders-in-chief six year earlier, on August 22, 1939, a few days prior to his invasion of Poland. According to the unnamed author of the Times article, the speech had been introduced as evidence during the November 23, 1945, session of the Nuremberg Tribunal. Hitler is quoted as having stated. "Thus for the time being I have sent to the East only my Death's Head units, with the order to kill without pity or mercy all men, women, and children of the Polish race or language. Who still talks nowadays of the extermination of the Armenians?"(3) However , this version of the address was never accepted as evidence in this or any other session of the Nuremberg Tribunal.

Furthermore, the Times article of November 24, 1945, was not the earliest mention of Hitler's alleged statement on the Armenians. Rather, this quotation, and indeed an entire text of a Hitler speech purportedly made at Obersalzberg on August 22, 1939, was first published in 1942 in a book entitled What About Germany? and authored by Louis Lochner, a former bureau chief of the Associated Press in Berlin." (4)

On the opening page of his work, Lochner cites an unnamed Speech to the Supreme Commanders, and Commanding Generals, Obersalzberg, August 22, 1939." He further states that he obtained a copy of this speech (a three-page typed German manuscript) one week prior to Hitler's 1939 invasion of Poland. (5)

This "document", the provenance of which has never been disclosed, investigated, and much less established, is the real "source," and indeed the sole source, of Hitler's purported remark vis-i-vis

the Armenians. In its historical debut, as published by Lochner, the "quote" reads as follows:

I have issued the command-I'll have anybody who utters one word of criticism executed by a firing squad-that our war aim does not consist in reaching certain lines, but in the physical destruction of the enemy. Accordingly, I have placed my death-head formations in readiness-for the present only in the East-with compassion, men, women, and children of Polish derivation and language. Only thus shall we gain the living space (lebensraum) which we need. Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians." (6)

Of particular interest is the fact that while this "question" has appeared in literally hundreds of publications in the past forty years, not a single one has ever cited Lochner's book as its source. Likewise, no work has ever suggested that this statement made its first appearance, not in the course of the 1945 Nuremberg trials, but rather in the 1942 wartime publication of an American newspaperman.

Of equal interest, assuming for the moment that Lochner's unnamed informant did in fact supply him with an authentic copy of Hitler's Obersalzberg remarks, in the total absence in this text of a single direct or implied reference to the Jewish people. Obviously, it is an anti-Polish polemic; the single reference it contains to the Armenians is clearly made in that context. In Lochner's version, Hitler states.

Accordingly, I have placed my death-head formations in readiness-for the present only in the East-with orders to them to send to death mercilessly and without compassion, men, women, and children of Polish derivation and language. Only thus shall we gain the living space (lebensraum) which we need. Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians" (7)

Here there is no ambiguity in his meaning, If Hitler actually made this statement it obviously referred to his impending invasion of Poland and to the fate he envisioned for its citizenry; it had absolutely nothing to do with his plans for the Jews of Europe. This fact in and of itself belies the allegation of those sixteen members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives who in their statements in conjunction with the April 24 remembrance of Armenian Martyrs' Day, insisted that Hitler's remarks expressed the rationale for his slaughter of the Jews.

Interestingly enough, of the twenty-two elected representatives who incorporated the alleged Hitler quote into their Congressional remarks, only one, Congressman William Ford (D-Mich), correctly identified the time and context of the statement attributed to Hitler. Ford said, "Even Adolf Hitler used past events to shape his own policies. In 1939 as he was beginning his invasion of Poland, Hitler ordered the mass extermination of its inhabitants, commenting, "Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?" (8) In contrast, most of his colleagues displayed their lack of knowledge about the subject they purported to address by the use of phrases such as:

"When Adolf Hitler was planning the extermination of the Jewish people..." (Aspin).

When Hitler first proposed his final solution.....(Boschwitz).

... on the eve of the extermination of the Jews (Berman).

Hitler's statement concerning the final solution for the Jews of Europe...(Bliley).

Hitler who while planning the extermination of millions of Jews was asked ... (Boland).

We can only be haunted by the words of Adolf Hitler, who said, in embarking on this "crazed

attack" on the Jews, "Who after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?" (Ferraro).

In speaking of the consequences of the Jewish Holocaust, Adolf Hitler once remarked...(Fish).

Hitler, before beginning his Holocaust against the Jews ... (Gejdenson).

When Hitler was about to begin the Holocaust ... (Green).

Questioned about his policy of Jewish genocide, Hitler said.... (Lehman).

Looking at the Armenian genocide as a precedent for his own Holocaust perpetrated against Europe's Jews ...(Morrison).

Etc., etc., etc. (9)

The Hitler Quote and the Nuremberg Trials

Having established that the first published appearance of Hitler's alleged remark on the Armenians occurred in the 1942 Lochner book, we will now examine the history of its subsequent appearance in the course of the Nuremberg trials. It is necessary to state at the outset, however, that contrary to Professor Hovannisian in the above-mentioned quote, and a whole body of scholars writing on the Holocaust, the Nuremberg trials transcripts do not in fact contain the purported Hitler quote. Instead, the Nuremberg transcripts clearly demonstrate that the tribunal rejected Lochner's version of Hitler's Obersalzberg speech in favor of two more official versions found in confiscated German military records. These two records are, respectively, detailed notes of the August 22, 1939, meeting taken down by Admiral Hermann Boehm, Chief of the High Seas Fleet, who was in attendance; (10) and an unsigned memorandum in two parts which provides a detailed account of Hitler's August 22, 1939, remark at Obersalzberg. This document originated in the Chief of the High Command of the Armed Forces (Oberkommando der Wehrmacht [OKW]) files and was captured by American troops at Saalfelden in Austria. This was the chief document introduced by the prosecutor at Nuremberg as evidence in the course of the session concerned with the invasion of Poland. (11) In addition, a third eyewitness account of the Obersalzberg meetings is found in the detailed diary kept by General Halder. (12)

These three versions, the first two of which are in fact preserved in the transcripts of the Nuremberg Tribunal, are internally consistent one with the other in regard to the wording of Hitler's Obersalzberg speech. Of primary importance in the context of this study is the fact that none of these three eyewitness versions contains any reference whatsoever to Armenians.

The noted historian of the Second World War William Shirer reconstructed his account of the Obersalzberg meeting strictly on the basis of the Boehm notes, the Halder diary, and the captured memorandum. (13) In explaining his failure to incorporate the "Lochner version," he wrote with characteristic understatement, "it may have been embellished a little by persons who were not present at the meeting at the Berghof." (14)

An examination of the Nuremberg transcripts from the afternoon session of November 26, 1945, enables us to piece together the actual sequence of events which led to the Times of London article on November 24, 1945, which, as has been stated, is the source of all post-1945 references to the alleged Hitler quote.

From these records it becomes apparent that a total of three documents dealing with the August 22, 1939 speech were discussed in the course of the November 26, 1945, session of the tribunal. Called, respectively, US-28, US-29, and US-30, two of the three were subsequently introduced as

evidence and preserved in the records of the trials: US-29 (Document Number 798-PS) and US-30 (Document Number 1014-PS). The third document, US-28, was not introduced as evidence by the prosecution. An examination of the Nuremberg transcript provides the following detail in regard to these three documents. The prosecutor, Mr. Alderman, introduced the subject thus:

In this presentation of condemning document, concerning the initiation of the war in September 1939, I must bring to the attention of the Tribunal a group of documents concerning an address by Hitler to his chief military commanders, at Obersalzberg on 22 August 1939, just one week prior to the launching of the attack on Poland.

We have three of these documents, related and constituting a single group. The first one I do not intend to offer as evidence. The other two I shall offer.

The reason for that is this: the first of the three documents came into our possession through the medium of an American newspaperman and purported to be original minutes of this meeting at Obersalzberg, transmitted to this American newspaperman by some other person; and we had no proof of the actual delivery to the intermediary by the person who took the notes. That document, therefore, merely served to alert our Prosecution to see if we could find something better. Fortunately, we did get the other two documents, which indicate that Hitler on that day made two speeches, perhaps one in the morning we captured. By comparison of these two documents with the first document, we concluded that the first document was a slightly garbled merger of the two speeches.

On 22 August 1939 Hitler had called together at Obersalzberg the three Supreme Commanders of the three branches of the Armed Forces, as well as the commanding generals bearing the title Commanders-in-Chief (Oberbefehlshaber).

I have indicated how, upon discovering this first document, the Prosecution set out to find better evidence of what happened on this day. In this the Prosecution succeeded. In the files of the OKW at Flensburg, the Oberkommando der Wehrmacht (Chief of the High Command of the Armed Forces), there were uncovered two speeches delivered by Hitler at Obersalzberg, on 22 August 1939. These are document 798-PS and 1014-PS in our series of documents.

In order to keep the serial numbers consecutive, if the Tribunal please, we have had the first document, which I do not intend to offer, marked for identification Exhibit USA-28. Accordingly, I offer the second document, 798-PS, in evidence as Exhibit USA-30. (15)

Once again we must note the obvious: Neither of the Obersalzberg speeches introduced to the Tribunal as evidence by Alderman (US-29/798-PS and US-30/1014-PS) contains any reference to Armenians.

Dr. Otto Stahmer, the defense counsel for Hermann Göring, took exception to Mr. Alderman's presentation, stating, "The third document which was not read is, according to the photostatic copy in the Defense's document room, simply typewritten. There is no indication of place or times of execution." (16) This led to the following exchange between the president of the Tribunal and Dr. Stahmer:

The President: Well, we have got nothing to do with the third document, because it has not been read.

Dr. Stahmer: Mr. President, this document has nevertheless been published in the press and was apparently given to the press by the Prosecution. Consequently both the Defense and the

defendants have a lively interest in giving a short explanation of the facts concerning these documents.

THE PRESIDENT: The tribunal is trying this case in accordance with the evidence and not in accordance with what is in the press, and the third document is not in evidence before us. (17)

The discussion was then joined by Prosecutor Alderman who made the following response to Dr. Stahmer's charge that "the third document" (US-28) had been "leaked to the press, and had already appeared in print:

On the other question referred to by counsel, I feel somewhat guilty. It is quite true that, by a mechanical slip, the press got the first document (US-28), which we never at all intended them to have. I feel somewhat responsible. It happened to be included in the document books which were handed up to the Court on Friday, because we had only intended to refer to it and give it an identification mark and not to offer it. I had thought that no documents would be released to the press until they were actually offered in evidence. With as large an organization as we have, it is very difficult to police all these matters. (18)

As the reader has doubtless discerned. US-28, the document provided to the prosecution by "an American newspaperman," which was not introduced as evidence after the original minutes of the Obersalzberg meeting were found, is the source of the alleged Hitler statement on Armenians. Aided by the passages quoted above from the Nuremberg transcript for appeared in the Times of London on Saturday, November 24, 1945. To make his deadline the unidentified Times reporter based his story on a leaked document on the assumption that it (US-28) would have been introduced in evidence by the time his story broke on Saturday. As the transcript clearly attests, the reporter's expectations in this regard were not fulfilled. The results were far-reaching: The world has been misled for almost forty years into thinking that the Nuremberg transcripts provided the Times reporter with his source for the quote attributed to Hitler, "Who still talks nowadays of the extermination of the Armenians?" Armenian spokesmen have been free to argue that Adolf Hitler justified his planned annihilation of the Jews on the world's failure to react to the alleged Ottoman genocide of the Armenians during the First World War. The Armenian success in this regard is clearly reflected in the April 24, 1984, Congressional Record.

In truth, no document containing the purported Hitler statement on the Armenians was introduced or accepted as evidence in the course of the Nuremberg trials. In fact, the actual minutes of Hitler's August 22, 1939 Obersalzberg speeches (recovered from the files of the Chief of the High Command of the Armed Forces as Flensburg), as well as the detained notes compiled during the speeches by Admiral Hermann Boehm, Chief of the High Seas Fleet, and the record preserved in General Halder's diary, are all totally devoid of anything resembling this alleged quote. In short, contrary to Richard Hovannisian and a host of other Armenian spokesmen, the Nuremberg transcripts through their preservation of US-29 (798-PS), US-30 (1014-PS), and the notes of Admiral Boehm (which are corroborated by the relevant passages from the diary of General Halder), in no way authenticate the infamous Hitler quote. On the contrary, by establishing the actual texts of Hitler's Obersalzberg speeches they demonstrate that the statement is conspicuously absent from Hitler's remarks. The assertion that Hitler made a reference to the Armenians in any context whatsoever is without foundation.

What About Lochner's What About Germany?

Was Louis Lochner the "unidentified American newspaperman" who provided the Nuremberg prosecutor with the purported transcript of the Obersalzberg meeting (US-28 or L-3, as it is variously known), which contains the alleged Hitler quote on the Armenians? And, in fact was the version of the August 22, 1939, Obersalzberg speech published in Lochner's 1942 book and that supplied by the "unidentified American newspaperman" at Nuremberg one and the same

document?

The answer to both these queries is a resounding "yes". As regards the identity of the "unidentified American newspaperman," in a later book (Always the unexpected). (19) Lochner quotes with some pride a passage from W. Byford-Jones's Berlin Twilight (20) regarding his role in supplying this document to the Nuremberg Tribunal. It reads:

My coming with Louis Lockner [sic] had made the visit more exciting because he was no ordinary observer at the historic trial of the major war criminals. He had told me how he was responsible for the delivery of one of the most sensational of innumerable documents to prove Nazi conspiracy. This document, which described how Hitler maliciously planned the beginning of the Second World War by an attack on Poland... was given to Louis Lockner in Germany just before America came into the war, by a confidant of Colonel-General von Beck, and, having first written on top of it "'Ein Stuck gemeine Propaganda" (A piece of filthy propaganda) (to protect himself if the Germans searched him), he smuggled it to America. (21)

Since Lochner related same story in the 1942 What About Germany? in regard to his initial receipt of the purported Obersalzberg transcript, there can be no doubt that the was Alderman's "unidentified American newspaperman." (22)

Furthermore, all three known versions of the speech containing the "who remembers the Armenians" passage (see Appendix II)-Lochner's 1942 What About Germany? version; US-28 (or L-3), the document discussed at the November 26 session of the Nuremberg Tribunal; and the one quoted in the Times of London article of November 24, 1945-are identical copies of the same document, i.e., the one which Lochner in 1956 finally identified as having come into his possession from a confidant of Colonel-General Beck, (23) An awareness of Beck's role in the purveyance of this version of the speech may lend insight into the differences between the Lochner version, which was not accepted by the Nuremberg Tribunal, and the two sets of minutes of the Obersalzberg meetings that were accepted by the Nuremberg Tribunal and the Halder diary account (see Appendix III): Admiral Boehm's minutes of the meetings; and General Halder's minutes of the meetings.

By August 1939 General Beck was the acknowledged leader, along with Halder, of that faction of the German officer corps plotting against Hitler and the Nazis. (24) If, as Lochner claimed, he had received his version of the Obersalzberg speech via Beck, i.e., if it were leaked to him as an American newspaperman by forces opposed to Hitler, this could well account for Shier's assessment of the Lochner version as "embellished a little by persons who were not present at the Berghof." (25) His assessment is in fact a gross understatement. A comparison of the Lochner version with the Nuremberg and Halder versions, shows that the former contains far more than a little "'embellishment." Passages which would have lent themselves to stronger anti-Hitler propaganda found in the Lochner version, are totally missing from the Nuremberg and Halder versions. These include the following phrases each of which, if published in the West, would have effectively portrayed Hitler in an extremely negative light to his allies (or potential allies), to the neutrals, and to the rest of the world:

Mussolini is threatened by a nit-wit of a king and the treasonable scoundrel of a crown prince.

After Stalin's death-he is a very sick man-we shall demolish the Soviet Union.

The (Japanese) Emperor is a counterpart of the last Czar. Weak, cowardly, undecided.

I got to know those wretched worms, Daladier and Chamberlain, in Munich.

(The peoples of the Far East and Arabia are) at best lacquered semi apes who crave to be flogged.

Carol of Romania is a thoroughly corrupt slave of his sexual desires.

The King of Belgium and the Nordic Kings are soft jumping jacks.

I'll have anybody who utters but one word of criticism executed by a firing squad.

(I have given) orders to send to death mercilessly, and without compassion, men, women, and children of Polish derivation and language. Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians? (26)

In short, a comparison of the Lochner and Nuremberg versions of the August 22, 1939, Obersalzberg speech, strongly suggest that the one leaked to Lochner by the confidant of Beck was a strongly doctored version designed for propaganda purposes. This interpretation is supported by the fact the General Halder's detailed diary entries for August 22, 1939, contain none of the above passages. Halder was, by that date, firmly in the ranks of the anti-Hitler German officers, and presumably he would have had no interest in censoring his own diary had Hitler in fact made such statements. (27)

While it may never be possible to completely reconstruct the reasons behind these addenda to the Obersalzberg speech and the manner in which they were made, nor why Lochner was chosen as the conduit to transmit them to the West, one thing is certain: The only versions of the Obersalzberg speech containing any reference to the Armenians derive from a single source-Louis P. Lochner.

Thus, not only is the provenance of US-28 (L-3) doubtful, but the actual transcripts of Hitler's Obersalzberg speech (US-30/1104-PS, Boehm, and Halder) are at total variance with the text of the Lochner version vis-à-vis the alleged Armenian statement (compare Appendices II and III). Therefore one cannot help but share the opinions of the Nuremberg prosecutor and William Shirer and reject the Lochner version.

Why Has the Lochner Version Assumed the Importance That It Has?

Why and how has a spurious quotation of forty-five years ago become so important that it has been cited by no fewer than twenty-two members of the U.S. Congress in 1984? The answer is complex and closely linked to American ethnic politics. Taking advantage of the flurry of press interest aroused by the activities of Armenian terrorist groups, activities which in the past decade have resulted in the assassinations of over thirty-five Turkish diplomats, (28) Armenian-American spokesmen have stepped up their ongoing campaign of vilification against the Republic of Turkey which they allege was responsible for the "genocide" of more than 1.5 million Armenians during the First World War. Unhampered by the limitations of logic or truth, these spokesmen attempt to justify current Armenian violence against innocent diplomats to Armenians suffering in the course of the First World War.

In terms of logic (or the lack thereof), this is comparable to the descendants of peoples who suffered under the last Russian czars running around shooting Soviet diplomats today. Both the Soviet Union and the Republic of Turkey began their existence as revolutionary states in the wake of the First World War the former emerging from the ashes of the Russian empire, while the latter was created from the ruins of the 600-years-old Ottoman empire, the political entity in existence at

the time of the alleged genocide.

A significant portion of Armenian propaganda efforts in recent years has been devoted to establishing a linkage between their own historical experiences and those of European Jewry during the Second World War. The cornerstone in their case has long been the spurious Hitler quote, "Who, after all, speaks today of the extermination of the Armenians?" Certainly the argument that Hitler himself cited the world's lack of reaction to the fate of the Armenians and was encouraged by it, must be very poignant to Jews. The following examples will serve to illustrate the mileage hitherto obtained by Armenian-Americans in this regard:

1. Under the tutelage of an Armenian-American Congressman, Charles Pashayan, Jr. (R-Calif.), [\(29\)](#) sixty-six elected U.S. Representatives made speeches on or about April 24, 1984 (Armenian Martyrs' Day), condemning the Republic of Turkey, a NATO ally, for failing to acknowledge its responsibility for the "genocide" of the Armenians which allegedly transpired a decade before the Republic came into existence.

2. As noted earlier, seven of the twenty-two members of the U.S. Congress (three Senators and four Congressmen), who used the alleged Hitler quote in the course of their April 24, 1984, remarks, were Jewish.

3. Utilizing the "linkage" conveniently provided by the spurious Hitler quote, the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council has agreed that the Armenians were the victims of the twentieth century's first genocide and therefore deserve inclusion in the planned memorial. Indeed Elie Wiesel, himself a Holocaust survivor and Chairman of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, in a 1981 speech delivered in the Capitol rotunda stated, "Before the planning of the final solution Hitler asked, 'Who remembers the Armenians?' He was right. No one remembered them, as no one remembered the Jews. Rejected by everyone, they felt expelled from history." [\(30\)](#)

In a similar vein, Congressman Glenn Anderson, in his April 24, 1984, remarks, discussed the inclusion of the Armenians in the planned Holocaust Memorial Council, established by an act of Congress in 1980, has unanimously resolved to include the Armenian genocide in its museums and education programs." [\(31\)](#)

4. During the past two years a number of state boards of education have adopted into their programs Holocaust curricula which include detailed treatment of the Armenian "genocide" as the precursor of the Jewish Holocaust. The curricula adopted by the states of Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New Jersey all stress the spurious Hitler quote as the tie that binds the Armenian and Jewish experiences. In New Jersey, the curriculum was actually prepared and published by the B'nai B'rith anti-Defamation League. This is, to say the least, ironic, as the continued repetition of the spurious Hitler quote, as it is used today, certainly defames the Turkish people.

5. On September 10, 1984, the U.S. House of Representatives unanimously passed a resolution (House Joint Resolution 247) designating April 24 as a National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man, and requesting the President of the United States to issue a proclamation calling upon the American people to observe such a day of remembrance for all the victims of genocide, "especially the one and one-half million people of Armenian ancestry who were victims of the genocide perpetrated in Turkey between 1915 and 1923." [\(32\)](#)

This resolution, both by naming April 24 Armenian Martyrs' Day and by specifically naming only Turkey as the "perpetrator" of a "genocide," does nothing less than brand one of the United States' NATO allies with the historically controversial charge of genocide. In regard to the label itself, the fact remains that the years 1915 and 1923; rather, the governing power in the region was the

multinational state known as the ottoman Empire."(33)

House Joint Resolution 247 was submitted by Congressman Tony Coehlo (D-Calif.) and 233 co-sponsors. Of interest to us is the fact that Coehlo, who represents the "heartland" of California's Armenian community (the Merced-Fresno region of the San Joaquin Valley), cited the purported Hitler quote in urging his colleagues to vote for passage of H. J. Res. 247." (34)

In addition to his own utilization of the quote, Coehlo also entered a letter from California's Armenian-American Governor, George Deukmejian, supporting the resolution's passage in the record. In support of H. J. Res 247, Deukmejian wrote, "One cannot ignore the chilling words of Adolph Hitler before he began his reign of error during World War II, "Who still talks nowadays of the extermination of the Armenians?" (35)

At the time of this writing the U. S. Senate is considering the adoption of their half of this joint resolution.

Leaving aside the larger question of whether or not the fate of the Ottoman Armenians in 1914-1915 was in fact anything that could conceivably be termed a genocide, and focusing only on the matter at hand, the spurious Hitler quote, we find that three things come immediately to mind.

The first is the obvious danger inherent in partisan ethnic politics as currently practiced in the United States. To appease a handful of potential voters, some American politicians are willing to allow themselves to be used as tools of ethnic pressure groups, regardless of the truth or falsehood of the information they are fed.

Secondly, one cannot help but marvel at the patience of the Republic of Turkey, which, beleaguered by economic and social problems of its own, also has to cope with misinformed American politicians lecturing her on her own history. It is safe to say that if the U. S. Congress spent as much time hammering at the Federal Republic of Germany (another NATO ally) for the well-Documented events which transpired forty years ago in that nation's history, as they spend lecturing the Republic of Turkey for actions alleged to have occurred seventy years ago in the Ottoman empire, the North Atlantic Treaty organization would long since have lost a member.

Finally, given the serious problems facing our nation, e.g., the arms race, unemployment, and budget deficits, in conjunction with the fact that as this study has repeatedly demonstrated, history is clearly not the forte of many U.S. Congressmen and Senators, it is not impertinent to suggest that the Congress would be better served if its members were to confine their activities to the business at hand heave the writing of history to the historians.

[Appendix](#)

Assembly of Turkish American Associations
1526 18th St, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036 Telephone: (202) 483-9090, Fax: (202) 483-9092 email: assembly@ataa.org

Copyright © ATAA



The U.S. Congress and Adolf Hitler on the Armenians

Heath W. Lowry
Institute of Turkish Studies, Inc. Washington, D.C.
Political Communication and Persuasion, Volume 3, Number 2 (1985)

Appendix I. Experts from Congressional Speeches on the Armenians

SENATOR RUDY BOSCHWITZ, R-Minn. (CR-Senate, 4/25/84, p. S4852): When Hitler first proposed his final solution, he was told that the world would never permit such a mass murder. Hitler silenced his advisers by asking, "Who remembers the Armenians?"

Today, I join my colleagues in answering Hitler by pledging the truth.

SENATOR CARL LEVIN, D-Mich. (CR-Senate, 4/24/84, p. S4703): But, regrettably it was soon forgotten, not by the surviving Armenians, but by most of the rest of the world. So that when Adolf Hitler planned his invasion of Poland and the destruction of the Jewish people, he was able to scornfully state, "Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?"

SENATOR HOWARD METZENBAUM, D-Ohio (CR-Senate, 4/24/84, p. S4719): Three years ago, in a speech given here in the Capital rotunda, Elie Wiesel, Chairman of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, made a telling point.

Professor Wiesel said: "Before the planning of the final solution Hitler asked "Who remembers the Armenians?" He was right. No one remembered them, as no one remembered the Jews. Rejected by everyone, they felt expelled from history."

CONGRESSMAN LES ASPIN, D-Wis. (CR-House, 4/24/84, p. H2977): Two decades later, when Adolf Hitler was planning the elimination of the Jewish people, he is reported to have said, "Who remembers the Armenians?"

CONGRESSMAN HOWARD BERMAN, D-Calif. (CR-House, 4/24/84, p. H2982): It should be a source of concern to all of us that to this day Turkey does not acknowledge, despite eyewitness accounts, either the facts or its historical responsibility; for the line from Armenia to Auschwitz is direct. The holocaust of European Jewry has its precedence in the events of 1915 to 1922. "Who still talks nowadays of the extermination of the Armenians," Hitler told his generals on the eve of the extermination of the Jews. The horrendous events of World War II overshadowed the Armenian genocide, and it is only recently, through the peaceful efforts of the Armenian groups, that the rest of the world has once again begun to recognize the collective agony of the Armenian people.

CONGRESSMAN THOMAS BLILEY, R-Va. (CR-House, 4/24/84, p. H2979): Mr. Speaker, I know that the actions of the Ottoman Government did not lead directly to the forced starvation of the Ukraine by Josef Stalin, the gas chambers of Auschwitz, the gruesome slaughter of the Cambodians. Idi Amin's death campaign in Uganda, and the more recent actions in Matabeleland in Zimbabwe, but I know that human nature, even a warped and infamous human nature, needs the comfort of believing that it can get

away with something before it proceeds. As an example I would cite Adolf Hitler's statement concerning the final solution for the Jews of Europe when he said, "Who now remembers the Armenians?" If more proof is needed then we can all look up Idi Amin's frequent statements of his adoration for Adolf Hitler as a man who knew how to handle a problem.

CONGRESSMAN EDWARD BOLAND, D-Mass. (CR-House, 4/24/84, p. H2975): The silence with which the community of nations greeted the decimation of the Armenian people may have emboldened those who would later perpetrate similar acts. It certainly had an effect on Adolf Hitler who while planning the extermination of millions of Jews was asked how the world would respond a program of mass murder. In reply Hitler said, "Who remembers the Armenians?"

CONGRESSWOMAN BARBARA BOXER, D-Calif. (CR-House, 4/24/84, p. H2977): The repeated denials of these well documented crimes of the Ottoman Turkish regime call to mind the Nazi maxim that a big lie if often repeated becomes truth. Hitler himself cited the Armenians massacres as evidence that humanity cares nothing for the murder of a people.

CONGRESSMAN JIM COURTER, R-N.J (CR-House, 4/24/84, p. H2977): But here can be no could that this ignorance of history's darker events aids those who perpetrate them, and those who would do son in the future. It is known that Hitler cited that fact that the Armenian genocide was little known, little discussed and little remembered in his time. We can only imagine the conclusions he drew from this fact.

CONGRESSMAN MERVYN DYMALLY, D-Calif. (CR-House, 4/12/84, p. H2924): Today, historians argue about the number of Armenians actually killed. Others claim that no genocide took place at all. This is a devastating conclusion to the survivors, whether they be Americans, Lebanese, Egyptians, French or citizens of any other country..... If we deny the Armenian Genocide -a historical event that has been well documented- we echo the words of Adolph [sic] Hitler who said, "Who still talks nowadays, of the extermination of Armenians?"

CONGRESSMAN EDWARD FEIGHAN, D-Ohio (CR-House, 4/24/84, p. H2971): But only twenty years after the fact, the century's first genocide was the "forgotten genocide." As Hitler paused on the edge of his own reign of terror, he asked "Who remembers the Armenians?" And no one had. A world blind to the lessons of history saw them repeated on a wider scale.

CONGRESSWOMAN GERALDINE FERRARO, D-N.Y. (*Quoted in the Armenian Reporter, July 26, 1984, p.2.*) I have dwelled on the Armenian genocide not because it is unique as a flagrant abuse of human rights, but precisely because it is not unique. The world knew about the Nazi Holocaust against the Jews and failed to act. Those failures spread the shame of these unspeakable crimes against humanity far beyond those directly responsible for them.

The events in Turkey in 1915 and in Germany in World War II, and in Cambodia in the 1970's, are of course not directly related. The madness and brutality of the perpetrators of each genocide had their own tragic basis.

But there is a strong tie in the world's silence in the face of each of these horrors. We can only be haunted by the words of Adolph Hitler, who said, in embarking on his "crazed attack" on the Jews. "Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?"

Now, today, years too late for the millions killed in the Nazi gas chambers and Khmer Rouge execution centers, we stand to say that we speak of the annihilation of the Armenians. And of the Jews, and of the Cambodians. We stand to remind the world of these crimes against humanity, that we may prevent future crimes.

CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON FISH, R-N.Y. (CR-House, 4/24/84, p. H2982): In speaking of the consequences of the Jewish Holocaust, Adolf Hitler once remarked: "Who remembers the Armenians?" Indeed it is our responsibility to do just that; remember that which we would rather choose to forget.

CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM FORD, D-Mich (CR_House, 4/24/84, p. H2981): Even Adolf Hitler used past events to shape his own policies. In 1939 as he was beginning his invasion of Poland, Hitler ordered the mass extermination of its inhabitants, commenting, "Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?" Humanity's failure to remember the genocide of an entire people scarcely 25 years earlier gave Hitler the go ahead to exterminate millions of innocent people.

CONGRESSMAN SAM GEJDENSON, D-Conn. (CR-House, 4/25/84, p. E1766): In the now infamous quote, Adolf Hitler, before beginning his Holocaust against the Jews, referred to international indifference in the face of the Armenian genocide, "Who," he asked, "remembers the Armenians?"

CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM GREEN, R-N.Y. (CR-House, 4/2/84, p. H2972): When Hitler was about to begin the Holocaust and a member of his staff asked him what the world would think, Hitler is reported to have replied, "Who remembers the Armenians?"

CONGRESSMAN RICHARD LEHMAN, D-Calif. (CR-House, 4/12/84, p.H2793): Questioned by an aide about his policy of Jewish genocide, Hitler said: "Who after all now remembers the annihilation of the Armenians?"

CONGRESSMAN BRUCE MORRISON, Conn. (CR-House, 4/24/84, p. H2979): Adolf Hitler took advantage of the world's amnesia, looking at the Armenian genocide as a precedent for his own Holocaust perpetrated against Europe's Jews. Hitler said, in a chilling remark made in 1939. "Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?"

CONGRESSMAN NICHOLAS MAVROULES, D-Mass. (CR-House, 4/24/84, p. H2979): Sadly, however, the Armenian genocide would be surpassed by the Nazi holocaust in the 1930's and 1940's. Adolf Hitler, in an attempt to explain away his maniacal slaughter, would ask with a laugh: "Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?"

CONGRESSMAN CHARLES SCHUMER, D-N.Y. (CR-House, 4/24/84, p. H2976): It is of paramount importance that we do not let this tragedy be forgotten with the passage of time. This act of inhumanity, based on religious and nationalistic grounds, was as terrible as any manmade catastrophe to that time yet only two decades later Hitler could ask, "Who remembers the Armenians?" Perhaps if the world had paid more attention to the plight of the Armenian massacre later tragedies could have been averted.

CONGRESSMAN JAMES SHANNON, D-Mass. (CR-House, 4/24/84, p. H2973): This act of wholesale annihilation set the stage for Hitler's attempted extermination of the Jewish people. He justified his plan to doubting coconspirators with the reasoning that no one remembered the Armenian genocide which had taken place only 15 years earlier.

CONGRESSMAN HENRY WAXMAN, D-Caliph. (CR-House, 4/24/84, p. H2981): This day server to remind us that this first genocide of our century served as a precedent for the holocaust of World War II when more than 6 million people were destroyed by a government leader who responded: "Whoever cared about the Armenians?" When it was suggested that world opinion would not allow the Nazis to get away with their attempt to eliminate the Jewish people.

APPENDIX II: Excerpts from the Lochner Version of the August 22, 1939, Obersalzberg Speech Dealing

with the Planned Invasion of Poland

Lochner, 1942, p.2: Our strength consists of our speed and in our brutality. Genghis Khan led millions of women and children to slaughter ñ with premeditation and a happy heart. History sees in him solely the founder of a state. It's matter of indifference to me what a weak western European civilization will say about me.

I have issued the command ñI'll have anybody who utter one word of criticism executed by a firing squad- that our war aim does not consist in reaching certain lines, but in the physical destruction of the enemy.

Accordingly, I have placed my death head formations in readiness ñ for the present only in the East ñ with orders to them do send to death mercilessly and without compassion, men, women and children of Polish derivation and language. Only thus shall we gain the living space [*lebensraum*] which we need. Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?

NCA, Volume VII, p. 753: Our strength is in our quickness and our brutality. Ghenghis Khan had millions of women and children killed by his own will and with a gay heart. History sees only in him a great state builder. What weak Western European civilization thinks about me does not matter.

I have given the order, and will have everyone shot who utters one word of criticism that the aim of the war is not to attain certain lines, but consist in the physical destruction of the opponent. Thus for the time being I have sent to the East only my "Death's Head units" with the order to kill without pity or mercy all men, women, and children of the Polish race or language. Only in such a way will we win the vital space that we need. Who still talks nowadays of the extermination of the Armenians?

The Times, November 24, 1945, p. 4: Our strength is in our quickness and our brutality. Ghengis Khan had millions of women killed by his own will and with a gay heart. History sees in him only a great State-builder. What the weak European civilization thinks about me does not matter.

I have given the order, and will have everyone shot who utters one word of criticism...

Thus for the time being I have sent to the East only my Death's Head units, with the order to kill without pity or mercy all men, women, and children of the Polish race or language. Who still talks nowadays of the extermination of the Armenians?

APPENDIX III: Excerpts from the Nuremberg Versions of the August 22, 1939, Obersalzberg Speech

Dealing with the Planned Invasion of Poland

Us-30 [1014-PS]

TMWC, Vol. II, pp. 290-291

NCA, Vol. III, pp. 665-666

DGFP, Vol. VII, pp. 205-206

Destruction of Poland in the foreground. The aim is elimination of living forces, not the arrival at a certain line: Even if war should break out in the West, the destruction of Poland shall be the primary objective. Quick decision because of the season.

I shall give a propagandistic cause for starting the war ñ never mind whether it bi plausible or not. The victor shall not be asked, later on, whether we told the truth or not. In starting and making a war, not be Right is what matters but Victory.

Have no pity. Brutal attitude. 80 million people shall get what is their right. Their existence has to be secured. The strongest has the right. Greatest severity.

Quick decision necessary. Un shakable faith in German soldier. A crisis may happen only if the nerves of the leaders give way.

First aim: advance to the Vistula and Narew. Our technical superiority will break the nerve of the Poles. Every newly created Polish force shall again be broken at once. Constant war of attrition.

New German frontier according to healthily principles. Possibly a protectorate as a buffer. Military operations shall not be influenced by these reflections. Complete destruction of Poland is a military aim. To be fast is the main thing. Pursuit until complete elimination.

Boehm, August 22, 1939 TMWC, Vol. XLI, p.25: The goal is the elimination and destruction of Poland's military power even if war should begin in the west. A swift, successful outcome in the east offers the best prospects for restricting the conflict.

A suitable propaganda cause will be advanced for the conflict. The credibility of this is unimportant. Right lies with the victor.

We must shut and harden our hearts. To whomever ponders the world order it is clear that what is important are the war ñlike accomplishments of the best....

We can and must believe in the value of the German soldier. In times of crisis he has generally retained his nerve, while the leadership has lost theirs....

Once again: the first priority is the swiftness of the operations. To adapt to each new situation to shatter the hostile forces, wherever they appear and to the last one.

This is the military goal which is the prerequisite for the narrower political foal of later drawing up new frontiers.

Halder, August 22, 1939, DGFP, Vol. VII, p. 559: Aim: Annihilation of Poland ñ elimination of its vital forces. It is not a matter of gaining a specific line or new frontier, but rather the annihilation of an enemy, which constantly must be attempted by new always.

Solution: Means immaterial. The victor is never called on to vindicate his actions. We are not concerned with having justice on our side, but solely with having justice on our side, but solely with victory.

Execution: Harsh and remorseless. Be steeled against all signs of compassion!

Speed: Faith in the German soldier, even if reverses occur.

Of paramount importance are the wedges [which must be driven] from the southeast to the Vistula, and from the north to the Narev and the Vistula.

Promptness in meeting new situations; new means must be devised to deal with them quickly.

New Frontiers: New Reich territory. Outlying protectorate territory. Military operations must not be affected by regard for the future frontiers.

Notes

1. The entire text of Hovannisian's 1983 speech was read into the Congressional Record-Senate, pp. S4713-S4715, by Senator Carl Levin (D-Mich.) on April 24, 1984, as part of his remarks entitled. "69th anniversary of Armenian Martyrs' Day." Hovannisian's use of the alleged Hitler quote appears on p. S4714. On p. S4704 Levin notes that the Hovannisian speech had similar fact sheets and articles which he entered into the Record were provided him by the Armenian Assembly.

2. The Time, Saturday, November 24, 1945, p. 4. While the alleged Hitler quote on the Armenians normally appears bereft of source (as in the example cited above by Hovannisian), when "documented" the Times article is invariably given. The unidentified author of the Times article claims that his story was based on "An address by Hitler to his commanders-in-chief on August 22, 1939 ña few days before the invasion of Poland- was read at yesterday's hearing of the Nuremberg trial [November 23, 1945]."

3. Italics added.

4. Louis P. Lochner, What About Germany? (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1942), pp. 1-4 (hereafter cited as Lochner, 1942).

5. Lochner, 1942, p. 1

6. Lochner, 1942, p. 2 (italics added).

7. Lochner, 1942, p. 2.

8. Congressional Record ñHouse, p. H2981 (April 24, 1984).

9. See Appendix I for the use of the alleged Hitler quote in the remarks of the sixteen U.S. lawmakers.

10. The minutes of the August 22, 1939, Obersalzberg meeting kept by admiral Boehm were submitted as evidence at Nuremberg in defense of Admiral Raeder.

11. The documents confiscated from the OKW were in number. They were accepted by the Nuremberg prosecutors as the official minutes of the August 22, 1939, Obersalzberg meeting. As such they are preserved as part of the trial transcripts: TMWC, Volume II (New York: AMS Press, 1971), pp. 285-293. Given the trial numbers of US-29 (798-PS) and US-30 (1014-PS)., respectively, these documents were also published in Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression (hereafter cited as NCA). There, US-29 (798-PS) appears in Volume III, pp. 581-596, and US-30 (1014-PS) in the same volume on pp. 665-666. Likewise, they appear in Document on German Foreign Policy. 1918-1945, Series D (1937-1945), Volume VII (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1956) (hereafter cited as DGFP), pp. 200-206. In subsequent citations of these documents I shall cite the appropriate page numbers from each of the three publications listed above.

12. General Franz Halders notes from the August 22, 1939, Obersalzberg meeting, while not submitted as evidence at Nuremberg, were subsequently published in DGFP, pp. 557-559 (hereafter cited as

Halder, August 22, 1939).

13. William Shirer, *The Rise and fall of the Third Reich* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1960), p. 529-532. See in particular his detailed description of the documents in question on p. 529 (hereafter cited as Shirer, 1960).

14. Shirer, 1960. fn. P. 529.

15. This passage is taken from the transcript of the Nuremberg tribunal: TMWC, Volume II (New York: AMS Press, 1971), pp. 285-286 (*italics added*). The document discussed (but not submitted as evidence) by Prosecutor Alderman as Exhibit USA-28 was subsequently published in NCA, Volume VII, pp. 752-754, where it was given the number L-3 (Note Shirer, 1960 fn. 529, mistakenly lists its number in this publication as: C-3).

16. TMWC, Volume II, p. 291.

17. TMWC, Volume II, p. 291 (*italics added*).

18. TMWC, Volume II, p. 292.

19. Louis P. Lochner, *Always the Unexpected* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956), p. 287 (hereafter cited as Lochner. 1956).

20. Lieutenant-Colonel W. Byford-Jones, *Berlin Twilight* (London: Hutchinson & Co. Ltd. 1946), pp. 174, a76-77.

21. Lochner, 1956, pp. 287-288 (*italics added*).

22. Lochner, 1942, p. 405. What is harder to account for is the fact that neither the Nuremberg prosecutors nor William Shirer was aware of the fact that Lochner had originally published his document in 1942. In Lochner, 1956, p. 314, the author tells us that his *What About Germany?* appeared in print on October 15, 1942, and "it was on the best-seller lists for a considerable time." Despite this fact, the present study is the first to establish that US-28 (L-3), the document discussed but not introduced as evidence in the course of the Nuremberg trials, was supplied to the prosecutors at Nuremberg by Lochner, and had in fact been published by him in 1942.

23. Lochner, 1956, pp. 287-288.

24. Shirer, 1960. For Beck's role as an organizer of the anti-Hitler conspiracy, see pp. 309, 366-375, 422, 488.

25. Shirer, 1960, fn. P. 529.

26. See Lochner, 1942, pp. 1-4, and NCA, Volume VII, pp. 752-754.

27. For a description of Halder's role in the anti-Hitler conspiracy, see Shirer, 1960, pp. 374-375, 378-379, fn. 380, 381-382, 404-408, 411-413, 422, 426, 517, 530, 558-559.

28. For an analysis of the manner in which Armenian spokesmen use the activities of terrorists to further their cause, see Heath W. Lowry, "Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Armenian Terrorism: Threads of Continuity," in *International Terrorism and the Drug Connection* (Ankara: Ankara University Press,

1984), pp. 71-83.

29. It was Pashayan who "took the special order" on April 24, 1984, under which the various members of the House of Representatives made their speeches on Armenian Martyrs' Day See Congressional Record- House, p. H2967 (April 24, 1984)

30. Quoted in the April 24, 1984, remarks of Senator Howard Metzenbaum (D-Ohio), which were published in the Congressional Record-Senate, p. S4719 (April 24, 1984).

31. Quoted in the April 24, 1984, remarks of Congressional Glenn Anderson (D-Calif), which were published in the Congressional Record-House, p. H2970 (April 24, 1984).

32. Congressional Record-House, p.H9227 (September 10, 1984).

33. The most authoritative scholarly work dealing with the Ottoman population of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is Justin McCarthy's Muslim and Minorities: The Population of Ottoman Anatolia and the End of the Empire (New York and London: New York University Press. 1983). This demographic study shows (pp. 47-88) that Armenian deaths during the period in question did not exceed 600,000 and resulted from the same wartime conditions of starvation, epidemic disease, and inter communal warfare which accounted for the loss of 2.5 million Muslim lies in the same period. The author provides no breakdown of the percentage of deaths experienced by either group resulting from the various causes he discusses.

34. Congressional Record-House, p. H 9228 (September 10, 1984).

35. Congressional Record-House, p. H 9228 (September 10, 1984)

Assembly of Turkish American Associations
1526 18th St, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036 Telephone: (202) 483-9090, Fax: (202) 483-9092 email: assembly@ataa.org

Copyright © ATAA

VITA

Tamar Meguerditchian, a native of New Orleans, Louisiana, is a graduate student in The Manship School of Mass Communication at Louisiana State University. She received her undergraduate degree in mass communication with an emphasis in public relations and a minor in Spanish from Loyola University New Orleans in May 2004. As an active member in the Public Relations Student Society of America, she planned and coordinated the 2003 PRSSA National Conference in New Orleans. Her background in public relations includes internships and positions in both the private and public sectors – education, tourism, event planning, research and government relations. She has interned for the New Orleans Convention & Visitor's Bureau, the Public Relations Society of America and the National Association of Television Program Executives. While completing her master's degree at The Manship School, she served as the public relations graduate assistant at the LSU College of Engineering. Currently, a public relations account executive at Keating Magee Momentum Marketing in New Orleans, she is currently a candidate for the degree of Master of Mass Communication for the commencement of May 2007.