

THE RE-EMERGENCE OF THE ARMENIAN QUESTION AS AN ASPECT OF
ARMENIAN NATIONALISM AND ITS EFFECTS ON TURKEY: 1960-1990

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

YELİZ GÜNEŞ

IN PARTIAL FULLFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
IN THE PROGRAM OF MIDDLE EAST STUDIES

MAY 2010

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Recep Boztemur
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Birten Çelik
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Ceylan Tokluođlu	(METU, SOC)	_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Recep Boztemur	(METU, HIST)	_____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Birten Çelik	(METU, HIST)	_____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name: Yeliz Güneş

Signature:

ABSTRACT

THE RE-EMERGENCE OF THE ARMENIAN QUESTION AS AN ASPECT OF ARMENIAN NATIONALISM AND ITS EFFECTS ON TURKEY: 1960-1990

Güneş, Yeliz

M.Sc., Program of Middle East Studies

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Birten Çelik

May 2010, 131 pages.

This thesis aims to analyze the re-emergence of the Armenian question as an aspect of Armenian nationalism and its effects on Turkey between the years 1960 and 1990. The Armenian question is a very controversial political issue with its multi-dimensional characteristic. The Armenian question emerged with the Ottoman Armenians' autonomy demands as an extension of Armenian nationalism in the nineteenth century. With the interest of the imperialist states, the Armenian question became an international problem especially after the Ottoman-Russian War of 1877-1878. Although the Armenian question reached its peak in World War I, it dropped from the international agenda by the Peace Treaty of Lausanne in 1923. After World War II, the Armenian question was transformed into an international issue once again by Joseph Stalin the leader of the USSR that was used as a political trump against Turkey in the Cold War period. Especially, the date April 24, 1965 became a remarkable turning point in the re-emergence of the Armenian question as an aspect of Armenian nationalism. Since 1965, the Armenian Diaspora has used the Armenian question to materialize dream of the "Greater Armenia." Today, the Armenian question has affected Turkey's bilateral and multilateral relations with other countries especially with the Republic of Armenia and the United States of America. By this thesis, these whole facts will be analyzed to expose the historical background of the re-emergence of the Armenian question as an aspect of Armenian nationalism,

and its effects on Turkey between the years 1960-1990, and to contribute to the academic literature.

Keywords: Armenian question, 24 April 1915, Armenia, Turkey, Armenian Diaspora, United States of America.

ÖZ

ERMENİ SORUNUNUN ERMENİ MİLLİYETÇİLİĞİNİN BİR BOYUTU OLARAK YENİDEN ORTAYA ÇIKMASI VE TÜRKİYE ÜZERİNDEKİ ETKİLERİ: 1960-1990

Güneş, Yeliz

Yüksek Lisans, Ortadoğu Araştırmaları Programı

Tez Danışmanı: Yard. Doç. Dr. Birten Çelik

Mayıs 2010, 131 sayfa

Bu tez, 1960 ve 1990 yılları arasında, Ermeni sorununun, Ermeni milliyetçiliğinin bir boyutu olarak yeniden ortaya çıkışını ve bunun Türkiye üzerindeki etkilerini analiz etmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Çok boyutlu özelliği ile Ermeni sorunu, tartışmaya oldukça açık, siyasi bir meseledir. Ermeni sorunu, Ermeni milliyetçiliğinin bir uzantısı olarak, Osmanlı Ermenilerinin otonomi talepleri ile on dokuzuncu yüzyılda ortaya çıkmıştır. Emperyalist devletlerin ilgisi ile Ermeni sorunu, özellikle 1877-1878 Osmanlı-Rus Savaşı'ndan sonra, uluslararası bir sorun haline gelmiştir. Bu sorun, Birinci Dünya Savaşı'nda doruk noktasına ulaşmış olmasına rağmen, 1923 senesinde Lozan Barış Antlaşması ile uluslararası gündemden düşmüştür. İkinci Dünya Savaşı sonrasında, Sovyetler Birliği lideri Joseph Stalin tarafından bir kez daha uluslararası bir sorun haline dönüştürülen Ermeni sorunu Soğuk Savaş döneminde Türkiye'ye karşı politik bir koz olarak kullanılmıştır. Özellikle 24 Nisan 1965 tarihi, Ermeni sorununun Ermeni milliyetçiliğinin bir boyutu olarak yeniden gündeme getirilmesinde önemli bir dönüm noktası olmuştur. 1965 yılından itibaren, Ermeni Diasporası Ermeni sorununu "Büyük Ermenistan" hayalini gerçekleştirecek bir siyasi araç olarak kullanmaktadır. Bugün, Ermeni sorunu, Türkiye'nin diğer ülkelerle, özellikle Ermenistan Cumhuriyeti ve Amerika Birleşik Devletleri ile olan ikili ve çok yönlü ilişkilerini olumsuz yönde etkilemektedir. Bu gerçekler de bu tezde, Ermeni sorununun Ermeni milliyetçiliğinin bir boyutu olarak yeniden ortaya çıkışının

tarihsel gemişini ve 1960-1990 yılları arasında Türkiye üzerindeki etkilerini ortaya koymak ve akademik literatüre katkıda bulunmak için analiz edilecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Ermeni sorunu, 24 Nisan 1915, Ermenistan, Türkiye, Ermeni Diasporası, Amerika Birleşik Devletleri.

To My Family...

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The completion of this thesis was made possible through contribution of a number of people. To say “thank you” to all of you is not enough to express my gratitude.

The first and foremost of whom is Assist. Prof. Dr. Birten Çelik, my thesis supervisor. I express my deepest gratitude for her guidance, and advice throughout this work. Without her encouragement and criticism, this thesis would not have been completed.

Second, I would like to extend my thanks to Prof. Dr. Ceylan Tokluoğlu and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Recep Boztemur, all are included in my thesis jury, for spending their valuable time to read and review my thesis. Without their suggestions and comments, I would not be able to improve the academic quality of my thesis as it is now.

Third, I would like to thank my friends from the bottom of my heart. They have lent a hand in order to complete my thesis.

Last but not least, I would like to express my gratitude to my family for their love and support throughout my life. I am grateful to my mother, and my father. I have no suitable word that can fully describe their everlasting love for me. I would like to thank my brother and my sister-in-law for their prayers and supports. My warmest thanks go to my 32-month-old nephew Efe Deniz for his sunny smile, which makes me happy. He has been one of my sources of inspiration in completing this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
DEDICATION.....	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENT.....	x
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER	
1.THE EMERGENCE OF THE ARMENIAN QUESTION.....	12
1.1. The Armenians in the Ottoman Empire.....	12
1.2. The Armenian National Awakening and the Emergence of the Armenian Question.....	15
1.2.1. The Establishment of the Revolutionary Armenian Political Organizations.....	18
1.3. The Transfer of the Armenian Question to the International Agenda as an Integral Part of the Eastern Question.....	21
1.4. The Armenian Rebellions Before and During World War I.....	27
1.5. The Measures Taken by the Ottoman Government.....	34
1.5.1. The Decree of April 24 1915.....	34
1.5.2. The Relocation of the Armenians in 1915.....	38
1.6. The Fall of the Armenian Question from the International Agenda.....	41
2. ARMENIAN NATIONALISM AND THE RESOURCES KEEPING IT ALIVE.....	47
2.1. The Armenian Diaspora.....	47
2.1.1. Arab Nationalism and the Armenian Community in the Middle East	49

2.1.2. The Armenian Diaspora in the United States of America.....	52
2.1.2.1. The Armenian Church in the United States of America.....	55
2.1.2.2. Armenian Political Parties in the United States of America.....	56
2.2. The USSR and the Soviet Armenians.....	58
2.2.1. Vladimir Ilyich Lenin and the Soviet Armenians.....	59
2.2.2. Joseph Stalin and the Soviet Armenians.....	62
2.3. World War II and Its Effects on Armenian Nationalism.....	64
3. TURNING POINTS IN THE RE-EMERGENCE OF THE ARMENIAN QUESTION: COLD WAR PERIOD.....	69
3.1. Peace Operation in Cyprus and Its Role in the Armenian Question.....	70
3.2. The First Signs of the Re-Emergence of Armenian Nationalism.....	74
3.3. The Armenian Terrorist Organizations and the Armenian Terrorism.....	80
3.4. The Dissolution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Rise of Armenian Nationalism.....	85
4. THE POLITICIZATION AND INTERNATIONALIZATION OF THE ARMENIAN QUESTION: 1980-1990.....	88
4.1. Nagorno-Karabakh Dispute, and the Armenian Question in Levon Ter-Petrossian Period.....	89
4.2. The Armenian Question and Its Articulations into the Politics of the United States of America.....	95
4.2.1. Armenian Lobby Institutions in the United States of America.....	98
4.3. The Resolutions on the So-Called Armenian Genocide and Their Impacts on Turkish-American Relations.....	102
CONCLUSION.....	116
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	121

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AAA	Armenian Assembly of America
ABCFM	American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions
ACIA	American Committee for the Independence of Armenia
ACOLT	American Committee Opposed to Lausanne Treaty
AHI	American Hellenistic Institute
ANCA	Armenian National Committee of America
ANI	Armenian National Institute
ANM	Armenian National Movement
ARAMAC	Armenian-American Action Committee
ARF	Armenian Revolutionary Federation
APM	Armenian Pan-Nationalist Movement
ARP	Armenian Ramgavar Party
Armenian SSR	Armenian Soviet Socialistic Republic
ASALA	Armenian Secret Army for Liberation of Armenia
CPA	Communist Party of Armenia
CUP	Committee of Union and Progress
EU	European Union
JCAG	Justice Commandos for the Armenian Genocide
KAVBURO	Caucasian Bureau of the Russian Communist Party Central Committee
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NKAO	Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast

NKVD	People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OSCE	Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe
PKK	Kurdish Worker's Party
PLO	Palestine Liberation Organization
SDHP	Social Democratic Hunchakian Party
TGNA	Turkish Grand National Assembly
UN	United Nations
USSR	The Union of Soviet Socialist Republic
USA	The United States of America.

INTRODUCTION

Today, one of the most important political problems of Turkey is the Armenian allegations on the events of 1915 and their negative impacts on Turkey's bilateral and multilateral relations. Turkey has long been facing with a systematic propaganda campaign carried out by the Armenian Diaspora and the Armenian lobbying groups. The Armenian allegations in regard to the events of 1915 found mainly a base in the international political arena after World War II.¹ The Armenians living in the Armenian Diaspora in Europe and in the United States of America have asserted that the temporary relocation of Armenians, carried out under circumstances of war, culminated in the so-called Armenian genocide during World War I. Since the Cold War period, the events of 1915 have been approached with certain mutual political profits as well as with a prejudicial way of thinking, far from historical facts.

After the term genocide was used to condemn the mass destruction of the Jews, who were killed by Adolf Hitler's Nazi Germany at the end of World War II, the Diaspora Armenians have focused on finding similarities between the temporary relocation of Armenians in 1915, and the Jewish Holocaust.² In that period, the

¹It has been claimed that the events of 1915 began with the mass arrest of Armenians living in Istanbul on April 24, 1915. On that date, all Armenian political committees were closed, their documents were seized, as well as approximately 235 notable Armenians were arrested because of their revolutionary activities against the Ottoman Empire, and their collaborations with the Entente Powers during World War I. Then the arrested Armenians were sent to Ayaş and Çankırı. On May 27, 1915, the Ottoman Government passed a temporary law entitled the Relocation and Settlement (*Tehcir ve İskan Kanunu*) to relocate approximately 700,000 Armenians to other Ottoman provinces including Mosul, Der-el-Zor, Aleppo and Damascus. Of course, it is not denied that many Turks and Armenians passed away under the heavy conditions of wartime. Since the Cold War period, the Armenian propaganda against Turkey has been put into practice within the framework of the "Four T" plan in order to receive indemnity, and obtain territory from Turkey. The Armenian Diaspora has concentrated on the date April 24 as if it was the beginning of genocide. To keep alive the Armenian Question in the world, the Armenian Diaspora has worked to be arranged the date April 24 as a commemoration day for the Ottoman Armenians who passed away in the events of 1915. Day by day, many parliaments have adopted the Armenian resolutions to recognize the events of 1915 as a crime against humanity. For more detailed information see: Yusuf Sarıınay, "Decree of April 24, and Armenian Committee Members Arrested in İstanbul." *Review of Armenian Studies*, 15/16, 2007, pp. 69-82. See also, Kamuran Gürün, *The Armenian File: the Myth of Innocence Exposed*, (Nicosia, North Cyprus: K. Rüstem, 2001), pp.204-221.

² Ömer Engin Lütem, "Giriş," in Ömer Engin Lütem (ed.), *Ermeni Sorunu Temel Bilgi ve Belgeler*, (Ankara: ASAM,2007), p.1.

Armenians called the temporary relocation decision taken by the Ottoman Government and its results as the so-called Armenian genocide, which became an important core of Armenian identity for Armenian nationalism.³ After World War II, they assumed that they would be able to take revenge from Turkey in regard to the events of 1915, and they would be able to materialize their dreams on the “Greater Armenia.”⁴

The post-World War II period, which was called as the Cold War, provided conditions to force Turkey to accept their groundless allegations. How did these allegations affect Turkey in the Cold War period? The answer of this question dates back to the Armenian question, which began in the middle of the nineteenth century with the reform movement, and then the independence claims of the Ottoman Armenians. Without exposing the content of the Armenian question, it could not be possible to understand the effects of these allegations on Turkey in the Cold War period. As mentioned above, these allegations have created many obstacles for Turkey whenever she wanted to attempt to secure her national interests, and to become a full member of the European Union⁵, and to secure political and economic

³Genocide is a legal term. A Polish Jewish lawyer Raphael Lemkin defines crime of genocide as intention in order to destroy a nation, an ethnic, a racial, or a religious group. The term genocide was firstly used in the Nuremberg Tribunal on October 8, 1945. Then, the United Nations enacted the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide to describe genocide as “acts committed with intent to destroy in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group.” For more detailed information see: Gündüz Aktan, “Devletler Hukukuna Göre Ermeni Sorunu,” in Ömer Engin Lütem (ed.), *Ermeni Sorunu Temel Bilgi ve Belgeler*, (Ankara: ASAM Pub.,2007), pp.138-139.

⁴Lütem, op. cit., pp.1-4.

⁵ Since 1963, Turkey has been trying to become full member of the European Union (E.U.). However, there are many obstacles for Turkey’s full membership to the E.U., which are Turkey’s unstable economy, its high population rate, and two deadlock problems the Cyprus as well as the Kurdish issues. Besides these obstacles, the allegations on the events of 1915 have affected negatively Turkey’s membership to the E.U. In 1987, the European Parliament accepted the Armenian allegations as if it was genocide. Among the E.U. member countries, there is a wide belief that Turkey should accept these allegations otherwise its membership to the E.U. would be under risk. However, there is not any official obligation on the recognition of these allegations before Turkey’s membership to the E.U. For more detailed information see: Meltem Müftüler Baç, *Turkey’s Relations with a Changing Europe*, (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1997), pp.53-74.

support of the United States of America.⁶ Moreover, these allegations have created an obstacle on the political, social, and economic relations of Turkey with the Republic of Armenia.⁷

Considering the whole facts, this thesis is prepared to expose the re-emergence of the Armenian question and its effects on Turkey between the years 1960 and 1990. Since the Armenian question has been a consequence of Armenian nationalism, the re-emergence of the Armenian question will be examined as an aspect of Armenian nationalism. In this thesis, the political actors and political processes in the re-emergence of the Armenian question, and the influence of Armenian nationalism on reviving the Armenian question will be studied. The reason why this thesis chooses to analyze the re-emergence of the Armenian question as an aspect of Armenian nationalism, and its effects on Turkey in the Cold War period is twofold. On the one hand, to analyze how the Armenian question was brought into world's political

⁶ The allegations on the so-called Armenian genocide have affected Turkish-American relations. With efforts of the Armenian Diaspora, the Armenian resolutions have been submitted five times to the U.S. Congress. Nevertheless, these resolutions have not been accepted as a law up until today. Although forty-two states in the United States have accepted the allegations on genocide, the White House has not officially recognized the events of 1915 as if it was the first genocidal act in the twentieth century. For more detailed information see: Sedat Laçiner, *Ermeni Sorunu, Diaspora ve Türk Dış Politikası* (Ankara: USAK, 2008), pp.184-190, 206-245.

⁷ The allegations on the so-called Armenian genocide have caused the deterioration between Turkey and Armenia relations. Since Armenia declared her independence from the USSR, these two countries have not established economic and diplomatic relations. Despite of the fact that Turkey recognized Armenia's independence along with all other former Soviet Republics, the relations have not normalized between these two countries. Indeed, in Turkish-Armenian relations, a positive atmosphere was created under the rule of Levon Ter-Petrossian, who tried to establish good relations with Turkey, and other neighbors of Armenia without presenting any precondition. However, he was forced to resign due to his moderate policy against Turkey and Azerbaijan. After Levon Ter-Petrossian, all Armenian Presidents have presented the allegations on the events of 1915 as a precondition to normalize the relations with Turkey. On October 10, 2009, the Turkish – Armenian relations entered a new phase with signing two protocols by Ahmet Davutoğlu, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Turkey and Edward Nalbandian, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Armenia, which were on establishing diplomatic relation, opening a common border as well as establishing an investigation committee formed by the historians for the allegation on genocide. Before these protocols were signed, the allegation on the events of 1915 caused diplomatic crisis due to the fact that Nalbandian wanted to use the term genocide to refer to the events of 1915 in the statement. In the bilateral relations' normalization process, this crisis overcame with mediation of the United States Secretary of State Hillary R. Clinton. Although Davutoğlu has followed an active and constructive foreign policy toward Armenia, considering the last eight months it is very difficult to say that the Turkish-Armenian relations began to normalize because of the Armenian Diaspora's general approaches toward the Armenian question and Nagorno-Karabakh issue. For more detailed information see: M. Serdar Palabıyık, "Türkiye-Ermenistan İlişkileri (1918-2007)," in Ömer Engin Lütem, (ed.), *Ermeni Sorunu Temel Bilgi ve Belgeler*, (Ankara: ASAM Pub., 2007), pp.233-265; see also, Murat Yetkin, "Ermeni Normalleşmesi Anormal Başladı," *Radikal*, October 10, 2009.

agenda after World War I. On the other hand, to analyze how the Armenian question was materialized as a political instrument against Turkey in the Cold War period. The main contribution of this study would be exploring how the major political players moved the Armenian question into the world's agenda between the years 1960 and 1990 and underlying that the political players who sparked fire of the Armenian question with efforts of the Armenian Diaspora during the Cold War period.

The main reason for focusing on Armenian nationalism to examine the Armenian question is that the Armenian question itself was a natural result of Armenian nationalism. Therefore, without explaining how Armenian nationalism emerged, it is not possible to understand in a comprehensive way neither the roots of the Armenians question, nor the conditions of keeping it alive during the Cold War period. Namely, to be able to understand Armenian nationalism, it is necessary to look at its historical background, and its survival strategies between the years 1960 and 1990. Armenian nationalism emerged in the Ottoman Empire in the nineteenth century. In fact, this century was the modernization period in the Ottoman Empire, which created a suitable milieu for the rise of Armenian nationalism.⁸

Indeed, no single theory of nationalism can explain historically and socially Armenian nationalism. One of the modernist theorists of nationalism is Ernest Gellner who examines nationalization and its development process through focusing on the concepts of modernization and industrialization in the world. He states that the nationalism cannot emerge in agrarian societies, because people do not deal with either cultural or political homogeneity issues, while they are struggling with poverty and starvation in agrarian societies.⁹ Another prominent scholar Elie Kedourie, who associates with the modernist school, also emphasizes the role of modernization in Armenian nationalism. For Kedourie, nationalism is a consequence of the Age of Enlightenment and a natural result of modernization and secularization. Kedourie underlines the role of middle class in the process of rising nationalism. However,

⁸Mim Kemal Öke, *Yüzyılın Kan Davası Ermeni Sorunu, 1914-1923*, (İstanbul: İrfan Yayınevi), pp.115-123

⁹ Ernest Geller, *Nations and Nationalism*, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1997), pp.1-19.

Kedourie does not touch upon the importance of religion. For him religion has little or no role in the rise of nationalism.¹⁰ Nevertheless, another prominent scholar Antony Smith disagrees with the modernist theorists' opinions. In his book entitled *Chosen People: Sacred Sources of National Identity*, Smith emphasizes that nationalism associates with religion, which becomes a foundation for building ethnic consciousness and national identity. Smith claims that the religion is a remarkable factor to protect ethnic identity. The Armenian Church had an important role in Armenian nationalism's development process in the Ottoman Empire. Also, today it has protected its influential role among the Diaspora Armenians. For Smith, ethnic nationalism feeds from inner sources, which are religion, history, and culture. That is to say, Smith claims that these factors have reinforced Armenian ethnic nationalism up until today. He explains the roots of these factors as follow: First, Armenia became the first Christian State in the history of the world. The Armenians adopted Christianity as the state religion of Armenia in 301 AD. Smith emphasizes the importance of common language, culture, and myths to shape collective identity. In that perspective, Mesrop Mashtots' invention of the Armenian alphabet played a remarkable role in the development of Armenian nationalism. In parallel to the invention of the Armenian alphabet, the golden age of Armenian literature began which had an enormous influence to create distinctiveness between Armenians and other nations. In that period, religious and historical literatures brought to raise the ethnic awareness among Armenians. Third, Smith mentions the importance of a battle between Armenians and Sassanids in 451 AD. After the battle of Avarayr, Armenians rejected the Iranian heritage and Zoroastrian influence.¹¹

Smith's nationalism theory could be called as a response to ethnic nationalism. Unlike Gellner and Kedourie, his analysis could be found more explanatory for the Armenian case in Diaspora. As it is known that, the ethnic awareness has been most unifying factor for the Diaspora Armenians. They have protected their ethnic identities through their common religions, languages, and cultures in the Armenian

¹⁰ Elie Kedourie, "Nationalism," in Omar Dahbour, and Micheline R. Ishay (eds.), *The Nationalism Reader*, (New Jersey: Humanities Press International, 1995), pp.161-163.

¹¹ Antony Smith, *Chosen People: Sacred Sources of National Identity*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp.66-69.

Diaspora. Namely, these factors have enabled them to survive as a distinct ethnic community throughout the centuries. In fact, all these scholars pointed to different aspects of nationalism. Interestingly, it is possible to find connections among the theories of Gellner, Kedourie and Smith and the development story of Armenian nationalism. To be able to prove this, we first need to look at the modernization processes in the Ottoman Empire, and then Soviet Armenia, which served a second home for the emergence of Armenian nationalism.

Armenian nationalism rose after a long process of modernization in the Ottoman Empire. After the French Revolution, the spread of nationalist ideas in Europe did not pass the Armenian community by in the nineteenth century. Nationalism spread slowly among the Armenians. Therefore, by the nineteenth century, as an extension of the Eastern Question, separatist tendencies arose with support of the Great Powers. The Ottoman political leaders, however, were late in discovering the effects of nationalism on the Ottoman subjects. When they realized its effects on the Ottoman government, they made reforms in the fields of social, economic and administration in order to catch up with the modernization process in Europe, and to prevent the separatist tendencies among the Ottoman subjects. These reform movement opened up a new era entitled *Tanzimat* period in which the traditional Ottoman society was transformed to a modern one. Nevertheless, this process contributed to the development of nationalism among the different Ottoman subjects. Armenian nationalism was one of them. In the rise of Armenian nationalism, the Armenian intelligentsia, the development of Armenian literature, the Armenian Church, the missionary activities as well as the policies of the Great Powers had very important roles.¹² However, the modernization process in the Ottoman Empire together with other factors and players caused to raise the separatist tendencies among the Armenians. They formed the revolutionary political committees to establish an independent Armenian State in the Ottoman Empire. To materialize their aims, Armenian nationalists began to rebel against the Ottoman Empire, and even they gave support to the Entente Powers during World War I. At

¹² Öke, op. cit., p.119-120.

the end of this war, Armenian nationalism found an opportunity to survive with modernization process in Soviet Armenia again.¹³

Like in the Ottoman Empire, Armenian nationalism followed the same development process in Soviet Armenia. In this perspective, the case of rising nationalism in Soviet Armenia is a very impressive example to analyze both Gellner's and Kedourie's nationalism theories. After World War I, Armenian nationalism began to develop under the communist regime in Soviet Armenia. Paralleling to the implemented reforms in the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR), the Armenian society was industrialized, and the Armenian ethnic culture, language, literature, art were used as a tool to revive Armenian nationalism. In the 1920s, Moscow began to support the revival of Armenian nationalism. In that process, Soviet Armenia was transformed from agricultural society to an urban one under the Soviet regime. In the meantime, on the one hand, the Moscow government was curtailing the Armenian clergies' influences; on the other hand, the Soviet Armenian society was transformed to the secularized one. The Armenians became more industrialized, more urbanized, and more educated, which caused to revive Armenian nationalism and ethnic Armenian identity. Although the Soviet Armenians became more critical against the Russification policy, they did not demand to establish an independent Armenian State from Moscow until the mid-1980s. Arising Armenian nationalism surfaced on the fiftieth anniversary of the so-called Armenian genocide in Yerevan in 1965. As parallel to this development, the same identity reinforcement process took place in the Armenian Diaspora who lived mainly in Europe, the United States of America and the Middle East region.¹⁴

From the year 1965 onwards, the Armenian question was moved to the international political arena. With rising of Armenian nationalism, the Armenian terrorist organizations were formed under the control of communist regime. They targeted Turkey in the early Cold War period. However, after the mid-1980s, the policies of the new Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, which were *perestroika*

¹³ Gürün, op. cit., pp. 162-205.

¹⁴ Ronald G. Suny, *Looking Toward Ararat: Armenia in Modern History*, (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1993), pp.133-178.

(reconstruction) and *glasnost* (openness), as well as the Moscow Government's general policy toward Nagorno-Karabakh conflict encouraged the Armenian nationalists to demand independence from the USSR.¹⁵ The Republic of Armenia was established in 1991 with the dissolution of the USSR. After then, not only the other countries but also the Republic of Armenia became an arena where the Diaspora Armenians worked on the policies and sanctions to be used against Turkey. In addition, the so-called Armenian genocide became an instrument of state policy from the year 1991 onwards.

All these facts mentioned above built a basis for this thesis and its topic. The topic of this thesis will be analyzed in the historical framework and it will consist of the analysis of the developments within a specified time span. This thesis comprises of four chapters, a conclusion, and a bibliography. The first chapter will be a historical review of the Armenian national awakening process, and the Armenian question up until the Lausanne Peace Conference. In the second chapter, the emergence of Armenian nationalism will be examined within a general framework. Also, the rise of Arab nationalism, and its influences on the Armenian community, Armenian nationalism's development process in Soviet Armenia, and the roles of Soviet leaders will be studied in the second chapter. In the third chapter, between the years 1960 and 1970, the re-emergence of the Armenian question as an aspect of Armenian nationalism will be analyzed. In this context, the Cyprus crisis, the Armenian terrorist organizations, and the Armenian terrorist attacks, the influence of Mikail Gorbachev's policies *perestroika* (reconstruction) and *glasnost* (openness) on the re-emergence of Armenian nationalism will be studied as well. In the fourth chapter, it will be analyzed Nagorno-Karabakh , and its impacts upon Armenian nationalism between the years 1980 and 1990. In addition, it will be discussed the role of Armenian question in Turkish-Armenian relations in Levon Ter-Petrossian period. Then, it will be analyzed how the Armenian question affected Turkey's bilateral relations with the United States of America and why the Armenian question were brought into political agenda of the United States as a political issue will be

¹⁵ Gerard Libaridian, *People, Nation, State*. (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publisher, 2007), pp.205-209.

analyzed systematically. Also, the effects of Armenian Diaspora over the U.S. Senate, and the formation of the Armenian lobbying groups in the U.S., and the Armenian resolutions' impacts on Turkish-American relations in the Cold War period will be discussed in this chapter. In the conclusion part, it will be summarized the findings of the thesis.

In this thesis, the nature of the events of 1915 and its aftermath, nationalism as an ideology and its influences on different nations living in the Ottoman Empire, the nature of bilateral relations between Turkey and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), the formation of the Armenian Diaspora in the European countries, and the Armenian Diaspora's intervention to the European countries' policies related to the Turkey's full membership to the European Union, the Armenian lobbying groups in Europe, will not be discussed since they are beyond the scope of this thesis. Hence, there is no specified chapter devoted to the description of these issues.

By means of the academic works, between the years 1960 and 1990 the re-emergence of the Armenian question as an aspect of Armenian nationalism and its effects on Turkey will be examined in this thesis. The books and articles written about this issue will be the main sources of this thesis. Also, the newspapers articles concerning to the resolutions on the so-called Armenian genocide and their influences upon Turkish- American relations will be used in the fourth chapter to depict the reflections of Armenian question upon the foreign policy of Turkey. Moreover, the authorized web sites will be utilized to a great extent. However, while searching this issue, I noticed that there is so much information pollution in this field. The majority of web sites have been set up to make propaganda concerning to the events of 1915 against Turkey.

There is an enormous literature on the events of 1915 and its aftermath until the Lausanne Peace Conference. However, in these books, Turkish scholars have focused on the events of 1915 to refute the orchestrated allegations on the so-called Armenian genocide. Hence, interestingly, there is not a vast literature on the date April 24, 1915, when the Ottoman Government arrested 235 Armenians and closed all Armenian political committees. Actually, the April 24, 1915 is accepted as a

milestone date in the Armenian question. Today, some scholars believe that the Ottoman Empire committed the crime of genocide against the Ottoman Armenians on April 24, 1915, which date has been accepted as the beginning of the so-called Armenian genocide. However, there is not a book, which has been written by a Turkish scholar to enlighten what happened on that day through the Ottoman archival documents. In this field, Yusuf Sarıay, who is the General Director of Prime Ministry State Archives, wrote an article entitled “Decree of April 24, 1915 and the Armenian Committee Members Arrested in Istanbul” through the Ottoman archival documents. As Sarıay, I wanted to examine the arrest of 235 Armenians in Istanbul in accordance with April 24, 1915 circular and its aftermath in Ayaş and Çankırı with reference to an Istanbul based Armenian newspaper, *Jamanak* as a primary source.¹⁶ Besides the archival documents, I was eager to benefit from an Armenian newspaper because I believe that the newspaper archives are very informative resources to understand general approaches of public opinions toward any issue. Of course, as it is known that, the whole newspapers have not presented the example of high standard journalism. Many of them have resorted to the sensationalism either to increase their own circulations or to make propaganda on whatsoever issue. However, besides the Ottoman archival documents, I wanted to use an Armenian newspaper to examine how an Ottoman-Armenian newspaper reflected this issue to the Armenian public opinion, and the Ottoman Armenians’ reactions toward the mass arrest of Armenians in Istanbul on April 24, 1915 and its aftermath in Ayaş and Çankırı from that date onwards.

Last summer, I seized an opportunity to examine the *Jamanak* newspaper’s news archive between the months April and August 1915 in the Beyazıt Library in Istanbul. What a strange I did not find any news article concerned to the mass arrest of Armenians in April 1915 and its aftermath. Unfortunately, I could not also find

¹⁶The *Jamanak* newspaper began its publication life in the Second Constitutional Era. When the Young Turks came into power in 1908, censorship was end, and each of the minority groups had right to publish their own magazines and newspapers in their own native languages. For more detailed information on the *Jamanak* newspaper see: Eylem Yanardağoğlu, “Maintaining Old Tradition of Media Diversity in Europe: The Non-Muslim Minority Media in Turkey, in Alec Charles (ed.), *Media in the Enlarged Europe: Politics, Policy and Industry*, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2009), p.202.

sufficient written resource to write a thesis on that issue. Due to the limited resource regarding with this issue, I altered my thesis subject as the re-emergence of the Armenian question as an aspect of Armenian nationalism and its effects on Turkey between the years 1960 and 1990. As the neglected issue April 24, 1915, two remarkable questions why the Armenian question was brought into political agenda, and how this issue affected Turkey's foreign relation have not been studied frequently through focusing on players and processes in the Cold War period. In the historical process, after World War I, the Armenians question was neglected since many people assumed that the Armenian question was ended with the signature of the Peace Treaty of Lausanne in 1923. Indeed, the majority of Turkish people, and even Turkish politicians began to aware of this question's importance after the Armenian terrorist organizations' attacks on Turkish diplomats and international institutions. As mentioned above, many books have been written on the Armenian question through focusing on the events of 1915 in the Ottoman Empire. On the other hand, there is not a vast literature about the re-emergence of the Armenian question as an aspect of Armenian nationalism as well as its politicization and internationalization processes, and its influences on Turkey's bilateral and multilateral relations although the Armenian Question has been accepted as a purely political issue.

CHAPTER I

THE EMERGENCE OF THE ARMENIAN QUESTION

Although the Armenian question emerged in the nineteenth century, it is still not outdated. There have been many factors in reproducing and maintaining this question. It emerged when the Armenians living in Ottoman Empire began to claim more rights for themselves in the nineteenth century. Naturally, these claims were expected to meet by the Ottoman government and to remain as an internal affair of the Ottoman Empire. However, it became an international problem with the involvement of the Great Powers at the will of the Armenians. How did it become an international problem really matters? However, before this, it is also matter of question why the Armenians, who have been one of the old inhabitants of the Ottoman territories namely of Anatolia, did not claim any right before the nineteenth century? To be able to reply these questions, it would be better first to give brief information about the situations of the Ottoman Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, and then to underline systematically the whole process, which created the Armenian question.

1.1. The Armenians in the Ottoman Empire

Throughout the history, different people from different ethnicities, and religions lived in Anatolia. The Armenians were also one of these people. The association between the Turks and the Armenians began in 1071. Before this date, the Armenians remained under different rules so that they could not manage to establish a long-lasting political administration throughout the Armenian history.¹⁷ From the year 1071 onwards, the Armenians first became the subjects of the Seljukid Empire, and after this empire was dissolved, they were taken under the Ottoman rule. The Turks and the Armenians managed to live together side by side on the same land

¹⁷ Gürün, op.cit., p.32.

with peace and safety for a long time until the problems emerged in the nineteenth century.¹⁸

Within the Ottoman Empire, the Armenians were very influential non-Muslim minority community. A large numbers of Armenians settled in cities including Istanbul, Izmir, Ankara, Kayseri, and Bursa. The rest of the Armenians mainly lived in the eastern provinces of the Ottoman Empire including Van, Erzurum, Sivas, Bitlis, Elazığ and Diyarbakır. The Armenians called these six vilayets of Ottoman Empire as the Western Armenia.¹⁹ The Armenian community like the other minorities in the Ottoman Empire was ruled via the *millet* system that based on ethnicity but on religious bases. In that context, as other major Ottoman subjects, which were the Greek Orthodox and the Jews, the Armenian community had autonomy in their own internal affairs. That is to say, the Armenian people's lives, properties, and religion were guaranteed under that system. Indeed, the Armenians enjoyed religious and cultural freedoms, as well as administrative, fiscal, and legal autonomies under the Ottoman rule. They were also exempted from the military service. The Ottoman Empire recognized the Armenian Patriarch's authority and responsibility to maintain the Armenian community's traditional laws and institutions concerning to the personal statuses such as marriage, divorce, and inheritance.²⁰ However, although the Armenians had some remarkable privileges, they were subjected to some special taxes – poll tax (*cizye*) and the land tax (*haraç*).²¹

The Armenians were very visible minority community in every area of life in the Ottoman Empire. The Armenians who were called as *Amira* class filled significant positions in the Ottoman economy and the bureaucracy. This *Amira* class

¹⁸ Richard G. Hovannisian, "The Historical Dimension of the Armenian Question, 1878-1923," in Richard G. Hovannisian (ed.), *The Armenian Genocide in Perspective*, (New Brunswick :Transaction Publishers, 1987), p.20.

¹⁹ Merrill D. Peterson, "*Starving Armenians*": *America and the Armenian Genocide, 1915-1930 and After*, (Charlottesville / London: University of Virginia Press, 2004), pp.17-18.

²⁰Salahi Sonyel, *The Great War and the Tragedy of Anatolia*. (Ankara:Turkish Historical Society,2000),p.2.

²¹ Sonyel, *The Ottoman Armenians: Victims of Great Power Diplomacy*, (London: Rustem&Brother, 1987), p.44.

consisted of financiers, merchants, and industrialists. Also, the members of this class served to the Ottoman bureaucracy as minister, pasha, deputy in the Ottoman Parliament, ambassador, consul general as well as teachers at the state schools. The *Amiras* were able to control national and religious activities of the Ottoman Armenians in İstanbul. The influential *Amira* class was able to appoint the Armenian Patriarch in the Ottoman Empire as well.²² On the other hand, many Armenians lived in the cities were organized into trade guilds, or *esnafs*. The middle class Armenians worked as goldsmith, moneylender, architect, locksmith, painters, silk weavers, tanner and so that, whereas the rest of the Armenians, who lived in eastern part of the Ottoman Empire, worked as either farmer or local trader in general.²³ Besides economic and political services to the Ottoman Empire, many of the Ottoman Armenians made major contributions to the Ottoman society in different branches of art such as music, literature, architecture, and theatre with their unique works.²⁴ The Armenians were called as the *Millet-i Sadıka* (loyal nation) due to their being faithful to the Ottoman rule and ability to interact with the Ottomans.²⁵

While the Armenians were very active in the Ottoman economy and bureaucracy concerning to their privileges, they began to demand more than rights to improve their economic and social conditions in the nineteenth century.²⁶ In fact, there were many factors behind these claims, which created the Armenian question in the Ottoman Empire. One of these factors was the Armenian national awakening and its development process in the nineteenth century.

²²Louise Nalbandian, *The Armenian Revolutionary Movement: (The Development of Armenian Political Parties through the Nineteenth Century)*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), pp.43-45.

²³ Robert Mirak, *Torn between Two Lands Armenians in America to World War I*, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1983), pp.8-18.

²⁴ Nejat Göyünç, "Turkish-Armenian Cultural Relations," in Türkkaya Ataöv (ed.), *The Armenians in the Late Ottoman Period*, (Ankara, The Turkish Historical Society for the Council of Culture, 2001), pp.23-39.

²⁵ Yılmaz Öztuna, "The Political Milieu of the Armenian Question," in Türkkaya Ataöv (ed.), *The Armenians in the Late Ottoman Period*, (Ankara: the Turkish Historical Society, 2001), p.48.

²⁶Mehmet Perinçek, *Rus Devlet Arşivlerinden 100 Belge Ermeni Meselesi*, (Istanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2007), pp.19-21.

1.2. The Armenian National Awakening and the Emergence of the Armenian Question

The roots of the Armenian question have been based on the emergence of Armenian nationalism with the penetration of revolutionary ideas of the French Revolution into the Ottoman Empire in the nineteenth century. In that process, nationalist ideologies found supporters from the non-Muslim Ottoman subjects, and the Armenians were not immune from this. Interestingly, the increasing interaction with the European countries as well as the politics of the Great Powers including the Great Britain, France, the Austrian-Hungarian Empire, Prussia and the Russian Empire enhanced the effects of these revolutionary ideas on the non-Muslim subjects in the Ottoman Empire.²⁷ All these together with, the socio-political developments influenced the Armenian community and contributed the birth of Armenian nationalism. The rise of Armenian nationalism gained power and gave born to the Armenian question due to the efforts of the Armenian intelligentsia, the development of the Armenian literature, the curtailed role of the Armenian Church, the missionary activities as well as the policies of the Great Powers.²⁸

The impact of the revolutionary ideas on Armenian nationalism was very remarkable, and they were imported via the links with Europe. The majority of the Armenian intellectuals were educated in Europe. The first group of Armenian students went to Italy, which was the home of the *Mekhitharist* Monastery. Then, a number of Armenian students went to Paris for their education. While they were studying abroad, they became acquainted with the main principles of the French Revolution, which were ‘liberty, equality, and fraternity’. In that perspective, the ideas of the well-known French writers including Lamartine, Chateaubriand, Victor Hugo, De Musset, Augustine Comte, Michelet, Guizot and Quinet affected the Armenian students. When they returned to Istanbul, they were ready to defend the main principles of the French Revolution.²⁹

²⁷Öke, op. cit., pp.119-123.

²⁸ Nalbandian, op. cit., pp.41-42, 61-63.

²⁹ Ibid., pp.45-46.

Having inspired from the revolutionary ideas, the Armenian intelligentsia claimed that the Armenians were ethnically and racially different from the Ottomans. The Armenian intelligentsia became pioneer in the creation of the modern Armenian literature, theater, and art, which embedded with the idea of nationalism. Also, they managed to create a wide network through Armenian newspapers including *Massis* (Ararat), the *Hiusisapile* (Aurora Borealis), and *Arazur Vaspurakan* (Eagle of Vaspurakan). In that process, they used the Armenian newspapers to present their complaints on the administrative corruptions, the economic exploitations, and the physical insecurities in the eastern part of the Ottoman Empire.³⁰ The Armenian intelligentsia moved a step further and began to claim the right of self-determination for the Armenians and this was the important step in the emergence of Armenian question.³¹ In parallel to the developments in educational area, the Armenian literature began to play a remarkable role in the Armenian national awakening process. In the 1860s, the Armenian writer and poet Mikayel Nalbandian became an important figure in the Armenian literature. In his works, he emphasized frequently freedom theme for the Armenian independence. Another Armenian writer Rafael Patkanian defended the idea of freedom in his works. Patkanian called the Armenian community to unite against the Ottoman Empire. In that process, the Great Powers supported the Armenian intelligentsia. The diplomatic channels became mediator to distribute daily newspapers, magazines, books, postcards, maps and posters, which emphasized the separatist ideas and Armenian nationalism.³²

While Armenian nationalism was spreading slowly among the Armenians, the Armenian Church also began to involve in this matter. Through the Armenian National Constitution of 1860, the Armenian society met new concepts liberalism and secularism. Consequently, a new page opened for the Ottoman Armenian

³⁰ Hovannisian, op. cit., p.21.

³¹ Laçiner op. cit., p.8.

³² Nalbandian, op. cit., p.47. In the eighteenth century, the Armenian literary movement began when the Nersesian and Lazarian schools were founded in Tiflis and Moscow. Some writers including S. Nazarian, K. Badganian, M. Nalbantian, Ardzrouni and Raffi were very important figures in that movement. For more detailed information on this issue see also: Esat Uras, *The Armenians in History and the Armenian Question*, (Istanbul, Documentary Publication, 1988), pp.331-335.

community.³³ In that process, the Armenian Church's influence was curtailed when its authority passed to the National General Assembly, which composed of 120 laymen and 20 clergymen. Also, the spread of Catholicism and Protestantism affected negatively the influence of Armenian Church among the Armenians. In addition to these, the Regulation of the Armenian Nation of 1863 reinforced the situation of the Armenian community in the Ottoman Empire, which granted some additional privileges and autonomy concerned to the Armenian community's self-governance.³⁴ The Armenian Patriarch began to use the rise of Armenian nationalism to preserve its influence over the Armenian community. It gave support to the Armenian nationalists to establish an independent Armenian State. Kamuran Gürün states the role of the Armenian Church in Armenian nationalism as follows "...essentially one should not talk about the Armenian nation, the Armenian State, or the Armenian history, but about the Armenian Church, the Armenian Church State. The Armenian Church needed a state in order to preserve its existence. It was not the Armenian nation that gave rise to the idea of an Armenian State, but the Armenian Church."³⁵

Another factor in the emergence of Armenian nationalism was the missionary activities. The impacts of the Catholic and the Protestant missionaries make some notable changes within the Armenian community. The Catholic missionary activities began in the seventeenth century, whereas the Protestant missionary activities began in the nineteenth century.³⁶ When the Protestant missionaries came to the Ottoman Empire, they realized that they would not be able convert any Muslim or Jewish people to Protestant sect. Therefore, they concentrated their whole energies on the Armenian people, who accepted the Christianity as a state religion. They were interested in the religion, culture, and health problems of the Ottoman Armenians. In that process, they mainly established schools in İstanbul, Maraş, Antep, Harput and Tarsus as well as in other cities of the Ottoman Empire. Besides the missionary

³³ Uras, op. cit., pp. 165-171.

³⁴ Öke, op. cit., p.74.

³⁵ Gürün, op. cit., pp.59-62.

³⁶ Öke, op. cit., pp.77-78.

schools, they built new churches and hospitals in order to attract this community to the Protestantism.³⁷ Mim Kemal Öke states the missionaries' roles in the process of the rise of Armenian nationalism as follows:

The missionaries constituted a serious political problem for the Sultan. They were hampering the development of Turkish nationalism by teaching foreign languages, by fueling the spirit of separatism among the minorities, and by introducing into country Western customs and ideas...³⁸

In the education field, the Ottoman reforms brought about an alteration of opinion between Armenian and the Western societies, which had an important process in the Armenian national awakening process as well. The first Armenian community school was established in Istanbul during the reign of the Sultan Selim III. Between 1790 and 1830, a number of Armenian schools were set up in the Ottoman Empire. The *Amira* class and the Armenian Church financed these schools. Among these, a school was founded for the Armenian girls. Then, a trade school was established for the Armenians. In the nineteenth century, the Armenian secondary schools were founded, which were the College of Scutari, the Nupar-Shahnazarian, Central and Berberian College at Istanbul, the Sanassarian College at Erzurum, the Normal School of Van, and the seminaries of the Monasteries of Varag and Armash. These schools and seminaries became the centers where Armenian nationalism was fed and carried from one generation to other one.³⁹ As a result of the rise of Armenian nationalism, the Armenian revolutionary political organizations were established and they led the separatist Armenians to establish an independent Armenia.

1.2.1. The Establishment of the Revolutionary Armenian Political Organizations

Between the years 1880 and 1890, some progress took place in the Armenian political life. Armenian nationalism gained momentum with the emergence of the Armenian revolutionary political parties in the second half of the nineteenth century.

³⁷Çağrı Erhan, *Türk-Amerikan İlişkilerinin Tarihsel Kökenleri*, (Ankara: İmge Kitabevi,2001), pp. 190-199.

³⁸ Öke, op. cit., p.47.

³⁹ Nalbandian, op. cit., pp. 48-49.

Especially, the developments in the Balkan Peninsula gave hope to the revolutionary Armenians to establish an independent Armenian State in the eastern part of the Ottoman Empire.⁴⁰ Consequently, a number of ephemeral secret societies were established. One of them was the Union of Salvation, which was established in 1872. Then, the Black Cross Society followed it in Van in 1878, and then, the Protectors of the Fatherland in Erzurum in 1881. These secret societies extended their political movements to the outside of the Ottoman Empire.⁴¹

These Armenian secret societies turned to an organized political committee with the establishment of the Armenian Ramgavar Party (ARP), which was founded by Mekertich Portugalian in Van, in 1885. The Armenian Ramgavar Party's name was altered as Ramgavar.⁴² Then, the Hunchak Revolutionary Party was established in Switzerland in 1887. The Hunchakian Revolutionary Party was renamed the Hunchakian Social Democratic Party in 1905 and the Social Democratic Hunchakian Party (SDHP) in 1908. Under the Ottoman rule, Hunchak Revolutionary Party was very influential political force both in Cilicia region and in Istanbul. Next, in 1890, the Armenian Revolutionary Federation (ARF) (known as Dashnak or Dashnaktsutyun) was established in Tiflis as a result of the efforts of Christopher Mikaelian and his friends. The ARF was the leading political force among the Armenians who lived in the Caucasus region.⁴³ This party's program was based on the national socialist principles. Aim of this party was to establish an Armenian State through organizing revolutionary activities, forming armed bands, distributing weapons to the Armenians, as well as assassinating the Ottoman government officials.⁴⁴

⁴⁰Sonyel, *Falsification and Disinformation: Negative Factors in Turco-Armenian Relations*, (Ankara, Center for Strategic Research, 2000), pp.15-16.

⁴¹Azmi Süslü, *Armenians and the 1915 Event of Displacement*, (Ankara: KÖK Sosyal ve Stratejik Araştırmalar Vakfı, 1999), p.55.

⁴²Gürün, op. cit., pp.171-172.

⁴³Dikran Mesrob Kaligian, *Armenian Organization and Ideology under the Ottoman Rule, 1908-1914*, (New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, 2009), pp.1-3.

⁴⁴Gürün, op. cit., pp.171-172.

The revolutionary political committees criticized the Armenian Church due to its regressive structure so that these parties avoided cooperating with the Armenian Church. Between the political parties and the Armenian bourgeoisie, relationships were very problematic in that period. The leaders of ARP expected financial assistance from the wealthy Armenian people. The Armenian revolutionary press often criticized them due to their uninterested approaches toward the Armenians' living standards and their problems that lived in the eastern parts of the Ottoman Empire. However, they managed to take support from the educational institutions, which were founded by the revolutionary Armenians and the missionaries. Therefore, these revolutionary political committees conducted their activities among the artisans, peasants, and petty bourgeoisie in the eastern part of the Ottoman Empire where majority of them had problems concerned to the feudal system, a new system of taxations, the regular army troops, and the Kurdish chieftains, abuses and corruptions.⁴⁵

The population rate of Armenians did not form the majority of population in the eastern part of the Ottoman Empire even in the "Six Vilayets" including Sivas, Elazığ, Bitlis, Van, Erzurum, and Diyarbakır. The percentage of the Armenians population was only 17 percent, whereas the Muslims' rate was 78 percent in those six cities. To establish the "Greater Armenia," the Armenian political committees were eager to expel Muslim population who lived in those cities.⁴⁶ Therefore, the Armenian political committees planned to carry out terrorist attacks as the most effective way to flee the Muslim inhabitants to other districts of the Ottoman Empire. Moreover, the Armenian political committees discerned that they would not be able to realize their dreams on the "Greater Armenia" without the intervention of the Great Powers. That is why; they applied terrorism in order to attract attention on the Armenian question.⁴⁷

⁴⁵ Libaridian, op. cit., pp.17-18.

⁴⁶ Justin McCarty, "The Reality of Armenian Issue," online at http://www.mfa.gov.tr/presentation-by-prof_-justin-mccarthy-at-the-tgna-on-the-reality-of-armenian-issue_-conference-on-march-24_-2005_.en.mfa. (accessed on 20.02.2010)

⁴⁷ Öke, op. cit., p.82.

Between the years 1890 and 1908, the Armenian revolutionaries the Hunchaks and the Dashnaks organized a number of rebellions throughout the Ottoman Empire. The first Armenian uprising broke out in Erzurum in 1890. That was followed by the Kumkapı demonstration in İstanbul in 1908. Then, the Armenian revolts came at Kayseri, Yozgat, Çorum and Merzifon in 1882 and 1893, the Sasun rebellion, the demonstration at the Sublime Porte and Zeytun rebellion in 1895, the Van rebellion and the raid on the Ottoman Bank in 1896, the second Sasun rebellion in 1903, the attempt to assassinate Sultan Abdül Hamid II in 1905, and the 1909 Adana Incident. While the Armenian revolutionary political organizations were provoking the Armenians to rebel against the Ottoman rule, the Great Powers also supported them. In fact, they did not avoid encouraging the Armenian revolutionaries due to the major benefits in the Ottoman Empire. The Armenian question was brought into the international agenda with the support of the Greater Powers.⁴⁸

1.3. The Transfer of the Armenian Question to the International Agenda as an Integral Part of the Eastern Question

The Armenian question was brought into the international agenda soon after it emerged in the nineteenth century. This originated from the weakness of the Ottoman Empire. The Great Powers including the Great Britain, France, Russia, Austrian-Hungarian empires, and then Prussia benefited from her weakness for their own military, strategic, and commercial interests on the Ottoman lands. In fact, a new period began due to military, economy, and administration crisis at the end of the seventeenth century. The Great Powers began to concentrate on the Ottoman Empire in order to get benefit of her weakness.⁴⁹ They aimed to share the Ottoman territories. From the seventeenth century to the end of World War I in 1918, the periods witnessed the rivalry of the Great Powers on sharing the Ottoman Empire by

⁴⁸ Süslü, op. cit., p.61.

⁴⁹ İsmet Binark, *Archive Documents About the Atrocities and Genocide Inflicted Upon Turks By Armenians*. (Ankara: Board of Culture, Arts and Publications, Grand National Assembly of Turkey, 2002),p.15.

using minority policy. They provoked the Ottoman subjects especially the non-Muslim ones against the Ottoman Empire.⁵⁰

The way to the Eastern Question was opened with the Treaty of Karlowitz, which was signed on January 26, 1699, after the Ottoman-Austrian War of 1683-1697. By the Treaty of Karlowitz, the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire began. Indeed, the turning point in the Eastern Question was the Treaty of Kuchuk Kainarji, which was signed between the Ottoman Empire and Russia on July 10, 1774. When this treaty was signed, a new way was opened for the expansion of Russia in the Black Sea region, and the Balkan Peninsula, as well as for the protection of the Orthodox Christian community who lived in the Ottoman Empire by the Russian Tsar. Thus, Russia seized an opportunity to intervene the Ottoman Empire's internal affairs via the Orthodox Christians. By Russia's penetration into the Balkan Peninsula, nationalism began to rise gradually among the Ottoman subjects coming from different ethnic and religious minority groups living there.⁵¹ After the Russian penetration into the Balkan Peninsula, the Ottoman Empire lost its control on the region. Then, that region became an arena where Russia and the Great Powers rivaled each other to materialize their own imperialist interests over the Ottoman Empire by materializing the Balkan nations as a political instrument. Meanwhile, under the influence of the Great Powers, the Balkan nations rebelled to demand independence from the Ottoman Empire. By the nineteenth century, these imperialist powers began to intervene in internal affairs of the Ottoman Empire under the pretext of the protection of the minorities' political, social, and economic rights. In that perspective, the Great Powers forced the Ottoman Statesmen to make reforms for the Ottoman minorities. After the Balkan nations, their next target was the Armenian community. First Russia and then other Great Powers made the Armenian community as a political question to implement their imperialist policies over the "Sick Man of Europe" after the Treaty of Berlin on July 13, 1878.⁵²

⁵⁰ Erick J. Zürcher, *Turkey A Modern History*, (London, New York: I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd, 2007), p.38.

⁵¹ Öke, op. cit., pp.135-142.

⁵² Hasan Kundakçı, *Emperyalizmin Maşası Ermeniler*, (İstanbul: Alfa,2006), pp.41-45.

Indeed, the reform issue for the Ottoman subjects and especially for the Armenians had been brought on the Sublime Porte's agenda long before the Berlin Congress. From the year 1820 onwards, the Armenian bourgeoisie increased their influence on the Ottoman economy and the bureaucracy. By means of the imperialist powers' supports, the Armenian bourgeoisie demanded to be made reforms to improve their economic and political situations. Following the Ottoman- Russian War of 1828, a reform movement began in the Ottoman Empire, known as *Tanzimat* in which series of reforms were introduced to modernize and westernize both regime and the Ottoman society. Two reform edicts the Noble Reform Edict of the Rose Chamber (*Gülhane Hatt-ı Şerifi*) 1839, and the Imperial Reform Edict of 1856 (*Islahat-ı Hatt-ı Hümayunu*) became the milestones of the *Tanzimat* period.⁵³

In 1839, the Sultan Abdül Mejid issued the Noble Edict of the Rose Chamber (*Gülhane Hatt-ı Şerifi*). New regulations were made in the mechanism of the state, laws, and military, and in the organizations of the non-Muslim communities. It was planned to catch up with the westernization and the modernization processes in Europe. The Noble Edict of the Rose Chamber proclaimed the legal equality of all Muslim and non-Muslim subjects of the Ottoman Empire without being distinction, which was based on class, religion, and race.⁵⁴ The second reform edict the Imperial Edict of Reforms of 1856 followed by a number of reform measures in the legal, financial, educational, and military fields. It was prepared due to the strong pressure of the French, Austrian, and British Governments. Like the Noble Edict of the Rose Chamber of 1839, with the Imperial Edict of Reforms of 1856, it was reconfirmed the abolition of taxation again. In addition, this edict guaranteed equality and some social and political rights for all Ottoman citizens. By the 1856 Imperial Reform Edict, the Sultan allowed that all Ottomans subjects could be appointed to public positions, and elected to provincial and sub-provincial assemblies. In addition to

⁵³ Zürcher, op. cit., pp.38-39.

⁵⁴ Sedat Laçiner and İbrahim Kaya, *Armenian Issue and Jews*, (Ankara: Institute for Armenian Research Publication,2002), p.49.

these, these people could have rights to attend public military or civil schools, and even join to the Ottoman army.⁵⁵

The Imperial Edict of Reforms of 1856 (*Islahat-ı Hatt-ı Hümayunu*) was followed by other reform measures. The Armenian Constitution was adopted on March 17, 1863. It composed of 150 articles that defined the limitations of the Armenian Patriarch's authority. Through the 1864 Provincial, and 1871 the Public Administration and Provincial Administration, local administrative assemblies were founded in the Ottoman Empire.⁵⁶ In the meantime, some reform measures in judicial and public administrative systems were introduced as well. In addition, it was allowed local people to participate to the local administrations. After the Law of Citizenship was passed in 1869, all Muslims and non-Muslim people were accepted as Ottoman citizen without being discrimination on the basis of race, religion, and sect. Through this law, it was aimed to unite all Ottoman subjects around the idea of being "Ottoman citizen." When the constitutional monarchy was proclaimed in 1876, a new liberal period began in the Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman Constitution granted equality and freedom for all Ottoman citizens. However, these efforts could not be prevented the revolutionary fractions within the Ottoman Empire and the rebellions for the Armenian independence, which were continued.⁵⁷

The Sublime Porte was warned many times to implement reforms in that period. Once the weakness of the Ottoman Empire became chronic in the nineteenth century, a number of rebellions were organized in the Balkan Peninsula, which caused to the Ottoman- Russian War of 1877-1878. The Russian troops gained victories both on the Balkan and on the Caucasian fronts. At the end of war, the Treaty of San Stefano was signed between the Ottoman Empire and Russia in 1878. The Armenian nationalists were eager to benefit from the consequences of this war. Before the Treaty of San Stefano was signed, the Armenian National Assembly

⁵⁵ Öke, op. cit., pp. 52-54.

⁵⁶ Hagop Barsoumian, "The Eastern Question and the Tanzimat Era," in Richard Hovhannisian (ed.), *The Armenian People From Ancient to Modern Times*, Vol II., (New York: Palgrave Macmillian, 2004), p.198.

⁵⁷ Uras, op. cit., pp. 165-171.

authorised the Armenian Patriarch Nerses Varzhabedian to visit the Russian Tsar Alexander II and to send a delegation to the Grand Duke Nicolas, at his headquarters in Edirne. The Armenian Patriarch asked the Grand Duke Nicolas to support the Armenians for establishing an autonomous Armenian State, which included some parts of Russia, and the Black Sea region, as well as the frontiers of Iran. However, the Armenian Patriarch could not get a promise for an independent Armenian State. The Article 16 was added into the Treaty of San Stefano by means of the mediation of Count Ignatiev, the Russian ambassador to Istanbul. Based on this article, the Ottoman Sultans were made to guarantee an administrative local self-government to the provinces inhabited by the Armenians.⁵⁸ According to this article,

“ Taking into account that the withdrawal of the Russian troops from the occupied by them territories of Armenia bound to be returned to Turkey, may cause clashes and complications there, which may harm the good relations between the two states, the Sublime Porte undertakes to immediately carry out improvements and reforms in the provinces, inhabited by Armenians, proceeding from the local needs, as well as to secure Armenians’ safety from Kurds and Circassians.”⁵⁹

After having been signed the Treaty of San Stefano, the Armenian Question became a part of the international diplomacy. All strategic balances of power altered in favor of Russia in the region. Hence, the Treaty of San Stefano did not constitute the final settlement of the Ottoman-Russian War of 1877-1878. The Great Powers, especially British Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli began to disconcert against the Russian hegemony in the region so that this treaty was revised at the Berlin Congress under the pressure of the Great Britain. The Treaty of Berlin was signed between the Ottoman Empire and Russia on July 13, 1878. This treaty addressed to the Armenian Question, too. As a result of its deliberation, the Armenian question was transformed from the domestic Ottoman to an international issue as an extension of the Eastern Question.⁶⁰ In the Treaty of Berlin, the Article 61 was dedicated to the Armenian question that underlined that Ottoman Government instituted reforms in eastern

⁵⁸ Sonyel, *Falsification and Disinformation...*, pp.12-14.

⁵⁹ Akaby Nassibian, *Britain and the Armenian Question: 1915-1923*, (New York: St. Martin Press, 1984), p.9

⁶⁰ Hovannisian, *op. cit.*, p.22.

provinces where the Armenians living in Sivas, Erzurum Harput, Bitlis, Van and Diyarbakır. Here is what is said:

The Ottoman Government undertakes to implement with no further loss of time the necessary regional reforms in the Eastern provinces inhabited by the Armenians and promises to protect them against the Caucasians and Kurds. The Ottoman Government shall inform Great Powers at regular intervals about the steps which she was taken along these lines. The Great Powers shall be entitled to supervise the implementation of these measures.⁶¹

On the one hand, Russia extended throughout the Ottoman territories; on the other hand, the Great Powers increased their influences over the Ottoman Empire and expanded their range of motion. However, these whole developments empowered the Armenian nationalists and the separatist organizations so that the Armenian rebellions increased after then. Before the Ottoman Empire entered World War I, the Great Powers started to negotiate on how they would share the Ottoman territories. As mentioned before, the Great Powers began to intervene in the Ottoman Administration's internal affairs because of their economic, political, and religious interests within the Eastern Question framework. In that perspective, under the Pan-Slavic foreign policy, Russia aimed to gain access to the Mediterranean Sea, to approach Istanbul and the Straits and to terminate control of the Ottoman Empire over the Balkan Peninsula. While Russia was conducting its **policy of expansionism**, the Great Britain was eager to curtail Russian's hegemony over the region. Moreover, the Great Britain aimed to secure the Ottoman territories and the sea routes for her own benefits. Like other imperialist states, France planned to strengthen her own position throughout the region. In that process, like other imperialist states Germany aimed to colonize the Ottoman Empire to the Mesopotamia region. She signed an agreement with Russia for the Baghdad-Berlin Railway's construction in 1911 after recognizing the Russian's influence on the northern Iraq.⁶²

⁶¹Enver Ziya Karal, *The Armenian Question: 1878-1923*, (Ankara: Imprimerie Gündüz,1975), p.10.

⁶² Öke, op. cit., p.110

1.4. The Armenian Rebellions Before and During World War I

The Armenian Revolutionary activities accelerated in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In 1889, a group of civilian revolutionaries and military cadets formed the Committee of Union and Progress (known as CUP) to establish a constitutional government and a democratic parliament, as well as to modernize the Ottoman Empire.⁶³ To materialize those aims, the CUP and the Armenian political committees began to cooperate with each other. The CUP joined to the first Congress of Ottoman Liberals with the Armenian political committee members in Paris in 1902. In that congress, it was decided to form a constitutional state in the future where all Ottoman subjects would be accorded with equal rights. In 1907, the Second Congress of the Ottoman Liberals was held in Paris where it was taken a decision to remove the Sultan Abdul Hamid II from the throne, and to establish a constitutional state without taking support from the Great Powers. Nevertheless, the Hunchak members refused to attend to this congress and accused the Dashnak Party of cooperating with the CUP members.⁶⁴

After the Sultan's dethrone on July 24, 1908, a new constitution was restored. Based on the constitution, all Ottoman subjects' securities and rights were guaranteed. In the early years of the CUP, the parliament was restored again and some parties were founded. Among these parties, the strongest one was the Union and Progress Party, which underlined the issues of equality between the Muslims and the non-Muslims as well as the importance of economic liberalization.⁶⁵

These developments were interpreted as an opportunity to build a liberal Ottoman society. A number of Armenian schools, unions, and libraries were founded all around the country. Meanwhile, censorship was lifted and each minority group

⁶³ Feroz Ahmad, *The Making Modern Turkey*, (London: Routledge, 1993) , pp.34-35.

⁶⁴ Sonyel, *The Great War...*, pp. 269- 285.

⁶⁵ Ahmad, op. cit. pp.34-35.

had right to publish their own newspapers and magazines in their own languages. In that process, the oldest Armenian newspaper *Jamanak* was founded in 1908, which has still published by Kotcunian family in İstanbul.⁶⁶ In addition, it was permitted the Armenian political exiles to return to İstanbul.⁶⁷

The Armenians greeted the Young Turk Revolution. This new political development was evaluated like an opportunity to establish an autonomous or even an independent Armenian State. In that respect, the Armenian nationalists worked hand in hand with the CUP and gave support to the Young Turks through freezing their revolutionary activities and defending the new Ottoman constitutional regime.⁶⁸ However, the Turkish-Armenian cooperation did not last long. The Adana Incident signaled the beginning of tension between the CUP members and the Armenian political committees. On 13 April, 1909, a counter coup, known as 31 March Incident, some radical Muslims organized in order to re-affirm the position of the Abdül Hamid II. Nonetheless, a few weeks later Sultan Abdül Hamid II himself was deposed, and then he was sent to exile in Salonika.⁶⁹

In parallel to the developments in İstanbul, a tension emerged in Adana in 1909. In fact, before the 31 March Incident; the Armenian people had been armed under the control of the Bishop Musheg Seropian, who encouraged the Armenians to purchase weapons, not to pay taxes and the military exemption money to the Ottoman Government. In that period, the city of Adana became a center of weapon and rifle commerce, which were brought from Cyprus and Beirut.⁷⁰ After the 31

⁶⁶In Turkey, three Armenian newspapers including *Jamanak*, *Marmara*, and *Agos* have continued their publications lives. The *Jamanak* newspaper has a special place in the history of Armenian press. The *Jamanak*, which is the oldest Armenian newspaper, has been continuing its publication life since 1908. It has mainly published news concerned to diplomacy and Turkish foreign policy. This newspaper has worked closely to the Diaspora media. Second, the *Marmara* newspaper was established in 1940. Then, it became daily online newspaper in 2000. Third, the *Agos* newspaper was established in 1996. It is a weekly newspaper. It has published news articles in regard to the minority rights and the democratization process in Turkey. For more detailed information see: Yanardağoğlu, op. cit., 202.

⁶⁷ Ahmad, op. cit., p.31.

⁶⁸ Sonyel, op. cit., pp.269- 285.

⁶⁹ Yusuf Halaçoğlu, *Facts on the Relocation of Armenians*, (Ankara: Turkish Historical Society, 2007), p.28.

⁷⁰ Uras, op. cit., p.812.

March Incident, the tension increased gradually in Adana. Then, it turned to the bloody violence, which extended to the streets of Adana and to the surrounding cities. A large number of Armenians, and the Turks passed away during the Adana Incident. After that, the martial law was declared in Adana.⁷¹

When the martial law was declared, Cemal Pasha, who was the member of the CUP Headquarter, was appointed as the Governor of Adana to restore confidence of Armenians toward the government. It was formed a commission to investigate the Adana Incident. This commission found forty-seven Muslims guilty. These people were sentenced to death. In that process, the CUP contributed to the reconstruction of villages by granting 100,000 liras, a five-year annual allocation of 10,000 liras for women and orphans, and a credit of 50,000 Liras for the Armenian businessmen in the region.⁷²

After the Adana Incident, the ARF continued to defend the constitutional regime. Nevertheless, the Hunchak and the Ramgavar members had some worries related with the cooperation with the CUP. The leaders of the Armenian political parties became very impatient to be implemented reforms. In that process, the Pan-Turanian doctrine was accepted as the Ottoman state's official ideology, which increased the worries of the Armenian political committees, and they lost their trust toward the CUP.⁷³ Meanwhile, the Balkan Peninsula turned a fireball as follow that Austria-Hungary annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria declared its independence, as well as Greece incorporated Crete. The Ottoman-Italian War of 1911-1912 brought about the loss of Tripolitania and Dodecanese Islands. Albania gained its independence. At the end of the Balkan Wars of 1912-1913, the Ottoman Empire lost almost her whole European territories. The new political developments in the Balkan Peninsula caused the rise of Turkish nationalism among the CUP members, who believed that the Ottomanism gone to bankrupt.⁷⁴

⁷¹ Halaçoğlu, op. cit., pp. 28-30.

⁷² Yusuf Ziya Bildirici, *The Massacres the Armenians Committed in Adana Province and the French-Armenian Relations*, (Ankara: KÖK Sosyal ve Stratejik Araştırmalar Vakfi, 1999), pp. 72-73.

⁷³ Sonyel, *The Great War...*, pp.269- 285.

⁷⁴ Sonyel, *Falsification and Disinformation...*, p.29.

When the CUP lost its control over the nations in the Balkan Peninsula, its moderate and liberal policies were replaced with the nationalist policies in order to unify all people under the Turkish constitutional government. However, Pan-Turkism caused an enormous polarization among the Armenian political committees, which interpreted this policy of the CUP as a decentralization and a federative administration for the Armenian community.⁷⁵ In that process, on the one hand, the ARF continued to collaborate with the CUP, on the other hand, the Hunchak members perceived the ideology of CUP as an obstacle to establish an autonomous or an independent Armenian State. Hence, unlike the ARF, all Armenian political committees opposed to collaborate with the CUP. They brought the importance of Russian protection into the agenda.⁷⁶

In fact, when the Balkan Wars ended with territorial losses for the Ottoman Empire, the reform issue was warmed up by Russia again. She warned the Sublime Porte to implement reforms for the non-Muslim minorities. The German and the Russian Ambassadors negotiated on the reform project of 1895 with the Sublime Porte. According to this project, an “Armenian Province” would be established and the Sublime Porte would appoint a Christian governor-general for five years. Nevertheless, the Sublime Porte rejected this proposal. As a result, Russia prepared a new reform project again. Based on this reform project, the Eastern Anatolia would be divided into two groups as follows; Erzurum, Trabzon and Sivas would constitute the first, as well as Van, Bitlis, Harput and Diyarbakır would form the second. For each group, the Great Powers would appoint an inspector-general for five years.⁷⁷ According to some remarkable articles of that reform project, a gendarmerie unit would be established in which Muslims and Christians would work together. Moreover, the minority communities would have right to use their own native languages in the legal affairs, and also official decrees would be published in

⁷⁵Robert Melson, *Revolution and Genocide: on the Origins of the Armenian Genocide and the Holocaust*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), p.138.

⁷⁶Christopher J. Walker, “World War I and the Armenian Genocide,” in Richard G. Hovannisian, (ed.), *The Armenian People from Ancient to Modern Times Vol. II*, (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2004), p.242.

⁷⁷ Halaçoğlu, op. cit., p.30-31.

Turkish, Kurdish and Armenian languages, and the whole Ottoman minorities would have right to establish their own private schools. In addition to these, the Hamidian Kurdish units would be abolished in the eastern part of the Ottoman Empire. Finally, the Russian reform for eastern provinces of the Ottoman Empire was accepted on June 30, 1913.⁷⁸

In accordance with the project, two inspectors, L.C. Westenek from the Netherlands and Nicolai Hoff from Norway, came to Istanbul in 1914. Meanwhile, the Grand Vizier Sait Halim Pasha and the Russian Ambassador agreed on a reform project that would make possible for every male citizen to do military service in their own localities. In addition, it was decided to hold election in the two provinces as soon as possible and to appoint the inspector-generals to the region. The CUP opposed to the Reform Agreement Act because of its experiences in the Balkan Peninsula, which made the authorities of the CUP very skeptical against the Great Powers' reform demands for the Armenian community. Due to the fact that World War I broke out, the Reform Agreement Act was not put into effect for the Armenians.⁷⁹

On the eve of World War I, the Armenian question gained a new dimension. The Armenian political committees evaluated the political conjecture as the most opportune time for the Armenian uprisings in order to establish an autonomous or an independent Armenian State.⁸⁰ When World War I broke out, the Armenian political committees and the Armenian Patriarch met together to discuss what would happen, if the Ottoman Empire entered the war. The representatives of Dashnaksutyun, Hunchak, and Ramgavar political committees attended that meeting at the Central Armenian School in Istanbul. In this meeting, they decided on the point that the Armenians would remain loyal to the Ottoman Government and they would do their military duties during the war. In June 1914, the Armenian Committee members held a congress in Erzurum where they declared their determinations to support the

⁷⁸Hovannisian, "The Armenian Question in the Ottoman Empire, 1876–1914," in Richard Hovannisian, (ed.), *Armenian People from Ancient to Modern Times*. Vol II., (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2004), p.236.

⁷⁹ Halaçoğlu, op. cit., pp.32-35.

⁸⁰ Öke, op. cit., p.90.

Ottoman Empire, if a war broke out between the Ottoman Empire and Russia. Nevertheless, they underlined that they would not be responsible for the action of the Russian Armenians in that congress. However, then the Dashnaks proclaimed that they would support the Russian army against the Ottoman Empire.⁸¹ This decision was published in the Dashnaksutyun's official newspaper *Horizion* as follows: "The Armenians have taken their place on the side of the Entente States without showing any hesitation whatsoever; they have placed all their forces at the disposition of Russia; and they are also forming volunteer battalions."⁸²

Although a general mobilization was called on August 3, 1914, most of the Armenian males were not eager to do their military duties in the Ottoman Army. However, a great many Armenians from Eastern Anatolia and Black Sea region joined the Tsarist Army. An Armenian National Bureau was established in Tbilisi to organize Armenian volunteers, and to provide military training for them.⁸³ According to Justin McCarty, the Russia gave 2.4 Million Rubles to the ARF in order to arm the Ottoman Armenians. The Russians distributed weapons to these organizations to attack on the Ottoman soldiers and the officials.⁸⁴

On August 2, 1914, the CUP Government signed a secret treaty with Germany in order to establish an alliance relationship. In November 1914, Russia declared war on the Ottoman Empire, and then Britain and France followed it. In that process, the revolutionary Armenians organized a number of rebellions throughout the eastern

⁸¹ Mehmet Saray, *The Principles of Turkish Administration and Their Impact on the Lives of Non-Muslim Peoples: the Armenians as a Case Study*, (Ankara: Ataturk Research Center, 2003), p.36.

⁸² Uras, op.cit., p.611.

⁸³ Öke, op. cit., p.119.

⁸⁴ McCarty, "The Reality of Armenian Issue", online at http://www.mfa.gov.tr/presentation-by-prof_-justin-mccarthy-at-the-tgna-on-the-reality-of-armenian-issue-conference-on-march-24-2005_en.mfa. (accessed on 20.02.2010)

provinces of the Ottoman Empire in order to attract attention of the Entente Powers, and to weaken the Ottoman army in Anatolia.⁸⁵

Between November 1914 and May 1915, the Armenian revolutionaries organized many revolts throughout the Ottoman Empire. The first Armenian rebellion began in Zeytun on August 30, 1914. The Armenian revolutionaries attacked on the gendarmerie forces in Zeytun. It was followed by other Armenian rebellions in different Ottoman cities including Muş, Kayseri, Diyarbakır, Ankara, Elazığ, Erzurum, Sivas, Trabzon, Adana, Urfa, İzmit, Bursa and Musa Mountain.⁸⁶

During World War I, the most atrocious of all Armenian rebellions was the revolt in Van in 1915, which began with support of the Tsarist Army on April 20, 1915. Under the leadership of Aram Manoukian, who was a member of the ARF, the Armenian revolutionaries attacked villages. However, the Ottoman Military Unit could not suppress these attacks in Van.⁸⁷ On May 2, 1915, Enver Pasha sent a telegram to the Governor of Van to inform that all Armenian revolutionaries would be sent out of the city.⁸⁸ In the meantime, the commander of the Third Ottoman Army sent a military force composed of the Erzurum and Erzincan mobile gendarmeries and some tribal Kurds to Van. However, the revolt in Van concluded with the evacuation of the Ottoman military forces and the Turkish population from Van. Consequently, Aram Manoukian was appointed as the governor of Van until the Russian forces came to there. Meanwhile, this rebellion spread to the sub-districts of

⁸⁵ Sonyel, op. cit., p.92. The Entente Powers began to implement their sharing plans over the Ottoman Empire with a series of secret treaties. These agreements meant to the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire. The Istanbul Agreement of 1915 was signed among Britain, Russia, and France in order to recognize Russia's claims on the annexation of Istanbul and Straits. The Treaty of London of April 26 1915 was signed among the Entente Powers to share the Mediterranean region. The Sykes-Picot Agreement of May 16, 1916 was signed among Britain, France, and Russia to share the Middle East region. Also, the Saint Jean de Maurienne Agreement of April 17, 1917, guaranteed Italy to the Aydın province with Izmir.

⁸⁶ Öztuna, op. cit., p.60.

⁸⁷ Justin McCarty, and Carol McCarthy, *Turks and Armenians: A Manual on the Armenian Question*. (Washington, D.C.: Committee on Education Assembly of Turkish American Associations, 1989), p.50.

⁸⁸ Gürün, op. cit., pp. 198–99.

Van including Erzurum, Bitlis, and Trabzon with the support of the Armenian revolutionaries.⁸⁹

While the Armenians were rebelling in Van, and the Russian Army was occupying the eastern territories, the Ottoman Army was busy to repel the Entente Powers attacks on the Dardanelles and the Gallipoli Peninsula on March 18, 1915. In that process, the British and French Navies had launched an attack to the entrance of the Straits, and the Russian Navy was positioned at the Black Sea.⁹⁰ The Ottoman Government began to suspect that Entente Powers were preparing to occupy Istanbul with the supports of Armenians. The Ottoman Empire's defeat at Sarıkamış, the Allied Power's attacks on the Dardanelles on March 18, 1915, the Armenian rebellions all over the country specifically in Zeytun and Van forced the Ottoman Government to take some precautions in 1915.⁹¹

Enver Pasha the Minister of War of the Ottoman Empire and Talat Pasha the Minister of Internal Affairs met the Armenian Patriarch and Varhtkes Efendi, who was a deputy from Erzurum, to warn them to control the Armenian revolutionaries and their activities against the Ottoman Government which would take measures to suppress their revolutions.⁹²

1.5. The Measures Taken By the Ottoman Government

1.5.1. The Decree of April 24 1915

The whole warnings of the Ottoman Government did not produce any positive result. While the Armenian rebellions were continuing, Talat Pasha sent a circular as “urgent and secret” to the provinces (*vilayets*) and the sub-provincial governorships (*mutasarrıflıks*) where the Armenian rebellions went on. He ordered that all revolutionary Armenian political committees would be closed, and their prominent

⁸⁹ Halaçoğlu, op. cit., p.50.

⁹⁰Hovannisian, “Determination of the Armenian Genocide,” in Richard G. Hovannisian (ed.), *Looking Backward, Moving Forward: Confronting the Armenian Genocide*, (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 2006), p.43.

⁹¹Alpay Şahin. “Follow up Interview with Berkday,” *Milliyet*, October 20, 2000.

⁹² Öke, op. cit., p.129.

leaders would be arrested because of their activities against the state.⁹³ After Talat Pasha's order, all Armenian political committees were closed due to the fact that they had armed the Armenians and provoked them to revolt, as well as these committees' documents were seized and 235 leading Armenians were arrested in Istanbul on the night of April 24, 1915.⁹⁴

During World War I, the Ottoman Intelligent Service determined that the Armenian political committees and the Entente Powers began to collaborate with each other against the Ottoman State. It monitored their activities in that period. Among 77,335 Armenians living in Istanbul, it designated only 610 Armenians to be arrested due to their dissident activities against the Ottoman Empire. Among 610 Armenians, 356 Armenians were members of Dashnaksutyun. 173 Armenians were members of the Hunchakian political committee, and 72 of them of Ramgavar and 9 of them of other Armenian communities and different organizations.⁹⁵ Although it had been determined 610 Armenians, only 235 Armenians were found at their homes on that night.⁹⁶ Among these people, there was an Armenian woman writer Zabel

⁹³ Binark, op. cit., p.21.

⁹⁴ Sarıay, op. cit., p.75.

⁹⁵ Uras, op. cit., p. 620.

⁹⁶ According to an Ottoman publication printed in 1916, approximately 77,335 Armenians were living in Istanbul when World War I broke out. Among those Armenians living in Istanbul, only 235 Armenians were arrested because of their activities against the state on April 24, 1915. The number of the arrested Armenians in Istanbul is a very complicated issue. Having been indicated numbers are very inconsistent within the limited sources. For example, in some sources, the number of the arrested Armenians in Istanbul was 2,345. On the other hand, according to British Military Office report, which was sent from Dedeğaç, it was approximately 1800. According to the German Ambassador report, this number was stated as 500. On the other hand, the U.S. Ambassador Morgenthau indicated that the number of arrested Armenians was 100. For detailed information see: Sarıay, op. cit., p.75.

Esayan. However, she was not found at her home in April 1915. Then, she fled to Bulgaria in 1915.⁹⁷

On April 24, 1915, 235 Armenians were arrested at Istanbul. First, the arrested Armenians were sent to the military barracks at Selimiye by buses. Then, they were gathered in the Central Prison Menderhane. Next, the Armenians were sent to Haydarpaşa train station to be transferred to Ayaş and Çankırı.⁹⁸ The Ministry of Interior sent a message to the governship of Ankara as follows that:

This evening at 10:23 hours, train number will leave Haydarpaşa and will arrive in Ankara the day after at eight o'clock, with train number 164 and the remaining approximately 100 Armenians will be deported via Ankara to Çankırı. During the end of April and the first week of May, 155 of 235 arrested Armenians in Istanbul were sent to Çankırı and 80 people were sent to Ayaş military chandlery.⁹⁹

The Ayaş town is forty miles west of Ankara, which was arranged for the Armenian political leaders. On the other hand, the city of Çankırı is located northeast of Ankara, which was destined for the Armenian intellectuals and community leaders.¹⁰⁰ In Ayaş, they were imprisoned in the military barracks, whereas the arrested Armenians were put in summerhouses where they stayed in groups of three or five in Çankırı. Those arrested Armenians were able to walk around the city centre of Çankırı. However, they had to give daily report to the police station in every twenty-four hours in Çankırı. Between April and August months, these people were

⁹⁷ Elif Shafak, "Accelerating the Flow of Time - Soft Power and the Role of Intellectuals in Turkey," *World Literature Today*, 80 (1), pp. 24-26. Esayan came from an upper class Armenian family in Istanbul. She studied at Sorbonne University in Paris. She was interested in the social injustice issue. She believed that the Armenian peasants suffered from the unequal living standards under the Sultan Abdul Hamid II regime. She supported the idea of a liberal and secular state. Interestingly, Esayan continued to support the CUP regime after the Adana Incident. For more detailed information see also: Hasmik Khalapyan, "Zabel Esayan," in Lerna Ekmekcioğlu and Melissa Bilal, (eds.), *Bir Adalet Feryadı, Beş Ermeni Feminist Yazar (1862-1933)*, (Istanbul: Aras Yayıncılık, 2006), pp.167-201.

⁹⁸ Peter Balakian, *Burning Tigris: Armenian Genocide and America's Response*, (New York: Harper Collins Pub. 2004), p.212.

⁹⁹ Sarıay, op. cit., p.79.

¹⁰⁰ Sarkil Y. Karayan, "From the Book Shelf –Two Must Read Books: 'The Fatal Night and Ayashi Pandic, 'The Prison of Ayash'." *Massis Weekly*, online at <http://www.massisweekly.com/Vol27/issue45/pg11.pdf>, (accessed on May 15,2009)

imprisoned in Çankırı in 1915. On the other hand, in Ayaş, most of Armenians were imprisoned until the end of World War I.¹⁰¹

The Ottoman Government tolerated the imprisoned Armenians, if they had any health problem. Among those imprisoned Armenians in Çankırı, an Armenian musician and priest Vartabet Gomidas was set free due to his health problem posttraumatic stress disorder on May 7, 1915. After his compulsory dwelling in Çankırı approximately thirteen days, he returned to Istanbul. Henry Morgenthau, U.S. Ambassador to Istanbul, and his friends Turkish poet Mehmet Emin Yurdakul, and a Turkish woman writer Halide Edip Adıvar endeavored for his liberation. After Talat Pasha sent a telegraph to Çankırı, Gomidas were released. In Istanbul, he appealed to the Ministry of Interior to go abroad on August 30, 1917. Then, he went to Vienna due to his health problem in September 1917. Nevertheless, after that year onwards, Gomidas did not return to Istanbul.¹⁰²

In a little while, the majority of the arrested Armenians were released in Çankırı, whereas the imprisoned Armenian were kept in Ayaş during World War I. Those Armenians were trialed in the Courts Martial due to their dissident activities against the Ottoman Empire. Among those Armenians, 18 prisoners were subjected to death penalty. The rest of the Armenians were sentenced to prisons so that some of them were sent to different Ottoman provinces including Diyarbakır, Kayseri, Ankara, Elazığ and Istanbul. On the other hand, some of them were sent to Der-el-Zor district. After the Mondros Armistice on October 30, 1918, the rest of the Armenians had right to return to Istanbul.¹⁰³

¹⁰¹ Sarıay, op. cit., pp.75-77.

¹⁰² Murat Bardakçı, "O Heykelin Altına "Soykırım" Yazmak En Azından Gomidas'a Hakarettir," *Hürriyet*, April 27, 2003.

¹⁰³It was permitted some imprisoned Armenians to return from Çankırı to İstanbul after the date August 1915. On the other hand, it was not allowed the majority of the imprisoned Armenians to return to Istanbul. For more detailed information see: Sarıay, op. cit., pp.77-79.

1.5.2. The Relocation of the Armenians in 1915

During World War I, the second precaution was taken by the Ottoman Government to terminate the Armenian rebellions. The Ottoman Government issued a temporary law entitled the Relocation and Settlement Law (*Tehcir ve İskân Kanunu*) to relocate Armenians living in some specific areas where the security of the Ottoman borders were under threat, which was accepted on May 27, 1915.¹⁰⁴ This temporary law comprised of four articles concerned to precautions, which were taken by the Ottoman army against the Armenian revolutionaries in World War I as follows:

Article I- If during the war time the army and army-corps and military divisions' commanders and the independent local commanders meet with opposition and armed attack and resistance against the Government and defense of the country and protection of the discipline and order in any way by the people in relation with the applications and arrangements done, immediately they have and are permitted to exterminate the attack and the resistance with the military forces and in a most powerful way.

Article II- The army and independent Army-Corps and Military Divisions can inhabit the people of the villages and districts which they feel it is suitable because of military purposes or in relation with espionage and betrayals they feel to other places.

Article III- This law is valid after its publication.

Article IV- Vice-Head Commanders and Minister of Defense are responsible of the validity of this law.¹⁰⁵

By this law, the Ottoman Government would relocate the Armenians living in strategic areas to other Ottoman provinces including Mosul, Der-el-Zor, Aleppo, and Damascus. In the first phase, the Armenians, who lived in Erzurum, Van, and Bitlis where were near to the fronts in Caucasus and Iran would be relocated. Then, the Armenians who lived in Mersin – İskenderun area where were near to the Sinai front, and the other Armenians who lived in other provinces would be relocated to prevent their collaborations with the Entente Powers.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁴ Saray, op. cit., p.41.

¹⁰⁵ Süslü, op. cit., p.113-114.

¹⁰⁶ Halaçoğlu, "Realities Behind the Relocation," in Türkkaya Ataöv (ed.), *Armenians in the Late Ottoman Period*, (Ankara: The Turkish Historical Society for the Council of Culture, 2001), pp.109-110.

The Law on Relocation and Settlement was published in the Ottoman official newspaper *Takvim-i Vekayi* on June 1, 1915.¹⁰⁷ Also, a circular was published concerned to the protection of the resettled Armenians' properties in June 1915. Based on this circular, a commission entitled Abandoned Property Commission was founded to protect Armenians' goods and livestock. That commission registered the whole properties of Armenians in villages and towns. They prepared some books on their all properties, which left behind the Armenians. Then, these registered documents were sent to the churches and the local administrations. According to that circular, the Armenians' properties would be sold on market value and the commission would keep the money.¹⁰⁸

When the new legislation term began in the Ottoman Assembly, the temporary Law on the Armenian Relocation and Settlement was approved on September 15, 1915, and the Armenian Relocation process officially began for the Armenian community.¹⁰⁹ Based on the Ottoman official documents, approximately 1,300,000 Ottoman Armenians lived in the Ottoman Empire in 1915. When the Armenian relocation process began, approximately 702,900 Armenians were relocated.¹¹⁰ Between the years 1915 and 1916, the Armenians, who lived in the cities as follows Erzurum, Bitlis, Van, Mersin Iskenderun, Adana, Ankara, Aydın, Bolu, Bursa, Canik, Çanakale, Diyarbakır, Edirne, Eskişehir, Erzurum, İzmit, Kastamonu, Kayseri, Karahisar, Konya, Kütahya, Elazığ, Maraş, Niğde, Samsun, Sivas, and Trabzon were relocated to outside the war zones. They were settled the province of Mosul, the district of Urfa, and the district of Der-el-Zor, which places refer to today's Syria and Iraq.¹¹¹

The relocation decision was not applied for the whole Armenians who lived in the Ottoman Empire. The Armenians who lived in Germiş, Urfa, in Canik,Çanakkale, Adapazarı, Halep, Bolu, Kastamonu, Erzurum, Aydın, Trabzon,

¹⁰⁷Yusuf Hikmet Bayur, *Türk İnkılabı Tarihi*, (Ankara:Türk Tarih Kurumu Yaymevi, 1983), p.27.

¹⁰⁸ Halaçoğlu, op. cit., pp.66-67.

¹⁰⁹ Binark, op. cit., p.26.

¹¹⁰ Halaçoğlu, op. cit., pp.98-99.

¹¹¹ Süslü, op. cit., pp. 116-117.

Edirne, Tekirdağ, Konya, and Karahisar-ı Sahib were left untouched. In that process, both the Protestant and the Catholic Armenians were not relocated as well. Moreover, artisan and businessmen Armenians as well as their families were not relocated. Furthermore, the Armenians who worked in the Ottoman Bank, in the tobacco administration, in the foreign consulates, and in hospitals were left out. In addition to all these, the elderly, blind, disabled, widows and homeless Armenians and orphan children were not relocated by the Ottoman Government in 1915.¹¹²

During the relocation process, a great many Armenians lost their lives due to epidemic diseases and severe shortages of fuel, food, medicine and other supplies.¹¹³ In addition, a large number of Armenians passed away because of the fact that small gendarmerie units could not provide the Armenian convoys' securities. On June 14, 1915, a secret code was sent to give information about the situations of the Armenians on the roads. According to this code as follows "...it is necessary to defend the lives of traveling Armenians during the transportation. The killings of these removing people must be prevented and along the road all kinds of precautions must be taken against the attacks of the tribes and peasants. Those who strive to seize by violence and murders had to be punished."¹¹⁴ Talat Pasha formed four different commissions to investigate reasons behind the deaths of Armenians between Halep and Der-el-Zor regions. These commissions comprised of the members of court appeals, council of state and chairs of the punishment courts. Talat Pasha ordered those commission members to take necessary measures. Those commissions found 1397 people guilty due to the fact that they were responsible for the deaths of Armenians in that process.¹¹⁵

¹¹² Halaçoğlu, op. cit., pp.76-81.

¹¹³Based on the Ottoman official documents, the Armenian population was 1.001.465 in 1893 census of the Ottoman Empire. The Armenian population increased to 1.120.748 in 1906 census, and this number reached to 1.221.850 in Population Statistics of 1914. Based on the official registrations, approximately 438,578 Armenians were removed, and 382,148 of these people were settled in different settlement districts. For more detailed information on the Armenian population issue see: Justin McCarthy, "The Population of the Ottoman Armenians," in Türkkaya Ataöv (ed.), *The Armenians in the Late Ottoman Period*, (Ankara: The Turkish Historical Society, 2001), pp.65-85.

¹¹⁴ Gürün, op. cit., pp. 285–286.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., p.228.

On November 25, 1915, the Ottoman Government sent an instruction to inform that the Armenian relocation process was to terminate temporarily due to the harsh winter conditions. Then, this temporary decision replaced with a permanent decision on February 21, 1916. Based on this decision, except some Armenians who engaged in revolutionary activities against the state, the rest of Armenians would not be relocated after that date. Consequently, the relocation process ended on March 1916. Following days, the relocated Armenians were sent to new areas instead of their own hometowns concerned to administrative, financial, and military reasons. At the end of World War I, a degree was issued relating with the relocated Armenians. According to this degree, the relocated Armenians would be able to return to their own original hometowns from the date January 4, 1919 onwards.¹¹⁶

1.6. The Fall of the Armenian Question from the International Agenda

Although the separatist Armenians cooperated with the Allied Powers for the period of World War I, they could not materialize their dreams on establishing an independent Armenian State on the Ottoman territories. During World War I, the Transcaucasian Democratic Federative Republic was established with Georgia and Azerbaijan in 1918. Nevertheless, this state lasted from February to May 1918. When it was dissolved, the Democratic Republic of Armenia was founded on May 28, 1918.¹¹⁷

Meanwhile, the Armenians still kept their hopes, when the Ottoman Empire accepted her defeat in World War I after signing the Armistice of Mudros with the Allied Powers on October 30, 1918. This armistice signaled the approaching end of the Ottoman Empire. After the armistice was signed, the Allied Powers landed on Istanbul first, and then appointed their commissioners. They also occupied the Ottoman lands using the Article 7 of the Armistice of Mudros on their favor after the date October 31, 1918. Then, the Armenian question was brought into the

¹¹⁶ Halaçoğlu, op. cit., pp.98-99.

¹¹⁷ Fahir Armaoğlu, *20.Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi, (1914-1995)*, Cilt 2, (İstanbul: Alkım Yayınevi,2005), pp.141-142.

international agenda via the Allied Powers at the Paris Peace Conference once again. In that conference, the Armenians repeated their claims to establish an independent Armenia, but this time they had to accept the mandate rule of either the Allied Powers or the United States of America.¹¹⁸

By the end of World War I, the United States of America was interested in peace process in the Middle East. The President of the United States of America Woodrow Wilson delivered a speech to declare the Fourteen Points at the American Congress in 1918. His speech became a basis for the New World Order, which based on moral principles and the concept of “self determination.”¹¹⁹ President Wilson’s approach encouraged the Ottoman Armenians in that period. In the Paris Peace Conference, the Armenian delegates Bogos Nubar Pasha and Avedis Aharonian demanded compensation from Turkey, which almost ‘nineteen billion francs’ for the Armenian casualties and some parts of Turkish territories including Van, Bitlis, Diyarbakır, Harput, Sivas, Erzurum, and Trabzon, Maraş, Kozan, Cebel-i Bereket, Adana, Antakya, Yerevan, Gümrü, and Kars.¹²⁰

In the Paris Peace Conference, the Council of Ten adopted a draft resolution with respect to the separation of Armenia, Syria, Mesopotamia, Palestine, and Arabia from the Ottoman Empire and the acceptance of mandates.¹²¹ Meanwhile, President Wilson sought to develop a program for peace in the region. Although President Wilson did not support any idea concerned to the mandate system in the Middle East, and the Caucasia regions, he formed a commission, which comprised of Italian, British, French, and American members, in order to investigate the mandate issue. In that process, France and Britain refused to take part in that commission due to a deadlock issue, which was Syria. In spite of this, President Wilson sent two American officials who were Charles Crane and Henry Churchill King to the region. The King-Crane Commission suggested the establishment of an American mandate

¹¹⁸ Kundakçı, op.cit., pp.197-198.

¹¹⁹ Öke, op. cit., pp.238-240.

¹²⁰ Ibid., pp.224-225.

¹²¹ John DeNovo, *American Interests and Policies in the Middle East 1900–1939*. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1963), pp.114-115.

for the region. The Commission stated that the Syrians were eager to be established an independent state or an American mandate. Nevertheless, the Commission opposed to the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine. However, in the end, the U.S. Administration applied none of these suggestions. Although the 'King-Crane commission had submitted their report on August 28, 1919, this commission's findings were unofficially published in 1922.¹²²

In September 1919, President Wilson sent another commission to the region. The Major General James G. Harbord headed this commission that interviewed with the community leaders and representatives of government and local community people in the region.¹²³ The General Harbord submitted a report to the commission on October 19, 1919. The commission opposed to the establishment of an American mandate over Armenia because of its general cost. According to the commission report, the American mandate for Armenia would cost at least 756,014,000 American Dollars for a five-year period. As a result, the American Senate rejected it to preserve the America's military, missionary, and commercial interests in the region. Also, based on the General Harbord's report, the Armenians had not the majority of the population in the region,¹²⁴

In the meantime, the representatives of the İstanbul Government signed the Treaty of Sevres with the Entente Powers on August 10, 1920.¹²⁵ Based on this treaty, an independent Armenian State would be established and President Wilson would determine its boundaries. However, the Ankara Government opposed this treaty and its provisions. For the moment, under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal,

¹²² Roger Trask, *The United States Response to Turkish Nationalism and Reform, 1914-1939*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1971), p.26.

¹²³ Thomas A. Bryson, *United States/Middle East Diplomatic Relations, 1784- 1978*, (Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1979), pp.25-27.

¹²⁴ Recep Boztemur, "Religion and Politics in the Making of American Near East Policy: 1918-1922," *JSRI*, (Summer, 2005), pp. 52-55.

¹²⁵ Based on the Treaty of Sevres, the Straits would be controlled by an international commission. An independent Armenian and Kurdistan States would be established on the Ottoman territories. In addition, the eastern Thrace and some Aegean islands would be given to Greece, As well as, Italy would take Dodecanese and Rhodes Islands. Moreover, the Great Powers would regulate the Turkish economy concerned to the capitulation rights. For more detailed information see: Sonyel, *Turkey's Struggle for Liberation and the Armenians*, (Ankara: Center for Strategic Research, 2000), p.143.

the Turkish nationalists began the Turkish War of Independence against the Allied occupation in Anatolia when the French and British forces occupied the Ottoman capital İstanbul and İzmir. The Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA) was established to represent and defend the rights of the Turkish people of Anatolia in Ankara on April 23, 1920. The TGNA armies battled against the Armenians in Eastern Anatolia and the Greeks in the Western Anatolia.¹²⁶ After the Turkish-Armenian War, the Treaty of Alexandropol was signed between Turkey and the Armenia on December 2, 1920. Then, the Moscow Treaty was signed between Turkey and the Bolshevik Soviet Union in 1921.¹²⁷ However, when the Bolshevik invaded to Armenia, the Alexandropol Treaty was superseded with the Treaty of Kars on October 23, 1921. Based on this treaty, it was allowed for Soviet annexation of Armenia in exchange for Turkish control over the regions of Kars, Iğdır and Ardahan, which are accepted as historical homelands by Armenians. In 1922, the Democratic Republic of Armenia was annexed by the Soviet Union, and then it was combined with Azerbaijan and Georgia to form Transcaucasian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic. This republic lasted until the year 1936, and then it was dissolved.¹²⁸

Meanwhile, the Turkish War of Independence ended up with a victory against the Allied Powers. At the end of this war, the Armistice of Mudanya was signed. On November 13, 1922, a peace conference was held between the Ankara Government and the Great Powers at Lausanne. Britain, France, Italy, Japan, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Greece, and Turkey attended that conference. However, the United States only sent observers to the Lausanne Conference. They were interested in the subjects of rights and the properties of American citizens, the new opportunities for the American business enterprise, and the American Protestant missionary

¹²⁶Stanford Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, Vol. II, (Cambridge: Cambridge University,1973), pp. 405-422.

¹²⁷ Saray, op. cit., pp.48-49.

¹²⁸ Suny, op. cit., pp.120-133.

activities.¹²⁹ At the conference, some prominent Armenian-Americans worked for the Armenian case.¹³⁰

The European Powers submitted a proposal at the Lausanne Conference as well. According to this proposal, an independent Armenia would be established in the Eastern Anatolia and its borders would be determined by the League of Nations. However, Turkey refused their whole territorial demands by asserting the treaties of Alexandropol, Moscow and Kars. On January 6, 1923, Lord Curzon touched upon the issue of the Armenian question at the conference. İsmet İnönü, who was the representative of the Turkish Grand National Assembly, responded Curzon's allegations on the Armenian question as follows:

It is entirely the Allies who bear the responsibility towards the Armenians. It is the Allies who turned the Armenians against Turkey and used them as a political tool. It is the Allies who delivered the Armenians up to hunger, epidemics, and finally emigration. We are not to blame for this, but rather the powers of the Entente. If the Armenians deserve compensation for everything they have endured, you give it to them! That the Armenians were unfortunate. That they must be given a homeland and independence. We are certain of this. However, there is not only one unfortunate nation in the world. Egypt so many times, and only yesterday, has been bathed in its blood for its independence. India, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, want their independence, their home land. For how many centuries, how much blood have Irish shed for their homeland, for their independence?...Give these people their homeland, their independence...What you have read is out of order. Under these conditions, we cannot stay here. I am leaving the session.¹³¹

On July 24, 1923, the Lausanne Conference was concluded with the Peace Treaty of Lausanne signed between Turkey and the European Powers. At the end of the conference, the borders of the Turkish Republic as well as its status were recognized as an independent and sovereign state. According to the Article 44 of this treaty, Turkey was to recognize regulations on the protection of minorities and secure religious freedom for all minorities in Turkey.¹³² In addition, based on the Article 31

¹²⁹ Öke, op. cit., p.300.

¹³⁰ Trask, op. cit., p.29.

¹³¹ Gürün, op. cit., p.432.

¹³² Berna Türkdoğan, *1915'ten Günümüze Tehcir (Türk'ler ve Ermeni'ler)*, (İstanbul: IQ Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık,2006), pp.211-213.

of this treaty, it was underlined that every former citizen of the Ottoman Empire who had acquired a new nationality through the establishment of the new independent states could come to Turkey as a Turkish citizen anytime within two years. However, there was not any provision concerned to the Armenian community in the Treaty of Lausanne, which made the Treaty of Sevres invalid.¹³³ At the end of the Lausanne Conference, the Armenian question dropped from the international agenda since the members of the Allied Powers mainly the Great Britain and France, which had helped the Armenian revolutionaries to materialize their plans on the establishment of an independent Armenia, focused on their own internal problems.

¹³³ Gürün, op. cit., pp.432-439.

CHAPTER II

ARMENIAN NATIONALISM AND THE RESOURCES KEEPING IT ALIVE

The Lausanne Peace Conference with its results removed the Armenian question from the agenda of the international politics. At the end of that conference, the members of the Allied Powers of World War I including the Great Britain, France, Russia, and the United States of America focused on their own internal problems. Those powers began to struggle with social and economic problems to keep political and economical stabilities in their own states. Between the years 1920s and 1940s in the United States, during which the U.S. economy was in a severe decline and millions of American people were out of work. While the United States was trying to overcome her economic problems, the Soviet Union engaged in internal problems to steady her new regime and to prepare a ground for the implementation of industrialization program. In the meantime, the Transcaucasian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic was established under control of the Soviet Union in 1922. From that year onwards, the Armenian society was transformed from an agricultural society to an industrial one with values of Soviet communism. The Armenians went into silence to build a new life in the countries where they migrated and tried to keep their national identity alive. In the meantime, the Armenians waited for a suitable time to bring the Armenian question into the attention of the world again. However, this became possible by World War II.¹³⁴

2.1. The Armenian Diaspora

The term Diaspora refers to the large numbers communities living outside of their own homelands. One of the Diaspora communities in the world is the Armenian Diaspora that mainly migrated from the Ottoman Empire and other countries to the United States of America and Europe. The history of the Armenian Diaspora dates

¹³⁴ Donald Bloxham, *The Great Game of Genocide : Imperialism, Nationalism, and the Destruction of the Ottoman Armenians*, (Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2007), p.212.

back to the late nineteenth century. The Armenian Diaspora emerged for the first time when the Armenians migrated from the Ottoman Empire to the Europe, the Middle East, and to America after the series of uprisings organized by the Armenian political committees between the years 1895 and 1896. In addition to this, the Protestant American missionaries played an important role in the process of the encouragement of the Armenians especially from the eastern parts of Anatolia to migrate to the United States, and other countries as well. After the first wave of Armenian's migration, the second one came with World War I. The Armenians from the Ottoman Empire migrated to the Middle East, Europe, and North and South America following the events of 1915.¹³⁵

Those Armenian immigrants formed a strong Diaspora community in different countries especially in the United States and France, as well as attracted many Armenians in different times. Thus, after World War II, a few thousand of Armenians migrated to the U.S. with the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. In parallel to the Arab-Israeli conflict in the Middle East region, which will be examined in the following passages, a large number of Armenians migrated to the U.S. When the quota system was lifted concerned to the migration to the U.S., most Armenians from the Middle Eastern countries including Egypt, Lebanon, and Iran migrated there. After 1975, many Soviet Armenians, who had repatriated to Soviet Armenia after World War II, preferred to migrate to the U.S. The last wave of the Armenian migration to America happened after the earthquake of 1988 in Armenia. Almost 11,000 Armenians from Soviet Armenia migrated to there.¹³⁶

According to the trusted estimates, there are four to five million Armenians in the Diaspora.¹³⁷ Today, the Russian Federation and the U.S. have the largest Armenian communities in the world. Almost 1,500,000 Armenians live in Russia, and 1,000,000 Armenians in the United States of America. Moreover, there are

¹³⁵George A. Bournoutian, *A History of the Armenian People*, Vol. II. (Costa Meza, California: Mazda Publisher, 2004), p.177.

¹³⁶Mirak, "The Armenians in America," in *The Armenian People From Ancient to Modern Times*, (ed.), Richard Hovannisian (New York: Palgrave Macmillian, 2004), pp.390-392.

¹³⁷Armine Ishkanian, *Democracy Building and Civil Society in Post-Soviet Armenia*, (London: New York: Routledge, 2008), p.136.

400,000 Armenians in Canada, 30,000 in Austria, 60,000 in Argentina, 15,000 in the rest of the Latin America and around 30,000 in France and another 100,000 Armenians live in the rest of Europe.¹³⁸

Today, the Armenian Diaspora is very influential ethnic community in some countries where they live in. Thus, from the early twentieth century onwards, the Armenian Diaspora became an important player in keeping Armenian nationalism alive, and the Armenian question alive with a hope of reviving the historical Armenia. They have been trying to use every condition and process as well as their enormous economic and political powers in the countries where they live in to force Turkey to accept the 1915 events as if it was genocide and to pay compensation for the loss of the Ottoman Armenians.¹³⁹

2.1.1. Arab Nationalism and the Armenian Community in the Middle East

In the historical process, the Middle East was one of the regions where the Armenians lived in majority. Today, sizable groups of Armenians have lived in the several Middle Eastern countries. A large number of Armenians, who migrated from this region, contributed to the formation of the Armenian Diaspora mainly in Europe, and in the U.S. The most of the Armenians living in the Middle East migrated to that region from the Ottoman Empire after the events of 1894-1896, and the events of 1915. After their migration to the Middle East, the Armenians began a new life by integrating into the economic and social lives. In the 1920s, with support of the European Powers, the Armenians became very influential minority community particularly in those states' economies. Both in Lebanon and in Iran, the Armenian community had special social and legal statuses. Robert Mirak explains the situations of the Armenians in the region as follows "the Armenians shied away from involvement in political affairs, they remained urbanities with petit bourgeois

¹³⁸Khachig Tololyan, "Armenian Diaspora," in Ember, Melvin, Carol R. Ember, and Ian Skoggard (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Diasporas: Immigrant and Refugee Cultures around the World*. (New York: Springer, 2004),p.43.

¹³⁹Sadi Çaycı, "Uluslar arası Hukuk Açısından Ermeni Sorunu ve 1915 Olayları," in Ömer Engin Lütem (ed.), *Ermeni Sorunu Temel Bilgi ve Belgeler*, (Ankara: ASAM, 2007), pp.176-177.

outlooks, lacking sufficient concern to the political and social currents influencing Arab society.” Before the rise of Arab nationalism, the Armenians enjoyed privileges in the Middle Eastern countries where they mainly settled in Lebanon, Syria, Egypt, Iran and Iraq.¹⁴⁰

However, the Armenians’ lives in the Middle East region began to alter after the region went into the nationalist uprisings following World War II. In fact, this was not the first revival of Arab nationalism. A historical background of Arab nationalism dates back to the late nineteenth century, when they began to rebel against the Ottoman Empire. The rise of Arab nationalism accelerated and reached a success with support of the Great Britain and France during World War I. After the war, an important part of the Middle East was divided into the French and the British mandates to be supervised by the League of Nations.¹⁴¹ Syria and Lebanon were assigned to France, whereas Iraq, Jordan, and Palestine were assigned to Britain.¹⁴²

In the post war era, the Allied Powers determined the character of Arab nationalism. For a while, the Arabs under the force of their feudal leadership endured the mandate regime until Arab nationalists began to resist against the mandate regime and tried to get rid of it with support of the Soviet Union. In the first phase of Arab nationalism, national movements arose in each of those states, which were founded in the formerly Ottoman area, due to the fact that they struggled for their independences from the British and the French mandates.¹⁴³

The Arab nationalists became successful in getting their independences concerned to the developing conditions before World War II. Nevertheless, something began to change in the region after World War II. The establishment of Israel as well as the politics of the U.S and the Soviet Union in the region affected countries in the Middle East. As a result, a second phase started in Arab nationalism and the fates of the Armenians were determined concerned to these political developments. The second phase of Arab nationalism appeared as a revolutionary

¹⁴⁰ Libaridian, op. cit., p.36.

¹⁴¹ Bournoutian, op. cit., p.180.

¹⁴² Don Peretz, *Middle East Today*, (New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1971), pp.133-135.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp.133-141.

movement in a radical manner. Namely, the Arab nationalist movement started after World War II. The establishment of Israel caused to raise Arab nationalism. When the United Arab armies were defeated in the war against Israel in 1948, this shocked formed the basis for the Arab nationalists' unification. With the support of Syria, Gamal Abdel Nasser the leader of Egypt began to lead the Arab nationalists to get rid of Israel from the region. His struggle continued throughout the 1950s and its aftermath. At the same time, Syria and Egypt had to struggle against the U.S., Britain, France, as well as Israel.¹⁴⁴

The new regime in Egypt based on the state bureaucracy rather than on the single party. In Egypt and Syria, the statist policies were followed to be able to develop themselves. Between these two countries, relationships entered to the dead-end street in 1958. The Syrian Arab Socialists united with Egypt in 1958, but could not keep it long. In the union, however, the Egyptian's centralist single-party system and the state bureaucracy caused a great tension with the Syrian Ba'thist. Between Egypt and Syria, this clash led to the Syria's withdrawal from the Union in 1961.¹⁴⁵

After the rise of Arab nationalism, the Armenian community began to face with some difficulties in the Middle Eastern countries, where statism emerged especially in Syria and in Egypt. The rise of statism affected relations between the Armenian communities and the states. The revolution of 1958 and the creation of the United Arab Republic meant to some restrictions in the economy area and to some extent restrictions in social relations for the Armenians. In that process, the majority of Armenians lost their financial properties. Moreover, the emergence of Nasserism altered the relations between the Armenians and the state especially in Syria and in Egypt. The new state policies were very suppressive for the minority communities to control the economy and their social relations with the western countries. The impact of these changes became very stressful for the Armenians who lost their prosperities there.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴⁴Türel Yılmaz, *Uluslararası Politikada Ortadoğu (Birinci Dünya Savaşından 2000'e)*, (Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları, 2004), pp.49-51, 58-64.

¹⁴⁵ Mirak, op. cit., pp.362-365.

¹⁴⁶ Libaridian, op. cit., p.38.

All in all, these political changes affected the Armenian community living in the Middle Eastern countries and caused their migration from the region. In Egypt following the military uprising in 1952 and after 1956 Nasser's nationalization policies, many Armenians migrated to Europe, Australia, and the United States of America.¹⁴⁷ In Syria, the revolution of 1958, and the creation of the United Arab Republic with Egypt as well as the military coup of 1963 damaged the Armenians' positions there. This development also caused the migration of the Armenians, who migrated from Syria to Lebanon, and some others to the U.S.¹⁴⁸ When the Lebanese Civil War erupted, many of the Armenians left from Lebanon. Those people mainly migrated to the U.S. and France. In addition, some Armenians in Iran shared the same fate with other Armenians who lived in the Middle East region. They migrated to western countries after the Iranian Revolution in 1979.¹⁴⁹

2.1.2. The Armenian Diaspora in the United States of America

The most influential community of the Armenian Diaspora comprises of approximately one million Armenians who live in the United States of America. Today, Los Angeles with its 800,000 Armenian population is accepted as the second largest city in the world.¹⁵⁰ Most of the Armenians first migrated to the North America. Within the three migration waves, the Armenian Diaspora was formed in the United States of America. A large number of Armenians migrated to the U.S. from the Ottoman Empire in the late nineteenth and in the early twentieth centuries. After the first trade agreement was signed in 1830, the relationships developed gradually between the Ottoman Empire and the United States. Then, between these two countries, trade relations gained importance for the United States as the most-

¹⁴⁷ Bournoutian, op. cit., p.181.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., pp.183.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., pp.184-186.

¹⁵⁰ Walker, *Armenia and Karabakh: The Struggle for Unity*, (London: Minority Rights Group: 1991), pp.49-51.

favoured-nation. The American merchants began to conduct their commercial relations with the mediation of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire.¹⁵¹

In that process, the American missionary activities gained momentum in the Ottoman Empire. Indeed, before the beginning of commercial relations, the American missionary activities began on the Ottoman lands. In the historical process, members of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Mission (ABCFM) arrived in the Ottoman Empire in order to evangelize Jews and Gregorian Armenians in the 1820s. Two American missionaries Levi Parsons and Plinky Fisk worked among the Armenians. They kept on spreading their activities to every corner of the Ottoman Empire by opening schools, hospitals, churches, and orphanages. The Armenian people benefited from these facilities in that period. By 1914, the ABCFM maintained 17 principal mission stations, 9 hospitals, and 426 schools.¹⁵² In 1839, approximately 800 Orthodox Armenians were converted to Protestantism. When the number of converted Armenians aroused, the Armenian Patriarch of Istanbul became very critical against the American missionaries and their missionary activities among the Armenians.¹⁵³ However, then the Ottoman Government accepted the Protestantism as a separate religious sect, and millet in 1850.¹⁵⁴

The first Armenian community migrated to the United States mainly to make commerce and to continue their education processes.¹⁵⁵ By means of the American Protestant missionaries, and the American merchants in the Ottoman Empire, a great many Armenians began to migrate to the United States.¹⁵⁶ The early Armenian immigrants to the United States settled in the urban and industrial centers either in the East coast including New York City, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Jersey or in the Midwestern cities including Detroit, Chicago, and Cleveland. At the end of the nineteenth century, approximately 100,000 Armenians arrived in North

¹⁵¹ Gordon, op. cit., pp. 119-127, 155-157.

¹⁵² Trask, op. cit., pp. 9-10.

¹⁵³ Erhan, op. cit., p.321.

¹⁵⁴ Gürün, op. cit., p.89.

¹⁵⁵ Mirak, op. cit., p. 25.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., p.35.

and South America. The majority of those people settled New York City and other metropolitan cities because of the fact that they could find job easily in those cities.¹⁵⁷

When the Armenian immigrants arrived in the U.S. in the nineteenth century, most of them began to work at unskilled or semiskilled occupations. The Armenians were hired to work with minimal wages in dangerous works without being the protection of labor unions. The heavy working conditions motivated them to work very hard in order to save money. After World War II, some Armenians left these cities to settle in California where they worked on farms in Fresno II. Many of them aimed to open small businesses or to buy a farm in California. Later, the majority of Armenians became landowner in Fresno, California. Then, San Francisco and Los Angeles attracted more Armenian immigrants to work there.¹⁵⁸

By the 1920s, many Armenians left factories to set up their own small businesses in different business sectors. For them, one of the most favorite occupations was shop-keeping in that period. Then, they began to work as barber, shoemaker, grocery shop owner, tailor, and butcher in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia.¹⁵⁹ At the same time, some Armenians managed to monopolize the oriental rug business in the major metropolitan centers in the U.S.¹⁶⁰ Approximately 30,771 Armenians migrated to the U.S. in the second migration wave, between the years 1920 and 1924. However, based on the Johnson Reed Immigration Act, the U.S. Administration reduced the annual quota to 150 for the Armenian immigrants in the year 1924.¹⁶¹

The first generation gave importance to their children's education in the New World. These immigrants' children managed to move up in the American society regarding with their literacy rates. The younger Armenians began to work as doctor, engineer, lawyer, and teacher in that period. By the third generation, they took part

¹⁵⁷ Bournoutian, op. cit., pp.188-189.

¹⁵⁸ Mirak, op. cit., p.394.

¹⁵⁹ Bournoutian, *A Concise History of the Armenian People: from Ancient Times to the Present*, (Costa Mesa, California: Mazda Publishers, 2002), p.317.

¹⁶⁰ Mirak, op. cit., pp.395-396.

¹⁶¹ Ibid., p.394.

significantly in science, academy, medical, and engineering areas. Although there was a common educational opportunity in the U.S, the idea of being own bosses attracted many young Armenians. The younger generation Armenians preferred to establish their own agricultural communities in Fresno and Coachella Valley of Southern California as mentioned before.¹⁶²

The third immigration wave began at the end of World War II. The Armenians migrated to the United States due to the political developments in the Middle East and the Caucasian regions. In this wave, approximately 700,000 Armenians fled from the Middle Eastern and Soviet Armenia to the United States.¹⁶³ In the United States, some of them have managed to open small stores including filling stations and auto shops, whereas other Armenians have become very influential in real estate and the jewelry sectors. Today, the Armenians have controlled the jewelry sector in Los Angeles. On the other hand, the situations of the immigrant Armenians from Iran, Iraq, and Lebanon were a bit different from the previous Armenian generation who were uneducated and unskilled. Those new immigrants melted easily in the same pot with the American people because of their high education rates, their familiarity with western cultures and languages, and their strong experiences in the economies of the developing Middle Eastern states.¹⁶⁴

2.1.2.1. The Armenian Church in the United States of America

The Armenian Church had an important role in the formation and preservation of the Armenian identity and this has been the fact no matter where the Armenians living. Like all immigrant groups in the world, the Armenians tried to preserve their cultural heritages and identities through the Armenian Church. The three sects Gregorian, Protestant, and Catholic were established in the United States. The Gregorian Armenians founded the first Armenian Church in Massachusetts in 1881. Then, the first Apolistic Church was established there in 1891. The Protestant Armenians also established their own churches in the U.S. states. The Armenian

¹⁶² Ibid., p. 397.

¹⁶³ Ibid., p.390.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., p.398-399.

Catholic Exarchate was also set up in New York City. At present time, the number of the Armenian churches in the United States is 115 in total. Because the fear of assimilation, the Armenian churches have been kept alive by the powerful conservative forces.¹⁶⁵

The Armenian Church has served to protect the Armenian identity in the United States of America. It has supported the Armenian language courses and encouraged the young Armenian-Americans to attend these courses. Also, the church has worked to increase use of English among the new immigrant Armenians to adapt them to a new life in the U.S. In addition, it has organized men and women's clubs in the church halls and community centers. Today, the Armenian Diaspora members have continued to support the church related activities and give a special attention to attend its annual commemorations on the events of 1915.¹⁶⁶

2.1.2.2. Armenian Political Parties in the United States of America

After the Armenians migrated to the U.S. and became visible in the economy area, they established their own political parties to maintain their national struggle. The most influential Armenian political parties are the Armenian Revolutionary Federation (ARF), Hunchakian Social Democratic Party of Eastern U.S. and Armenian Democratic Liberal Party (Ramgavar). These parties are very influential political ones in the U.S. than the other countries in the world. The Armenian political parties have served as a pressure factor over the American Congress concerned to their huge financial resources. Today, three political parties have focused on the Armenian Diaspora's social, economic, and cultural problems and particularly Turkish-Armenian relations and Armenian-Azerbaijan relations as well as the Armenian question in the United States of America.¹⁶⁷

The central organization of the Dashnaks, which is based in Boston, is called the Armenian Revolutionary Committee of America that has affiliated to the

¹⁶⁵Anny P. Bakalian, *Armenian-Americans: From Being to Feeling Armenia*, (New Brunswick: Transaction Publisher, 1993), p.92.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 93.

¹⁶⁷Şenol Kantarcı, "Ermeni Lobisi: ABD'de Ermeni Diasporasının Oluşması ve Lobi Faaliyetleri," *Ermeni Araştırmaları*, No:1, Ankara, Mart-Nisan-Mayıs,2001, pp.150-169.

Catholicosate of Antelias. The ARF has represented approximately one-half of the total Armenians who live in the United States. It has published three newspapers, which are *Dashnaktsutyun*, and *Azbarez* in Armenian language and *Haireik* in English language as well as a quarterly periodical entitled the *Armenian Review*. Another political organ of the Armenian Diaspora is the Armenian Liberal Party Ramgavar, which is based in Massachusetts. It has accepted the spiritual authority of Etchmiadzin. Like the Dashnak party, it has published a daily newspaper *Baikar* in Armenian and a twice-weekly *Mirror-Spectator* in English languages. The central organization of the Hunchaks is the Social Hunchakian Party of America. This party is based in New York City. It publishes a daily newspaper, *Eritassard Haiasdan* in the Armenian language.¹⁶⁸

Within the historical process, a number of parties remained active in the Diaspora. These political parties were interested in every political development in Soviet Armenia. Namely, the major political lines of these parties were drawn on the basis of the approach toward the Soviet Union. The Dashnaks opposed to the existence of communist regime in Soviet Armenia so that the members of Dashnaks desired to establish an independent Armenian State from Moscow. On the other hand, the Ramgavar and Hunchak parties accepted the Soviet rule as a beneficial step to establish an independent Armenia State, and to protect the Armenians from the future Turkish attacks in the region.¹⁶⁹

The Diaspora Armenians conducted an effective anti-Turkey campaign regarding with the events of 1915. They took support from the Armenian Church, and the Armenian activists in that process. Like the Armenian Church, the Diaspora political parties, served to preserve the Armenian identity against the assimilation threat. The allegations on the events of 1915 continued to keep Armenian identity alive in the Cold War period. The members of Armenian Diaspora worked to emphasize the importance of four stages in the Armenian question including

¹⁶⁸ Uras, op. cit., p.66.

¹⁶⁹ Mirak, op.cit., p.433.

“propaganda, recognition, indemnity, and land.”¹⁷⁰ The politics made the Armenian Diaspora effective in every movement against Turkey.

2.2. The USSR and the Soviet Armenians

Until Soviet Armenia became independent, it experienced many changes, which contributed to the development of Armenian nationalism as well as caused the migration of many Armenians to the United States and other countries. The way to the Republic of Armenia was laid with the developments through the end of World War I with the triumph of the Bolsheviks in 1917, which brought the end of the Russian Empire. After the Bolshevik Revolution, the Russian Empire was dissolved in 1918. As mentioned before, in February 1918, the Transcaucasian Democratic Federative Republic was established with the participation of Armenia, Georgia, and Azerbaijan. After three months, that republic collapsed in May 1918. Then, an independent Democratic Republic of Armenia was established on May 28, 1918. In 1922, the Bolshevik Russia occupied, and Armenia became part of the Soviet Socialist Republics under the establishment of the Transcaucasian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic on November 29, 1922. This federative state lasted between the years 1922 and 1936. Then, the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic was established, and this lasted until 1991.¹⁷¹

Like other Soviet Republics, Soviet Armenia had her own constitution. However, her foreign policy, foreign trade, civil and criminal legislation, education, health services, and army were regulated by Moscow. In that period, it was permitted one official political party, which was the Armenian Communist Party. It comprised of a number of minor socialist parties such as the Socialist Revolutionaries, Mensheviks, and Specifists.¹⁷² At the end of 1923, under the Soviet regime, the Dashnaksutyun was forced to evacuate Soviet Armenia like other opponent voices. In parallel to the political developments in the Soviet Armenia, the ARF followed an

¹⁷⁰ Lütem, “Ermeni Sorununun Olası Gelişmeleri,” in Ömer Engin Lütem (ed.), *Ermeni Sorunu Temel Bilgi ve Belgeler*, (Ankara: ASAM, 2007), pp.126-127.

¹⁷¹ Bournoutian, *A History of the Armenian...*, pp.131-149.

¹⁷² Bournoutian, *A Concise History...*, p.317.

anti-Soviet policy in the Armenian Diaspora. On the other hand, other Diaspora parties the Hunchak and Ramgavar avoided criticizing to the Soviet regime. Those two parties supported communist regime against Turkey's annexation threat to Soviet Armenia. According to Ronald Sunny, the establishment of an Armenian State was very remarkable step in the nation building process, although it was under control of the USSR. He states that:

The Armenians have constituted a people all over the world, in hundreds of communities and for many centuries, but for the first time in modern history they constituted a nationality, in the sense of a conscious and mobilized ethnic group, by the end of the nineteenth century. Armenians continue to constitute a nationality in the twentieth century in various parts of the world where their communities organize for cultural and political preservation and advancement – for example, in Lebanon, France, Argentina, and the United States. However, the Armenians constitute a nation in only one part of the world, in *Haiastan* itself, in the various incarnations of the Republic of Armenia- independent, Soviet and independent again.¹⁷³

2.2.1. Vladimir Ilyich Lenin and the Soviet Armenians

Under the Soviet communist rule, Soviet Armenia began to change with modernization process. When Vladimir Ilyich Lenin came into power, modernization process went hand in hand with a nation building process. Lenin implemented the New Economic Policy (NEP), which had a great influence over the Armenian economy and culture. In the economy area, the Moscow Government desired to develop the Soviet Armenian's industry, and modernize the agricultural base of peasant life.¹⁷⁴ Ronald Suny depicts the modernization process of Soviet Armenia as follows:

In the early 1920, about 90 percent of Armenians were living on the lands. The country had too little land to support so many people in agriculture, yet few ambitious industrial projects were undertaken in this period. The first major development project in Armenia were building the canals (for example, the *Shirak* Canal, constructed between 1922 and 1925) irrigation of desert areas (particularly the *Sardarabad* desert), and the electrification of the country. By 1928, Armenians could boast twenty hydroelectric plants. Clearly peasant life was being improved.¹⁷⁵

¹⁷³ Suny, *Looking Toward Ararat...*, pp.131-132.

¹⁷⁴ Bournoutian, op. cit., pp.320-321.

¹⁷⁵ Suny, op. cit., p.143.

With the support of the Soviet Government, the industrialization process gained momentum in Soviet Armenia. The development of the Armenian industry solved partially the unemployment problem of Soviet Armenia. Meanwhile, the peasant Armenians began to migrate to cities, especially Yerevan. The Armenian society met the concept of urbanization as an extinction of the modernization process.¹⁷⁶

Besides economic, industrialization, and urbanization developments, the Soviet Government was eager to alter traditional values of the Soviet Armenians. The Moscow Government aimed to replace the Soviet Armenians' traditional and religious values with secular and socialist ones. To materialize its aim, it planned to expand industries. In addition, the Moscow Government supported to be established new schools and cultural institutions in that period. Meanwhile, the traditional Armenian women were encouraged to join the work force. In that perspective, it was underlined that the Armenian women should left behind their traditional female roles in the family life in order to defend their rights, and to become visible in every parts of social life. The Moscow Government formed a women's section (*Ginbazhin*) in order to encourage women to struggle for women's equality in the patriarchal Armenian society.¹⁷⁷

Meanwhile Armenian nationalism took a new form under Lenin's rule. The concept of *navization*, which was outlined in a resolution of the Tenth Party Congress in March 1921, became catalyst in the rise of nationalism. It was planned to organize administrative, economic organs and to develop local languages through schools, theaters, and newspapers in their own national languages.¹⁷⁸ In that period, the Moscow Government supported native languages and cultures of each republic. For the first time, Armenian became the official language of the republic. It began to be used commonly in Soviet Armenia. The Moscow Government supported to be

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., p.144.

¹⁷⁷ Bournoutian, op. cit., p.320.

¹⁷⁸ Hovhanisian, "The Republic of Armenia," in Richard Hovhanisian (ed.), *The Armenian People From Ancient to Modern Times*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillian, 2004), pp.320-321.

used the Armenian language among Armenians. In that process, all local newspapers, schools, courts, and theaters could use their own native languages. In addition, the establishment of the State University in Yerevan was very remarkable step for the Armenians because the science language became officially the Armenian language instead of the Russian language.¹⁷⁹

Between 1920 and 1937, a period of cultural renaissance began for the Armenian artists and scientists, which meant to the expression of the relative freedom in Soviet Armenia. The Armenian language, literature, and different branches of art continued to unite the Armenian nation under the communist regime. Some Armenian writers and poets such as Tumanian, Isahakian, Terian, Armen, Yesayan, Mahari, Totovents, Alazan, Zorian, Bakunts, Demirjian and Charents combined socialism with their nationalist feelings in that period. Their works revived the Eastern Armenian literacy tradition of Abovian and Raffi.¹⁸⁰ Also, some Armenian historians, linguists, composers, painters, sculptors, novelists and poets, such as Leo, Ajarian, Abeghian, Spendarian and Sarian, returned to Soviet Armenia to continue their lives on their native soils. In addition, a conservatory of music, national theater, and a film studio were founded with support of the Moscow Government in that period.¹⁸¹

While Soviet Armenia was transforming to an industrial and secular society, the Armenian question was shelved for a while. In that process, the founder of the Turkish Republic Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and the leader of the Soviet Union Lenin established close diplomatic relation. As a result, the Treaty of Friendship was signed between two countries on March 16, 1921. Lenin evaluated policies of Atatürk as an anti-imperialist force. Also, Moscow hoped to control the Muslim Central Asia so that she avoided antagonizing the Muslims. In addition to these, the Armenians could not warm up the Armenian question to bring into the world's agenda because of the fact that it was not allowed the Soviet Armenians to follow an independent and

¹⁷⁹ Bournatian, *A History of the Armenian People...*, pp.160-161.

¹⁸⁰ Suny, op. cit., pp.144-146.

¹⁸⁰ Hovannisian, op. cit. p.320.

¹⁸¹ Ibid., p.321.

neutral foreign policy from Moscow. Consequently, the Armenian question could not be brought into the attention of the world until the Soviet Union decided to use this question as a political trump against Turkey at the end of World War II.¹⁸²

2.2.2 Joseph Stalin and the Soviet Armenians

In the years following Lenin's death in 1924, Joseph Stalin began to rule the USSR from the year 1926 until he died in 1953. Under Stalin's rule, the Transcaucasian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic was dissolved, and the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic was established in 1936. In the same year, the new constitution of the USSR was adapted. Armenia became one of the fifteen Soviet Socialist Republics, which was governed by the Central Committee of the Republican Communist Party.¹⁸³

When Stalin came into power, he continued to modernize the Armenian SSR economy and society. The New Economic Policy replaced with the adaptation of the first Five Year Plan. Stalin introduced his five-year plan with a new slogan "Socialism in One Country." Stalin aimed to continue the industrialization of Armenian society so that the Armenian peasants were forced to accept the concept of the collective farm and give up their grains and animals to the state. However, the Armenian peasants opposed to the Stalin's collectivist policy. As a reaction to the Moscow Government, the Armenian peasants killed their own farm animals and destroyed crops. In that process, many of them migrated to the cities and they formed the new Armenian working class in the cities. Paralleling to the development in the Armenians industry, a number of white-collar workers brought up in Soviet Armenia. The unemployment problem was eliminated in a successful manner. Regarding with the industrialization, an upward social mobility occurred in the Armenian society. That is to say, the Armenian society became more urban and more industrial and more educated, which formed the commercial bourgeoisie in the Armenian SSR.¹⁸⁴

¹⁸² Kemal Karpat, "Turkish-Soviet Relations," in Kemal Karpat (ed.), *Turkey's Foreign Policy in Transition: 1950-1974*, (Leiden : E. J. Brill, 1975), pp.79-82.

¹⁸³Palabiyik, op. cit., pp.236.

¹⁸⁴ Bournoutian, op. cit., p.162.

Meanwhile, the rise of local nationalism began to be prevented by Stalin since he evaluated it as a great danger against the socialist unity. The social transformation began to affect negatively the Armenian society as well. Through using the police power, the Communist Party of Armenia (CPA) created a chaotic milieu in order to strengthen its political power on the Armenian population. Stalin established a secret policy unity entitled as the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs (NKVD) to suppress the whole opponent powers. The Soviet patriotism came under influence of the Stalinist police-party state. That is to say, under the Stalin rule, on the one hand, the Armenian State was centralized; on the other hand, the Stalinist police party increased its pressure on the rise of Armenian nationalism, which meant to the end of *navization*.¹⁸⁵ Under the Stalinist police-party state, the Russian language became compulsory for all Armenian students. The Armenians perceived the Soviet patriotism as a genuine threat toward the development of Armenian nationalism. In that perspective, the Armenians noticed the importance of their own languages, histories, and cultures. However, the Moscow Government continued to follow a very repressive policy against the development of local nationalisms.¹⁸⁶ For example, religious motifs were eliminated gradually so that anti-religious activities increased under the communist regime. Between Moscow and Yerevan relationships became very problematic when the Catholicos Khoren I Muratbekian passed away. There was a widely belief that he had been killed by the communist secret police. Interestingly, after Muratbekian died, it was not permitted Armenians to elect a successor to the Catholicos Khoren I Muratbekian.¹⁸⁷

As mentioned above, Armenians nationalism was curtailed under Stalin's rule. On the contrary, Russian nationalism was appreciated more than any local nationalism in different areas by Moscow. For instance, Russian nationalism was praised in social life through music, and theater plays. In that period, some films were produced to praise the Russian culture entitled *Peter the Great*, *General*

¹⁸⁵ Suny, op. cit., pp.153-154.

¹⁸⁶ Bournoutian, op. cit., p. 163.

¹⁸⁷ Suny, "Soviet Armenia," pp.366.

*Suvorov, Ivan the Terrible, Alexander Nevskii.*¹⁸⁸ By 1932, Soviet conservatism's traces began to be seen in different branches of art. The Armenian intellectuals and artists were forced to return to classicism. In that process, novels of Raffia, and Rafayel Patkanian were evaluated as provocative books.¹⁸⁹ The Moscow Government expected that writings had to be realistic in style; architecture had to underline classical and national motifs instead of modernism. Regarding with these developments, the Armenian nationalists, and intellectuals became very critical against Stalin's police state and his offensive policies against local nationalism.¹⁹⁰ Among these people, there was Aksel Bakunts who was arrested to encourage bourgeois nationalism among Armenians through his work. Like Bakunts, poets Eghishe Charents, Alazan, Grigor, Mahari, Vahan Totovents, Vanantetsi, and Ter Simonian were arrested, and then exiled by the Soviet Government.¹⁹¹ Consequently, as mentioned above, such radical social transformation including collectivization, industrialization and Stalin's oppressive policies contrary to the policies of Lenin affected negatively the Soviet Armenians.

2.3. World War II and Its Effects on Armenian Nationalism

World War II with its results created a great hope among the Soviet Armenians because they believed that they would be able to materialize their demands. While the Diaspora Armenians, who were living in other parts of the world, kept their silence, the Soviet Armenians who supported the Soviet army in World War II in order to benefit from the results of the war. When the war broke out in Europe with the occupation of Poland by Germany in 1939, Soviet Russia joined the war. The war brought many changes to Soviet Armenia. The Soviet Russian Government became centralized in that process. Stalin continued to behave like a dictator, which increased tension among the Armenian nationalists. The secret Soviet police and its oppressive policies caused a chaotic political milieu in Soviet Armenia, which

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., pp.364-365.

¹⁸⁹ Bournoutian, op. cit., p.163.

¹⁹⁰ Suny, *Looking Toward Ararat...*, pp.153-155.

¹⁹¹ Ibid., pp. 155.

signaled the end of modernization. However, this war meant to the revival of Armenian nationalism through the state policy for the Armenian community.¹⁹²

On June 22, 1941, when Adolf Hitler's armies crossed the Soviet border, Stalin altered his oppressive policies against the Armenians. Of course, some radical Armenians' collaborations with the Nazi Germany influenced Stalin's pragmatist policy in that period. The collaboration between the Nazis and the Dashnak Armenians surfaced, when they signed a document to declare their cooperation against the Soviet Union. Actually, between the Armenians and the Nazis, that cooperation was based on mutual interests. The Dashnaks supported the Nazi Germany to establish an independent Armenian State from Moscow.¹⁹³ On the other hand, the Armenians living in Soviet Armenia worried that the Turks would attack on Soviet Armenia, while the Soviet Russia was battling. In that process, Stalin softened his policies against the Armenian Church to take support of the Armenians. A number of Armenian churches were opened in Soviet Armenia, and it was permitted some Armenian clergymen to return from Siberia. In addition, a Council of Ecclesiastical Affairs was founded in Soviet Armenia. Toward Stalin's softened policy, the Armenian Church supported the USSR during World War II.¹⁹⁴ That is to say, the war against the Nazi Germany became a unifying factor in the Armenian society. As mentioned above, many of the Armenians joined the Russian army in order to fight against the Nazi Germany after the Armenian Church invited the Armenians to struggle against fascism. When World War II ended with the victory of the Allied Powers in 1945, the political alignment and social structure of the world altered in a radical manner. As a response toward the Armenian Church's support to the Russian army, it was permitted the election of new Catholicos. In that process, Gevorg VI was elected. In addition, it was allowed him to live in Etchmiadzin.¹⁹⁵

At the end of the war, the Soviet Union and the U.S. emerged as two superpowers in the international political arena. A new period began in the

¹⁹² Ibid., pp.155-161.

¹⁹³ Laçiner, op. cit., p.138.

¹⁹⁴ Suny, "Soviet Armenia," p.366.

¹⁹⁵ Bournoutian, op. cit., p.164.

international politics, which was called as the Cold War. It emerged with conflict and economical competition between those two states. This period lasted almost forty-six years.¹⁹⁶ In that process, Turkey was pressured by Moscow to permit some degree of the Soviet control on the region. That is to say, the USSR wanted a revision for the Soviet-Turkish border in the region of Kars and Ardahan, and for the Montreux Convention to give guarantee to her. Again, the Armenian question was brought into the agenda with Stalin's demands from Turkey. Stalin revived the Armenian question, which had been shelved at Lausanne.¹⁹⁷

On the other side, the Soviet Armenian leaders and political parties in the Armenian Diaspora supported Stalin's pragmatist policies at the end of World War II. For instance, the Armenian National Council of the United States organized the San Francisco Conference for the unification of the lands of Turkey and Soviet Armenia. Meanwhile, the major Armenian political party in the Diaspora, the ARF altered its priority from the establishment an independent Armenian State to the recognition the events of 1915 as the so-called Armenians genocide, which caused to the rise of national consciousness among the Armenians. For that aim, they decided to cooperate with Soviet Armenia in order to unify the Turkish lands to Soviet Armenia.¹⁹⁸ The Armenian clergies, who gathered for the Congress in Etchmiadzin to elect a new Catholicos, supported Stalin's policies toward Turkey. Gevork VI sent a letter to Stalin after his election to demand land from Turkey with support of the USSR.¹⁹⁹

Meanwhile, Stalin failed concerned to his demands because of the fact that Turkey was supported by the U.S. against the Soviet penetration threat to the region. Stalin's pragmatist policy forced Turkey to establish close dialogue with the U.S. against the Soviet threat. In the first phase of the Cold War, the U.S. supported Turkey and Greece against the USSR. The U.S. Congress accepted the Truman

¹⁹⁶ Ann Lane, "The Cold War as History," in Klaus Larres and Ann Lane (eds.), *The Cold War: Essential Readings*, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2001), pp.1-3.

¹⁹⁷ Suny, *Looking Toward Ararat...* ,p.167.

¹⁹⁸ Bloxham, op.cit., p.212.

¹⁹⁹ Suny, op. cit., p.167.

Doctrine, which was an anti-communist foreign policy that President Truman set forth in 1947, in order to call for military and economic aids to these countries whose political stabilities were threatened by the communist regime. In addition, the U.S. Government offered an economic aid plan to Europe. It was the Marshall Plan which loaned nearly 9 billion American Dollars to the western countries. The United States aided millions American dollars to Turkey in order to protect Turkey's stability. Moreover, in that process, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was established to contain communism in 1949. Turkey became member of NATO in 1952.²⁰⁰ Turkey's entry into NATO was a remarkable step in Turkish-American relations, which consolidated through sending Turkish military force to South Korea against North Korea.²⁰¹ In the Cold War period, with the declaration of the Truman Doctrine and the admission of Turkey as a member into NATO, the Soviet leader Stalin's hopes on the territorial gain came to an end.²⁰²

Stalin invited the Diaspora Armenians to Soviet Armenia in order to settle in, and revitalize the country's population, although Soviet Armenians tried to struggle with economic problems at the end of World War II. However, he managed to finance that movement with support of the anti-Soviet political parties in the Diaspora. In June 1946, the first group of repatriates came to Soviet Armenia. In the following three years, approximately 90,000 Armenians came from different countries including Lebanon, Syria, Iran, Greece, France, Turkey, and even the United States of America to their homelands. Interestingly, many of these people were exiled to Siberia or to Central Asia because of the fact that those repatriated Armenians were supposed as spy of western powers. On the other hand, the rest of the Armenian immigrants began a new life in Soviet Armenia. When the Soviet Government gave them new homes, it brought about a great dissatisfaction among the Armenians in Soviet Armenia. After a short time, those people preferred to return

²⁰⁰ William Hale, *Türk Dış Politikası 1774-2000*. (Petek Demir, Trans.), (İstanbul: Arkeoloji Sanat Yayınları,2003), pp.116-118.

²⁰¹George S. Harris, "Turkish-American Relations Since the Truman Doctrine," in Mustafa Aydın and Çağrı Erhan (eds.), *Turkish-American Relations: Past, Present and Future*, (London and New York : Routledge, 2004), pp.65-69.

²⁰²Armaoğlu, op. cit., pp.426-430.

to the western countries, when Soviet Armenia faced with an economical strait in the Cold War period.²⁰³

After Stalin died in 1953, a new era opened for Soviet Armenia. Once Nikita Khrushchev came into power, he began to eliminate the secret police NKVD. Under the Khrushchev's rule, the local Soviet Armenian Government became more independent from Moscow.²⁰⁴ In that period, statue of Stalin was destroyed in Moscow's Red Square, which meant to the re-emergence of *nativization* in the Soviet Armenian society again. Armenian culture and language were revived by Moscow. For instance, it was permitted Raffi and Patkanian's books to be published again. In the economy area, Khrushchev continued to industrialize Soviet Armenia. Also, he implemented a new policy in which the farms were divided into smaller ones for the Armenian peasants. Moscow continued to give importance to the improvement of the urbanization and the modernization.²⁰⁵

All in all, between the years 1950 and 1960, political changes, social, and intellectual developments caused a new phenomenon that was dissident nationalism. Instead of supporting assimilation, the Moscow Government encouraged the development of local nationalism in Soviet Armenia. It led a great awareness of national culture and national language among Soviet Armenians. While Armenian nationalism was rising, the Soviet Armenians preserved their loyalty toward the Soviet regime until the year 1988. However, dissident Armenian nationalism, which was developed with support of Moscow, reminded an old "historical enemy," and the events of 1915, which had occurred in the Ottoman Empire, to the Armenians.²⁰⁶

²⁰³ Suny, op. cit., pp.158-159.

²⁰⁴ Ibid., pp.180-182.

²⁰⁵ Bournoutian, op. cit., pp. 165-166.

²⁰⁶ Suny, op. cit., pp.186-187.

CHAPTER III

TURNING POINTS IN THE RE-EMERGENCE OF THE ARMENIAN QUESTION: COLD WAR PERIOD

Up until the year 1965, the Armenian question passed from various phases as mentioned in the previous chapters. After World War II, the political developments gradually revived Armenian nationalism both in Soviet Armenia and in different countries where the Armenian Diaspora members lived in. In parallel to the changing international politics, the Armenian question was used as a political trump against Turkey during the Cold War period. The Armenian question, which had been covered with ashes, became a burning fireball on the fiftieth anniversary of the so-called Armenian genocide. The year of 1965 became a milestone date in the Armenian question.

For the first time, Soviet leader Vladimir Stalin had brought the Armenian question into the international political agenda at the end World War II. Second, the Armenian question was brought into international political agenda with a mass demonstration, which was held by the Armenian nationalists in Yerevan in 1965. Paralleling to the mass demonstration in Yerevan, a number of countries organized some demonstrations to commemorate the Ottoman Armenians who passed away in the events of 1915. While this was the case, the rising problems **at the Cyprus Island** gave one more chance to the Diaspora Armenians to use this question against Turkey. Interestingly, when the United States warned Turkey not to involve in Cyprus crisis, a new cooperation began between Turkey and the USSR. In the world, the whole balances of power changed very fast with the Cyprus crisis. These political developments gradually prepared the re-emergence of the Armenian question as an aspect of Armenian nationalism in Yerevan in the year 1965.

Interestingly, while the Armenian question was being brought into world's political agenda through mass demonstrations, Turkey's unresponsive manner strengthened the hands of the Armenian Diaspora. In that period, Turkey's general approach underlined that neither Turkish politicians nor Turkish scholars evaluated

those mass demonstrations as a genuine threat and a political problem of Turkey. With the establishment of the Armenian terrorist organizations, the Armenian question gained a different dimension in the mid-1970s. The Armenian terrorist organizations targeted Turkey, its allies, and the Turkish diplomats to attract the world's attention to the Armenian question between the years 1975 and 1985. Meanwhile, the strengthened Armenian Diaspora moved the Armenians Question to the parliaments after the 1980s.

3.1. Peace Operation in Cyprus and Its Role in the Armenian Question

The Cyprus crisis was one of the most important problems of Turkey, which appeared in the Cold War period. It caused to resurface the Armenian question in the world. According to many scholars, there is a connection between the re-emergence of the Armenian question and the Cyprus crisis. When it took place in the international politics as a political problem after the mid-1960s, the Diaspora Armenians began to use this issue against Turkey. After Turkey did a peace operation in 1974 by landing Turkish Army on the North of Cyprus to save the Turkish Cypriots from the Greek Cypriots' planned massacre on them, the tension increased gradually in the world.²⁰⁷

As mentioned above, the collaboration between the Greeks and the Diaspora Armenians surfaced with the Cyprus crisis. The Greeks evaluated the Turkish occupation of the northern part of Cyprus as a genuine threat to the Hellenistic world. On the one hand, Turkey was trying to struggle with the Cyprus crisis; on the other hand, the Armenian terrorism became a diplomatic problem for Turkey in the Cold War period. In the Cyprus crisis, the two superpowers' approaches toward Turkey encouraged the Armenian radicals in the process of the formation of the Armenian terrorist organizations, which would target the Turkish diplomats and its allies in the world.²⁰⁸

²⁰⁷ Laçiner, op. cit., p.161.

²⁰⁸ Ibid., pp.162-163.

In fact, for the first time the collaboration between the Greeks and Armenians surfaced in the Lausanne Peace Conference where Greece supported the Armenian allegations on the events of 1915. The Prime Minister of Greece Eleftherios Venizelos defended the Armenian allegations on the events of 1915 during the Lausanne Conference.²⁰⁹ The reason behind his defense was the Armenian Diaspora in Greece. Virtually, after World War I, many Armenians migrated to Greece where they formed the Armenian Diaspora that became a very influential minority community in the political arena of Greece. They continued to serve under the Committee for the Armenian Community in Greece. The Armenians established the *Melkonian* College in Cyprus, in 1926. In that college, the Armenian students especially from the Middle Eastern countries were educated. Cyprus Armenians have served as a bridge for the Armenian immigrants, who migrated from Middle Eastern countries to Cyprus and Greece.²¹⁰

In the late 1950s, the Cyprus crisis became a vital issue in the Turkish foreign policy. Turkey opposed to a Greek rule on the Cyprus island or a union with Greece (ENOSIS). Two agreements Zurich and London were signed in that process. Based on those agreements, independence of Cyprus was granted. However, a tension arose when President Makarios of Cyprus proposed a plan to alter the constitution after Dr. Fazıl Küçük had been elected as the Vice President of the Republic of Cyprus. President Makarios insisted on alteration of the constitution, but Turkey rejected his demand in December 1963. In other words, when the Cypriot President Makarios Government decided to change the Cypriot's Constitution, a deadlock conflict began in the island. Finally, this tension resulted with a clash between the Turkish and Greek Cypriots.²¹¹

²⁰⁹ Uras, op. cit., p.58-64.

²¹⁰ Hirair Dekmejian, "Armenian Diaspora: A Conceptual Framework," in Richard Hovannisian (ed.), *The Armenian People From Ancient to Modern Times* Vol.:2. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan,2000),p.428.

²¹¹Süha Bölükbaşı, *The Superpowers and the Third World, Turkish-American Relations and Cyprus*, (Maryland: University Press of America), p.1.

In order to materialize the *Akritas* Plan, the Greek Cypriots began to annihilate the Turkish Cypriots on December 21, 1963. The National Organization of Cypriot Fighters (EOKA) attacked the Turkish villages. Immediately, Turkey decided to take military action. In that process, the United States President Lyndon Johnson sent a diplomatic note to İsmet İnönü who was the Prime Minister of Turkey. In this note, President Johnson warned Prime Minister İnönü not to conduct a military intervention in Cyprus, and not to use the American arms given within the framework of NATO membership. In addition, he presented his worries on the Turkish intervention which would lead to a Soviet attack, and NATO would not defend Turkey.²¹² President Johnson stated in his letter that:

NATO allies have not had a chance to consider whether they have an obligation to protect Turkey against the Soviet Union, if Turkey takes a step which results in Soviet intervention without the full consent and understanding of its NATO allies and the United States would not allow Turkey to use any American – donated military equipment in the invasion.²¹³

Despite President Johnson's warning, the Turkish Government sent aircrafts, and the Turkish army bombed military bases of Greek Cypriots. Consequently, the honeymoon phase in the Turkish-American relations ended, and the Turkish-American relations began to deteriorate. The Turks evaluated the letter of the U.S. President as an obstacle toward the Turkish-American alliance and friendship. Meanwhile, the leftist movements began to develop in Turkey.²¹⁴ Toward President Johnson's letter, a response came with street demonstrations in Turkey. Many young university students wanted to show their reactions through shouting slogans as "No to NATO" or else "Down with American Imperialism." Therefore, the mood altered toward the United States Administration and it became increasingly hostile toward the Turkish-American alliance among the Turks.²¹⁵

²¹² Meliha Altunışık, "Turkish-American Security Relations: The Middle East Dimension," in Mustafa Aydın and Çağrı Erhan (eds.), *Turkish-American Relations: Past, Present and Future*, (London; New York : Routledge, 2004), p.152.

²¹³ Parker T. Hart, *Two NATO Allies at the Threshold of War: Cyprus, A First Hand Account of Crisis Management: 1965-1968*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1990), pp.163-165.

²¹⁴ Hale, op. cit., pp.155-156.

²¹⁵ Yasemin Çelik, *Contemporary Turkish Foreign Policy*, (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1999), p.49.

At the first phase of the Cold War period, Turkey became strategic partner of the U.S., which supported Turkey through military and economic aids against the USSR. Even, as mentioned before, when Stalin wanted two remarkable revisions on the Turkey's border with the Soviet Union in the region of Kars and Ardahan as well as the Montreux Convention to give guarantee to the Soviet Union, the United States gave support to protect regional balances of power against the USSR. Nevertheless, by the Cyprus crisis, the diplomatic relations began to deteriorate between Turkey and the U.S.²¹⁶

Interestingly, in that process, Turkey tried to collaborate with the USSR, when her relation got worse with the U.S. In 1965, Turkey's Prime Minister Süleyman Demirel managed to establish military cooperation with the USSR, when a delegation Nikolai Podgorny from the Supreme Soviet, headed by Politburo (Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union) visited Turkey in 1965. After Podgorny's visit, Declaration of Friendship was made and agreements of economic cooperation and assistance were signed again in 1967. After relationships were established with Moscow, Ankara did not permit the U.S. to use the military bases in Turkey in the 1967 and 1973 Arab-Israeli Wars.²¹⁷

While Turkish and Soviet relations were developing gradually, the Cypriot Foreign Minister moved the Armenian question into agenda of the United Nation Security Council in 1964. He accused Turkey and the Cypriot Turks of implying at the "terrible Turk" image with his remark.²¹⁸ Meanwhile, Etchmiadzin Catholicos Vazken I and Khore I Catholicos of the Great House of Cilicia warmed up the Armenian question through publishing two statements to attract attention of the Diaspora Armenians in 1965. Here there is an interesting point that the USSR supported Etchmiadzin Catholicos Vazken I, whereas the U.S. supported Khore I Catholicos of the Great House of Cilicia during the Cold War process.²¹⁹

²¹⁶ Ibid., pp.49-50.

²¹⁷ Ibid., pp.50-51.

²¹⁸ Laçiner, op. cit., pp.161-166.

²¹⁹ Ibid., p.224.

Despite all efforts for the Cyprus issue, any success could not be gained. The Turkish army began to land her troops in Cyprus in July 1974. The United Nations Security Council called for a cease-fire, but that did not terminate the Turkish landing on the Cyprus island. Since 1974, Turkey has continued her occupation on the northern part of Cyprus. Today, the island has been partitioned between the Greek led state of Cyprus and the Turkish zone. In November 1983, the Turkish zone has declared herself as the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.²²⁰

Finally, the Cyprus crisis became very remarkable process in the Armenian question. While a tension was increasing in Cyprus, two super-powers warmed up the Armenian question by means of using two Armenian religious men, who called the Armenians to commemorate the events of 1915 as if it was the first genocidal act of the twentieth century to destabilize Turkey, and her relations with the European Union.²²¹ The Armenian question was used by two super-powers as an instrument of pressure on Turkey.

3.2. The First Signs of the Re-Emergence of Armenian Nationalism

By the 1960s, rapid political changes, social and intellectual developments in the Armenians SSR as well as political conflict in Cyprus caused to revive Armenian activism in the world. In the Cold War period, while serious clashes were going on between the Eastern and Western Blocs, the Armenian activists, who lived in mainly Lebanon, the USSR, France and the countries of South America, were ready to reactivate the Armenian question concerned to the changing relations of the USSR and the U.S. In other words, Armenian activism intensified as a result of the alteration of the *détente policy* during the Cold War period. The two super-powers encouraged the Armenian activists to revive the Armenian question in order to prevent Turkey from becoming a strong country in the region. Both the USSR and

²²⁰ Bilal Şimşir, *Ermeni Meselesi (1774-2005)*. (Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi,2005), pp. 221-222.

²²¹ In 1963, an association agreement was signed between Turkey and the E.U. One year later, this agreement came into effect. Based on this agreement a customs union was signed in order to bring the two sides closer in economic and trade matters. For more detailed information see: Müftüler- Baç, op. cit., pp.53-74 .

the U.S. were eager to make Turkey dependent on them. Therefore, the Armenian question was warmed up again to use against Turkey as a political trump in the Cold War.²²²

Meanwhile, Armenian nationalism continued to arise in the Armenian SSR. Under the Soviet leader Stalin's pragmatist policies against local Armenian nationalism, the Armenians became aware of their own national cultures as well as their own national languages. Hence, they tried to preserve their own ethnic cultures and national languages against the threat of Russification.²²³ Besides the effect of Russification policy on the development of Armenian nationalism, Ronald Suny attracts attention onto the industrialization of the Armenian SSR in the process of developing Armenian nationalism. He states that, "...the emergence of nationalism was the understandable response to modernization. The revolution came from above and from outside, uprooted the peasantry, eliminated the traditional political and religious authorities punished all opponents and forged a new society much like that in developed Western countries- more industrial, more urban..."²²⁴

In the Armenian SSR, the first major outbreak of dissident nationalism occurred on April 24, 1965. Thousands of Armenians gathered to demonstrate for the events of 1915. The year 1965 became a milestone in the Armenian question in Yerevan. In order to commemorate the Ottoman Armenians who passed away in the events of 1915, approximately one million Armenian protestors crowded unlawfully in front of the *Spendiarian* Opera Building in Yerevan. They demanded the Turkish territories' return to the Armenian SSR on that night. The Armenians shouted slogans as "*mer hoghere*" (our land in English) on that night. At the demonstration, many young Armenians were arrested. Among these people, there was Levon Ter-Petrossian who would be the first President of the Republic of Armenia later.²²⁵

²²² Uras, op. cit., pp.94-95.

²²³ Suny, op. cit., p.185.

²²⁴ Ibid., p.189. As mentioned before in the introduction part, the concept of nationalism goes hand in hand with industrialization in Armenian nationalism. Like Suny, Gellner explains the theory of nationalism and its development process through focusing on industrialization and modernization processes.

²²⁵ Laçiner, op. cit., pp. 180-184.

Indeed, this was not the first commemoration ceremony for the Armenians who passed away in the events of 1915. In the historical process, the first ceremony was held in İstanbul in 1919. Between the dates April 24 and April 25, 1919, Teotoros Lapçinciyan organized a series of commemoration ceremonies for the Ottoman Armenians.²²⁶ He formed a special committee in Istanbul. These committee members were the ones who had been arrested on April 24, 1915, and then the Ottoman Government released them. They were a group of Armenian intellectuals including Yevphime Avetisian, Zaruhi Galamkarian, Mari Stambulian, Perchuhi Parsamian, Miss Arpiar, Tigran Zaven, Meruian Pařamyian, Hakob Siruni, Gevorg Meřrop, Tagyor Sugiasian, Barsegh Tinanian, Shahan Perperian, and Hovhannes Poghosian.²²⁷

Those commemoration ceremonies began with a liturgy at the St. Trinity Church of Pera in Istanbul on April 24, 1919. Bishop Mesrop Naroian ruled the first ceremony at the St. Trinity Church. Then, Zaven Eghiaian, who was the Armenian Patriarch of Istanbul, gave a sermon at the St. Erordutyun Church of Pera. In the afternoon of this day, some Armenians, and representatives of the Saint Trinity Greek Church, and representatives of the U.S. Embassy to İstanbul, who were Mr. Heike and Mr. Faull, as well as a journalist from the *Times* newspaper gathered at the St. Trinity Church. That ceremony consisted of speeches, declamations, and sacred music. In this ceremony, the Armenian Patriarch commemorated the Armenians who passed away during World War I. A similar commemoration ceremony was held under the approval of Pope in Italy. Also, the Armenian Catholic Church held a commemoration ceremony on April 25, 1919. A number of cardinals and bishops, representatives of Italian Government including Minister of Education, Speaker of

²²⁶ Teotoros Lapçinciyan, who is known as Teotig, was an Ottoman Armenian writer and journalist. On April 24, 1915, he was arrested in İstanbul. After having been released, he wrote a book entitled “Monument to April 11.” For detailed information on Lapçinciyan see: Rita Soulahian Kuyumjian, *Teotig Biography (Including a Translation of Teotig’s “Monument to April”)*, (Princeton and London: Gomitas Institute, 2010).

²²⁷“At the Origins of Commemoration: The 90th Anniversary of Declaring April 24 as a Day of Mourning and Commemoration of the Armenian Genocide”, *Massis Weekly*, online at <http://www.massisweekly.com/Vol29/issue11/pg11.pdf>, (accessed on April 4,2009).

Italian Parliament, and Deputy Foreign Minister as well as French ambassador to Italy attended this ceremony.²²⁸

Almost forty-six year later than 1919, the Armenians gathered for the same aim in Yerevan on April 24, 1965. The mass demonstration signaled a radical alteration in the Armenian SSR, which was a milestone event in the process of the emergence of Armenian nationalism and its main characterized by irredentist nationalism. The fire of Armenian nationalism was sparked in Yerevan. Then, this fire affected other countries where the Armenian Diaspora lived in.²²⁹ In parallel to the mass demonstration in Yerevan on April 24, 1965, a series of memorial ceremonies, demonstrations, and meetings were held in Cyprus, Greece, Ethiopia, the USSR, France, and the U.S., and in other countries.²³⁰

Meanwhile, with financial support of Moscow, an Armenian memorial monument was built in Yerevan to commemorate the Armenians who passed away in the events of 1915 on the fiftieth anniversary of the so-called Armenian genocide. Actually, this monument was not the first monument to be dedicated to the so-called the Armenian genocide. In the historical process, the first Armenians monument was built in the 1950s in Antelias, Lebanon. In Yerevan, the Armenian monument, which is the 44-meter steel symbolizes the national rebirth of Armenians, is composed of twelve slabs arranged in a circle around, which represent the twelve provinces in Turkey, with an eternal flame at the center of the monument. On every April 24, thousands of Armenians visit this memorial in order to lay flowers around the eternal flames.²³¹

In the mid-1960s, the Armenian Diaspora began to give financial support to be built the Armenian monuments all around the world. In that period, a number of

²²⁸ "At the Origins of Commemoration: The 90th Anniversary of Declaring April 24 as a Day of Mourning and Commemoration of the Armenian Genocide", *Massis Weekly*, online at <http://www.massisweekly.com/Vol29/issue11/pg11.pdf>, (accessed on April 4,2009)

²²⁹Hovannisian, *The Armenian Genocide: Wartime Radicalization or Premeditated Continuum*, (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 2006), p.107.

²³⁰ Laçiner, op. cit., pp.152-156.

²³¹Rouben Paul Adalian, *Encyclopedia of Genocide*, (Santa Barbara, California: ABC-CLIO,Inc., 1999), pp.102-105.

monuments were built in Montebello, California, in Sydney, Australia, in Sao Paolo, Brazil and in Buenos Aires, Argentina. On the other hand, smaller monuments were built up in different cities where the Armenians lived in including Marseilles, Vienna, Stuttgart, Toronto, Montreal, Detroit, Philadelphia, and Montevideo. In addition to these, many monuments were built in towns and cities of the Armenian SSR.²³² Moreover, the Soviet Government permitted to be erected monuments for the Armenian's national heroes including a statue of Vartan Mamikonian, the fifth century defender of Armenian Christianity, and a statue of General Antranik, a soldier who fought against the Turks.²³³

In the U.S., several ceremonies and demonstrations were held on April 24, 1965. The California and Massachusetts State Assemblies arranged some ceremonies. Within the same year, in the Emerson town, the State of New Jersey, a monument was built for "two million Armenians who were massacred during the years 1915-1918." For the first time, the Armenians marched from the Washington Heights to the U.N. Building. In New York City, a large number of Armenians gathered in front of the U.N. Building that has become a traditional ritual for the Diaspora Armenians who have lived in the U.S. In that period, the Institute of Armenian Studies was founded in Californian University.²³⁴ The Armenians managed to form an American public opinion regarding with the events of 1915. In the political arena, both the American Senate and the House of Representatives began to deal with this issue. For the first time, the U.S. Senators invited an Armenian priest to read the customary opening prayer in the U.S Senate in 1965.²³⁵

²³² Ibid., pp.105-108.

²³³ Suny, op. cit., pp.186-187.

²³⁴ Indeed, these ethnic studies departments revived the Armenian identity in the Armenian Diaspora. In 1959, with the efforts of the National Association for Armenian Studies and Research, the Armenian Studies program was founded at Harvard University. Then, many Armenian Studies programs were established in different universities including Columbia University, the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) and Berkeley, the University of Michigan, TUFTL University, and California State University Programs at Wayne State University in Detroit, the University of Chicago, Glendale Community College in California. For detailed information see: Bakalian, op. cit., p.408.

²³⁵ Uras, op. cit., p.69-72.

While, the demonstrations were organized and monuments were erected in different countries where the Armenians lived in, interestingly, the first official recognition of the so-called Armenian genocide came from Uruguay with a resolution in the same year. Uruguay became the first country to take a parliamentary decision about the recognizing allegations on the so-called Armenian genocide.²³⁶ The Uruguay parliament's decision on the allegations on the events of 1915 became the beginning point of a movement across the world for the Diaspora Armenians.²³⁷

During the heyday of the Cold War period, the Armenian community began its attempts to form a suitable ground for psychological warfare against Turkey, which has lasted up until present day. To materialize their aims, they followed a very logical way in the process of the formation a sensitive public opinion on the Armenian question. The Diaspora Armenians used effectively mass media organs including television stations, newspapers, and magazines. They managed to revive the “terrible Turk” image in the western world.²³⁸ Today, the Armenian Diaspora has followed similar strategies to form a pro-Armenian public opinion. Esat Uras states how the Armenian Diaspora has formed a pro-Armenian public opinion as follows:

First, constantly propagating hostility against Turkey and Turkish nation. Second, enlisting the support of powers which have vested interests in Turkey and the Middle East. Third, establishing contacts and cooperation with states that have conflicts, no matter how insignificant with Turkey, after having prepared the ground by carrying out the operations described above (item 1-3). Fourth, taking measures to have the Armenian claims and demands discussed in international meetings and conferences.²³⁹

As a whole, the Armenian question was brought into political agenda in the Cold War period in which Turkey had problems with Greece, and some countries in the Middle East. Under those circumstances, Turkey was driven into a corner concerned to the new political developments in the region. Since 1965, the Armenian question has been deliberately kept alive to weaken Turkey. Year after year,

²³⁶ Bloxham, op. cit., p.215.

²³⁷ Ömer Engin Lütem, “Günümüzde Ermeni Sorunu,” in Ömer Engin Lütem (ed.), *Ermeni Sorunu Temel Bilgi ve Belgeler*, (Ankara: ASAM, 2007), p.96.

²³⁸ McCarthy, and McCarthy, op.cit., p.75.

²³⁹ Uras, op. cit., p.95.

commemoration of the so-called Armenian genocide gained a ritual identity in the early 1970s. It caused to increase Armenian nationalism, which would escalate into the Armenian terrorism against Turkey after the mid-1970s.

3.3. The Armenian Terrorist Organizations and the Armenian Terrorism

By the campaigns of the Diaspora Armenians, the Armenian question began to attract attention of the international community after the year 1965. In that process, the mass demonstrations became very effective in Yerevan and in different countries of the world. By the 1970s, these mass demonstrations radicalized many young Armenians on the national matters. Those people aimed to revenge from Turkey concerning to the events of 1915. Consequently, in the Armenian question, a new phase began with the rise of radical feelings. In that process, the Armenian question was brought into world's agenda with its terrorism dimension. The radical Armenians targeted Turkey, its allies, the Turkish Institutions, and Turkish diplomats.²⁴⁰

Michael Gunter describes the term terrorism as “a phenomenon that usually stems from the failure of its perpetrators to develop sufficient political and military strength to present their case in a more controversial manner.”²⁴¹ Under the light of his definition, a tie could be set up between the political disappointments of the Armenian people, who particularly lived in the Middle Eastern countries, and the development of Armenian terrorism in the mid- 1970s.

An individual act of revenge, which occurred in the United States of America, turned into an organized ethnic based Armenian terrorism all over the world. When a 78-year old Californian Armenian Gourgen Yanikian assassinated Turkey's Consul General of Los Angeles Mehmet Baydar and Vice Council Bahadır Demir in Santa Barbara on January 27, 1973, the Armenian terrorism came into the world's

²⁴⁰Türkdoğan, op. cit., pp.240-247.

²⁴¹Michael M. Gunter, *Pursuing the Just Cause of Their People*, (New York ; Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1986), p.30.

agenda.²⁴² Then, most of the Armenian terrorist organizations were established during the 1970s. Among these ones, the Armenian Secret Army for the Liberalization of Armenia (ASALA) and Justice Commandos for the Armenian Genocide (JCAG) organized many sensational terrorist attacks until the mid-1980s. With these two Armenian terrorist organizations, a new era began in Armenian nationalism in the Cold War period.²⁴³

In the historical process, the first Armenian underground terrorist organization was the Fedayeen Movement. During World War I, the prominent leaders of the Fedayeen Movement organized many Armenian rebellions and terrorist activities within the Ottoman Empire. The organized armed rebellions were supported by Russia and other states. These countries provided weapon for the Armenian revolutionaries. Some Armenians who lived in the eastern part of the Ottoman Empire encouraged their activities in that period. In the history of Armenian terrorism, perhaps the most striking Armenian terrorist attack was the Yıldız assassination in 1905. It was organized to dethrone the Ottoman Sultan Abdül Hamid II due to his oppressive rule in that period. Regarding with the Second Constitution, and the election of Armenian deputies to Parliament, the Armenian terrorist attacks were frozen. However, in parallel to the events of March 31, the armed Armenian rebellions created a chaotic milieu in the city of Adana. It was followed by other Armenian rebellions during World War I as mentioned in the first chapter. At the end of war, the same terrorist organization was reorganized under the code name of Nemses in Yerevan in 1919. Sahan Natali, who was an Armenian born American, was the head of that terrorist organization. In that year, the Ninth Dashnak World Congress was held in Yerevan where the Armenians decided to carry out terrorist attacks on the Ottoman political leaders who were in exile.²⁴⁴ That is to say, the Nemses arranged operations to take revenge from the members of the Ottoman Government. The first target of the Nemses was the Minister of the Interior Talat Pasha who was killed by Soghomon Tehlirian in Berlin. Then, the Nemses continued

²⁴² Şimşir, *Şehit Diplomatlarımız (1973-1994)*, (Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi,2000) , pp.230-231.

²⁴³ Ibid., p.232-235.

²⁴⁴ Uras, op. cit., pp.111-117.

its terrorist attacks by assassinating the former Ottoman Ministers Sait Halim Pasha in Rome, Cemal Pasha in Tiflis, and Enver Pasha in Afghanistan.²⁴⁵

During the Cold War period, the hostility against Turkey, and the Turkish citizens was revived with an organized anti-Turkey propaganda in the world. The first Armenian individual terrorist attack caused the rise of radical feelings among the young Armenians. Also, the roles of the USSR and some European states should not be forgotten in the Cold War period. In addition, Uras emphasizes the role of Armenian Church in the emergence of the Armenian terrorism. He claims that “the Armenian Church fostered the minds of young Armenians with the Turkish hostility to improve consciousness of being an Armenian.”²⁴⁶ All these factors induced the emergence of two Armenian terrorist organizations, which carried out bloody terrorist attacks in the 1970s.

The Armenian Secret Army for the Liberation of Armenia (ASALA) was an Armenian underground organization, which became very active particularly between the years 1975 and 1985. An Armenian activist from Mosul in Iraq, Bedros Ohannesian popularly known as Hagop Hagopian founded the ASALA in Beirut in 1975 during the Lebanese Civil War. The ASALA had a radical leftist-nationalist platform.²⁴⁷ In the organization of the ASALA, the Lebanon Central Committee was the supreme executive body, which was supported by other bodies of the ASALA including the Political Committee, the Finance Committee, the Propaganda and Information Committee, the Intelligence Committee and the Military Committee.²⁴⁸

The ASALA was committed to the establishment of Armenian State in the “lost” Armenian territories in Anatolia. By means of using violence, the ASALA hoped to bring the Armenian question into the world’s attention and to make pressure on Turkey not to deny the events of 1915.²⁴⁹ In that process, the ASALA was

²⁴⁵Francis P. Hyland, *Armenian Terrorism, the Past, the Present, the Prospect*, (Oxford: Westview Press, 1991), pp.19-22.

²⁴⁶ Uras, op. cit., p.112.

²⁴⁷ Hyland, op. cit., pp.45-48.

²⁴⁸ Uras, op. cit., p.165.

²⁴⁹ Zafer Özkan, *Tarihsel Akış İçerisinde Terörden Politikaya Ermeni Meselesi*,(İstanbul, 2001), pp.191-193.

supported by some countries including the USSR, Greece, Lebanon, and Syria that provided funds and sanctuary.²⁵⁰

The ASALA found its supporters from the Armenian youth in Lebanon and other centers of the Armenian Diaspora around the world. The ASALA cooperated with both the Palestinian Movement (PLO) and the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK). Here there is an interesting point that both the ASALA and the PKK were established after the Cyprus Operation in 1975. On the one hand, the ASALA provided military training for the PLO and the PKK; on the other hand, the PLO and the PKK provided logistic support for the ASALA. These terrorist organizations did not keep their cooperation secret in the process of fulfilling their own targets. In 1982, the ASALA and the PKK held a joint press conference to declare their cooperation in Lebanon. These two terrorist organizations signed a number of joint operations to attack important targets in different European countries.²⁵¹

Other Armenian terrorist organization was the Justice Commandos for the Armenian Genocide (JCAG). It was founded in Beirut in 1975. It was the right wing, and radical nationalist organization. The JCAG was later renamed as the Armenian Revolutionary Army (ARA).²⁵² Its main goals were to re-establish an independent Armenia from the USSR and to seek recompense from Turkey for the allegation of the events of 1915. The JCAG was not a separate organization. There was a strong tie between the Dashnaksutyun Party and the JCAG. The JPAG-ARA targeted only Turkish diplomats and Turkish institutions. The world public opinion became aware of the JPAG's existence with an assassination attack in 1975. Turkish Ambassador to Austria Daniş Tunagil was assassinated by the JPAG-ARA. It was responsible for the death of 20 Turkish diplomats in the world.²⁵³

Between the years 1970s and 1980s, these two Armenian terrorist organizations became very active in some countries. Approximately, 110 terrorist

²⁵⁰ Hyland, op. cit., pp.45-50.

²⁵¹ Ibid., pp.45-50.

²⁵² Uras, op. cit., p.162. When JPAG became failure in that operation, the name of JPAG was altered as "Armenian Revolutionary Army."

²⁵³ Hyland, op. cit., p.51.

attacks were carried out by these two terrorist organizations in 21 countries. The Armenian terrorist organizations attacked embassies of Turkey in Athens, Beirut, Belgrade, Berne, Brussels, Lisbon, Madrid, Ottawa, Paris, Hague and Vienna as well as the Turkish Delegation to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), and the Turkish Center at the United Nations. Also, the Turkish consulates in Geneva, Los Angeles and Lyons were bombed, as well as Paris Consulate was occupied. In addition to these, the Armenian terrorists bombed the Turkish Airlines offices in Amsterdam, Copenhagen, Frankfurt, Geneva, London, Milan, Paris, and Rome. It carried out terrorist attacks on the Turkish tourist and the airline offices.²⁵⁴ Moreover, the Armenian terrorists attacked Esenboğa International Airport in Ankara, and Orly Airport in Paris and the Istanbul Covered Bazaar (Kapalıçarşı).²⁵⁵ In the mid-1980s, the Armenian terrorist organizations' attacks were terminated with the efforts of Turkish politicians. When the Armenian terrorist attacks targeted local population living in the western countries, the activities of the Armenian terrorist organizations were monitored in order to prevent the future terrorist attacks in these countries.²⁵⁶ By the mid-1980s, their activities were dwindled in the international arena. Particularly the ASALA lost its influence after Israeli troops entered into Lebanon in 1982. Beirut which hosted headquarter of the ASALA was evacuated and moved its headquarter to Cyprus.²⁵⁷

Finally, in the Armenian question, a new phase began with the Armenian terrorist organizations and their attacks on Turkey, its allies, Turkish Institutions, and Turkish diplomats between the years 1973 and 1985. These two organizations managed to bring the Armenian question into the world's agenda. The Armenian terrorism helped to keep alive the events of 1915 as if it was the 20th century's first genocide. Both the Armenian Diaspora and the Armenians did not oppose to the Armenian terrorist attacks on Turkish diplomats and the international institutions.

²⁵⁴ Zürcher, op. cit., p.277. Among these airlines companies there were Air France, Alitalia, BEA, EIAI, KLM, Lufthansa, PAN-AM, Sabena, Swissair, and TWA.

²⁵⁵ Gunter, "Contemporary Aspects of Armenian Terrorism", in *the International Terrorism and the Drug Connection*, (Ankara: Ankara University,1984) pp.104-106.

²⁵⁶ Özkan, op. cit., pp.195-209.

²⁵⁷ Zürcher, op. cit., p.277.

Through the Armenian terrorist attacks on Turks and other targets, the Armenians managed to create psychological pressure to form an Armenian public opinion in the world. Consequently, in the mid-1980s, the Armenian question was politicized in many western countries where the Diaspora Armenians lived in. From the middle of the 1980s, the Armenian lobbying groups have advocated the Armenian allegations before the government, parliaments in the world. Until today, many parliaments have passed either Armenian resolutions or issued statements. Many of them have recognized the allegation on the events of 1915 as if it was genocide, and they have designated the April 24th is the day of commemoration of the so-called Armenian genocide for the Armenians all over the world.²⁵⁸

3.4. The Dissolution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Rise of Armenian Nationalism

Under the leadership of Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev, the USSR returned to its conservative structure like in the Stalinist period. Between the years 1960s and 1980s, Brezhnev carried out the Stalinist policies. The Stalinist bureaucrats had a great autonomy in economy area, and in running the affairs of the USSR.²⁵⁹ In the first years of Brezhnev's leadership, the post-Stalinist bureaucrats gained a remarkable success in the economy area of the Armenian SSR. Concerning to this, the Soviet Armenian industry continued to develop. In that process, many Armenians moved from the rural areas to the cities. However, when economic deterioration began in the USSR, the Stalinist development strategies did not work in the early 1980s. In that process, the growth rate decreased from eight percent to three percent in the early 1980s.²⁶⁰ Brezhnev continued to conduct a very conservative policy

²⁵⁸ "Türkiye Soykırımını Tanıyan Ülkelere Dava Açabilir," *Hürriyet*, March 20, 2010. The allegations on the events of 1915 have been recognized by a number of countries as follows: Argentina, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Cyprus, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Lebanon, Lithuania, Netherlands, Poland, Russia, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland, Uruguay, Vatican City, and Venezuela.

²⁵⁹ Bournoutian, *op. cit.*, p.170.

²⁶⁰ Suny, *op. cit.*, pp. 232-233.

toward the fundamental reform issues in some specific areas including military and foreign policies.²⁶¹

After Brezhnev's death in 1982, two Soviet Russian leaders respectively came into power who were Yuri Andropov and Konstantin Chernenko. After Andropov's death, Chernenko began to control the state. However, like Andropov, Chernenko died one year later. The Soviet leader Chernenko's death opened a new page in the history of the former USSR. After Chernenko, Mikhail Gorbachev was elected to lead the USSR. Gorbachev aimed to make a revision on the Soviet system. At the mid-1980s, he presented two new policies: *perestroika* (restructuring) and *glasnost* (openness).²⁶² He desired to establish a new society, which based on three principles: democratization, marketization, and decolonization. Gorbachev's triple principles encouraged the Armenian nationalists to demand independence from the USSR.²⁶³

Meanwhile, the Armenian political awakening caused a dilemma between the years 1988 and 1989. The first massive manifestation occurred in the Armenian SSR. By 1988, three key issues stimulated the Armenian nationalist movement. One of these three issues was the emergence of serious ecological problems because of a nuclear power plant at Metsamor, which was built to produce electricity for the Armenian SSR.²⁶⁴ Hence, a mass movement began regarding the environmental problem. Another issue was the wide corruption, which bothered the Soviet Armenians. During the Brezhnev's period, corruption as well as bribery issues became very commonplace.²⁶⁵ The other issue was the status of Nagorno-Karabakh, which activated the Armenian nationalists in Soviet Armenia.²⁶⁶ The political

²⁶¹ Bournoutian, op. cit., pp.167-169.

²⁶² Ibid., p.170.

²⁶³ Suny, op. cit., pp.232-233.

²⁶⁴ The plant was constructed with two nuclear reactors. However, it was closed after 1988 earthquake in the Armenian SSR. Then, only the Unit 2 reactor was brought back into operation on October 26, 1995. Today, Armenia has tried to solve her environmental problem with the support of the Ministry of Environment. For more detailed information see: Igor Oleynik, *Armenia Foreign Policy and Government Guide*, (Washington, D.C., International Business Publications, 2002), p.37.

²⁶⁵ Bournoutian, op. cit., p.168.

²⁶⁶ The status of Nagorno-Karabakh, which was an autonomous region of Azerbaijan where approximately 200,000 Armenians living in there, encouraged the Armenian nationalists in the Armenian SSR in the mid-1980s. For more detailed information see: Suny, op. cit., pp.196-197.

conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh turned to a violent action in a little while. Namely, an administrative tension turned to a clash between the Armenian SSR and Azerbaijan.²⁶⁷

Meanwhile, a strong earthquake occurred in the northern Armenia, which destroyed the towns of Spitak and Leninakan in December 1988. More than 25,000 Armenians died and approximately 500,000 Armenians left homeless. In that process, all Diaspora parties focused on the earthquake-stricken the Armenian SSR in order to recover traumas of the Soviet Armenians. This tragic event made closer the Diaspora Armenians to the major political actors in the Armenian SSR.²⁶⁸

All in all, the problems which have been mentioned above gave way to the rise of Armenian nationalism. In addition to these, restrictions on different issues including the Armenian language and culture brought about to the rise of Armenian nationalism.²⁶⁹ Also, as Gellner states that “the modernization process is an important precondition in the process of rising nationalism ideology”. Thus, it could be explained that the emergence of Armenian nationalism was a result of the complex modernization process in the Armenian SSR where modernization became catalyze to eliminate the traditional values, political and religious authorities under the communist regime. Consequently, it became a industrial, and urban country. That is to say, the Armenian SSR was built with economic and social modernization processes again, but these processes caused to the rise of Armenian nationalism.

²⁶⁷ Libaridian, op. cit., p.231.

²⁶⁸ Hovhannisian, *The Armenian People...*, p.433.

²⁶⁹ Suny, “Soviet Armenia,” pp.374-375.

CHAPTER IV

THE POLITICIZATION AND INTERNATIONALIZATION OF THE ARMENIAN QUESTION: 1980-1990

The Armenian question took different forms in different times due to the changing international politics as mentioned in the previous chapters. This question gained an international status with the efforts of the Armenian Diaspora and the Armenian nationalists as well as the foreign countries because of their mutual interests. The mass Armenian demonstrations, and the Armenians terrorist attacks were the first steps in attracting attention of the world to the Armenian question. The next step in their struggle was to make pressure on Turkey to accept the events of 1915 as if it was genocide, and to compensate the Armenians by giving territories from eastern parts of Turkey to Armenia. To materialize their aims, the Diaspora Armenians made propaganda in many countries in the Cold War period. As a result, they managed to bring their claims into the attention of the international organizations like the United Nations and the European Union. Of course, the alteration of the world politics like the end of the Cold War period enabled them to attract attention of the world. The changing politics in the former USRR strengthened the hands of the Armenian nationalists to demand independence from Moscow. Nagorno-Karabakh conflict got a catalyst in that process. After the Republic of Armenia was established, the Armenian question became an official state policy. In addition, in the Armenian question's politicization and internationalization processes, the roles of the Armenian Diaspora and the Armenian lobbying groups in the United States of America could not be ignored. In the Cold War period, they lobbied to blockade Turkey's bilateral relations with the U.S. For this aim, the Armenian resolutions on the so-called genocide were used with the support of the U.S. Congressmen. This chapter is dedicated to find traces how the Armenian question was politicized and internationalized in the late Soviet period, and in the United States of America between the years 1980 and 1990.

4.1. Nagorno-Karabakh Dispute and the Armenian Question in Levon

Ter-Petrossian Period

The status of Nagorno-Karabakh activated Armenian nationalism in Soviet Armenia. The conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh which served as catalyze in the Armenian nationalist movement in the late 1980s. In that perspective, Nagorno-Karabakh became a symbol for the protest movement against Moscow.²⁷⁰ In fact, the conflict on Nagorno-Karabakh has been an ongoing dispute between Armenia and Azerbaijan since the late nineteenth century. In 1822, the Russian Empire took control of the Karabakh region after the Russian-Iranian War. Then, Nagorno-Karabakh became a Russian province between the years 1822 and 1917. One year later the Russian Revolution, Karabakh became de-facto independent state. On July 5, 1921, when the Moscow Government began to control the Caucasus, *Kavburo* (Caucasian Bureau of the Russian Communist Party Central Committee) founded the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast (NKAO) within the Azerbaijani Soviet Republic. When the capital of Nagorno-Karabakh was moved to Khanded (later its name was altered as Stepanakert) in 1923, the Armenians demanded to take the control of this district. The Armenian nationalists never gave up demanding the control of Nagorno-Karabakh region, and repeated their demands in different periods. For example, during the Joseph Stalin's Presidency period, the Armenians sent petitions to Moscow, but they failed to get a certain result. Again, approximately 75,000 Armenians signed a petition to demand the unification of Nagorno-Karabakh with the Armenian SSR in 1987.²⁷¹

When the Armenian nationalists' demands were rejected by the USSR Supreme, the Armenians began to believe that Nagorno-Karabakh problem would be solved in favor of Azerbaijan.²⁷² In that process, Moscow put into force its direct rule over

²⁷⁰ Suny, op. cit., pp.196-197.

²⁷¹ Kamer Kasım, *Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict from its Inception to the Peace Process*, (Ankara : EREN), p.4.

²⁷² *Ibid.*, p.4.

Nagorno-Karabakh to overcome that problem. When the direct rule was lifted by Moscow, Azerbaijan had right to control Nagorno-Karabakh region. Paralleling to this political development, the Supreme Soviet of Armenia declared Nagorno-Karabakh region as part of Armenia as a response to the Azerbaijan's Supreme Soviet decision of the Supreme Soviet of Armenia.

To protest Moscow's approach toward Nagorno-Karabakh issue, some demonstrations were held in Yerevan by a number of Armenian intellectuals and political activists, including Levon Ter-Petrossian, Ashot Manucharian and Vazgen Manukian in the late 1987. These Armenians formed an anti-communist organization the Karabakh Committee to support Nagorno-Karabakh's unification with the Armenian SSR under the leadership of Levon Ter-Petrossian in 1988.²⁷³ All these demonstrations brought about a war. Namely, in 1988, a tension transformed to a war between the Azerbaijanis and the Armenians. It started when the Soviet Union involved this conflict by sending troops to the region.²⁷⁴

In the same year, the Armenian nationalists organized demonstrations in THE Armenian SSR, and in Nagorno-Karabakh to demand the unification of Nagorno-Karabakh region with the Armenian SSR. In July 1988, the Armenians living in Nagorno-Karabakh asked Moscow to let them unite with the Armenian jurisdiction. While tension was increasing in the region, the members of the Karabakh Committee were arrested in December 1989.²⁷⁵ Then, Armenian nationalist movement gained momentum especially after the Armenian nationalists were released. Those people who continued their campaigns for the unification of Nagorno Karabakh with the Armenian SSR. Also, they began to be more critical toward Moscow concerned to some specific

²⁷³ Libaridian, op. cit., pp.232-233.

²⁷⁴ Kasım, op. cit., pp.4-5. The conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan was ended with a ceasefire in 1994. However, the Republic of Armenia has continued to occupy twenty percent of Azerbaijan's territories.

²⁷⁵ Ibid., pp.4-5.

issues democratization, social justice, economic reform and national sovereignty.²⁷⁶ In Armenian SSR, the nationalist opposition gained momentum with the initiative of the Armenian Pan-Nationalist Movement (APM), which would emerge as the strongest party in the election of the Armenian Supreme Soviet in 1990. The APM and the Armenian National Movement (ANM) in Soviet Armenia began to cooperate, while the communist regime was decaying in the Eastern Europe.²⁷⁷ In that process, the first democratic election was held, while the Armenian SSR was still formally part of the USSR. Levon Ter-Petrossian, who was one of the founders of the Karabakh Committee, and the leader of the Armenian National Movement, was elected to form the government in 1990. At the end of Cold War, the Armenian SSR declared her independence from the USSR in 1991. Then, the Armenian USSR was renamed as the Republic of Armenia. Levon Ter-Petrossian became the first elected president of the Republic of Armenia. He was re-elected in 1996, but a new political conjecture in Armenia forced him to resign in February 1998.

Indeed, two Armenian Diaspora parties did not oppose the candidacy of Levon Ter-Petrossian except the ARF. Both the Ramgavars and the Hunchaks backed his candidacy. However, the ARF presented its own candidate, who was Sos Sargisian against Levon Ter-Petrossian's candidacy. After a general referendum, Armenia declared its independence from the USSR in November 1991. In that referendum, Levon Ter-Petrossian was elected with eighty-three percent of the vote. Toward Levon Ter-Petrossian, neither the ARF nor the communist candidates became successful in that election.²⁷⁸

During the Levon Ter-Petrossian's presidency period, Armenia gave importance to the four main issues including the development of a market economy, democratization, a realistic foreign policy regarding with Armenian question as well as Nagorno-Karabakh

²⁷⁶ Suny, op. cit., pp.203-212.

²⁷⁷ Ibid., pp. 240-246.

²⁷⁸ Bournoutian, op. cit., pp.195-196.

conflict.²⁷⁹ Levon Ter-Petrosian tried to build an independent Armenian State by saving her from dependencies of the Russian and the Armenian Diaspora. In that period, on the one hand, Russia could control eighty percent of the Armenian economy; on the other hand, the Armenian Diaspora could give direction to the Armenian economy, socio-political life, and even state ideology. To overcome these two remarkable dependencies, Levon Ter-Petrosian decided to follow a new policy that was based on establishing good relationships with her neighbors especially with Turkey and Azerbaijan.²⁸⁰

Some political problems became the main obstacles to establish the relationship between Turkey and Armenia during the Levon Ter-Petrosian's presidency period. These issues were Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, the question of border recognition, the question of closed borders, and the Armenian allegations on the so-called genocide. Actually, they have continued to affect the process of normalizing Turkish and Armenian relations, although Turkey recognized Armenia's independence on December 16, 1991. Among these problems, the allegations on the so-called Armenian genocide have brought the Turkish-Armenian relations to a deadlock since one of the main aims of the Armenian foreign policy is to be recognized the allegations of genocide.²⁸¹

The allegations on the so-called genocide, and territorial demands from Turkey have been mentioned within three different Armenian official documents. These are the Independence Proclamation of Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Independence Declaration of Armenia, and the Armenian Constitution of 1995. The Article 12 of the Independence Proclamation of Armenia Soviet Socialist Republic which was accepted in 1990 stipulates that "The Republic of Armenia will support all the efforts for the international affirmation of the genocide occurred in the Ottoman Turkey, and in Western Armenia, in 1915." Also, the Armenian allegations on the so-called Armenian

²⁷⁹ Stephan H. Astourian, "From Ter-Petrosyan to Kocharian: Leadership Change in Armenia," Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies Working Paper Series, 2000-2001, p.6. online at <http://www.iseees.berkeley.edu>, (accessed on 10.09.2009).

²⁸⁰ Libaridian, op. cit., pp.242-249.

²⁸¹ Aybars Görgülü, *Turkey-Armenian Relations: A Vicious Circle*, (İstanbul: TESEV Publications, 2008), pp.13-21.

genocide have been given a place in the Independence Declaration which states that “The Republic of Armenia stands in support of the task of achieving international recognition of the 1915 Genocide in Ottoman Turkey and Western Armenia.” In addition, with the Armenian Constitution of 1995, Armenia emphasizes her official policy concerned to the allegations on the so-called Armenian genocide, and the territorial demands from Turkey.²⁸²

Levon Ter-Petrosian tried to establish good relations with her neighbors to develop the Armenia’s economy, and to keep her political stability, which depended on the good relations with her neighbors. As it is known that Armenia is a mountainous country so that it does not have any direct connection to the sea routes as well as to important commercial centers. Also, Armenia does not have rich natural resources. In addition, the embargoes imposed by Azerbaijan and Turkey on Armenia caused a serious economic decline in the early 1990s.²⁸³ To overcome her economic decline, and to provide political stability, Levon Ter-Petrosian aimed to follow a moderate foreign policy. In that perspective, he gave a special importance to Turkey in order to normalize relations. Therefore, he avoided putting both the Armenian question, and Nagorno-Karabakh conflict into the political agenda.²⁸⁴

On the other hand, Levon Ter-Petrosyan’s moderate foreign policy toward Turkey created a tension among the Armenian Diaspora members, and the Armenian Diaspora parties including the ARF and the ADP. In that process, Ter-Petrosian supported Armenia’s involvement into the Black Sea Cooperation Organization. The Armenian Diaspora parties especially the ARF blamed Levon Ter-Petrosian and his moderate policies against Turkey, and Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. The ARF insisted on the recognition of the events of 1915 as genocide. In addition, it opposed to the solution

²⁸² Ibid., pp.18-19.

²⁸³ Reha Yılmaz, “Armenian Foreign Policy During Levon-Ter Petrossian and Robert Kocharian Period”, *Journal of Qafqaz University*, Number 26, 2009, pp.10-11, online at <http://www.qafqaz.edu.az/journal/20092602armenian.pdf>, (accessed on 02.25.2010)

²⁸⁴ Palabiyık, op. cit., pp.237-240.

proposals on Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, which has still very important obstacle against the process of normalizing the Turkish-Armenian relations.²⁸⁵

In fact, when Ter-Petrossian was re-elected in 1996, Nagorno-Karabakh problem entered a new phase. In that process, Turkey presented her own peace solution. Based on the Turkey's proposal, an Armenian corridor would be formed between Nagorno-Karabakh and Armenia, and Turkey would have a link with Azerbaijan. However, both Azerbaijan and Armenia did not want to accept the Turkey's peace proposal because of the fact that Armenia was not eager to lose her borders with Iran. Also, Azerbaijan did not want to lose Nagorno-Karabakh region either.²⁸⁶

In the international platform, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) Minsk Group has tried to solve this problem between these two countries. It has proposed a new peace solution that based on the withdrawal of the Armenian armed forces from Nagorno-Karabakh region, and surrounding areas of Azerbaijan as well as the return of all refugees to their own homes. Nevertheless, the Diaspora Armenians interpreted this peace solution as a failure of Levon Ter-Petrossian's moderate foreign policy. In that perspective, Levon Ter-Petrossian was forced to resign in 1998.²⁸⁷

After Levon Ter-Petrossian resignation, the former Prime Minister Robert Kocharian became the second president of Armenia in March 1988. He was supported by the Armenian Diaspora parties. Unlike Levon Ter-Petrossian who had aimed to normalize Armenia's relations with her neighbors especially with Turkey without presenting any precondition, Kocharian put the issue on the so-called Armenian genocide into the government's agenda. Kocharian conducted an active foreign policy

²⁸⁵Kasım, "Armenia's Foreign Policy: Basic Parameters of Ter-Petrosyan and Kocharyan Era", *The Journal of Turkish Weekly*, October 13, 2004, online at <http://www.turkishweekly.net>, (accessed on 20.02.2010)

²⁸⁶ Kasım, "Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict...", p.5.

²⁸⁷ Görgülü, op. cit., pp.14-16.

against Turkey. He aimed to increase pressure upon Turkey to recognize the allegations on the so-called Armenian genocide with the support of the western countries.²⁸⁸

4.2. The Armenian Question and Its Articulations into the Politics of the United States of America

After gained power in the countries where the Diaspora Armenians live, they began to use their powers to keep alive the Armenian allegations on the 1915 events. They formed lobbying groups to defend their claims, and get the support of the countries. With this way, they took over the task from the Armenian radicals, who conducted terrorist attacks between the years 1973 and 1985, in order to bring the Armenian question into the world's agenda again. The Armenian lobbying groups began to defend the Armenian claims in different countries' parliaments after the mid-1980s. Therefore, this question was politicized which was used against Turkey.

An influential ethnic community in the United States of America is the Armenian Diaspora since the 1920s. They have worked to keep alive the Armenian American community's cultural and political awareness. The aims of the Armenian Diaspora are to preserve their languages and heritages, and to active pursuit of the allegations on the events of 1915 against Turkey, and to aid independent Armenia. In addition, they conduct lobby activities on three different issues, which are humanitarian, economic, and especially political support for Armenia. In the historical process, the Armenian lobbying groups, and the Armenian political parties united to take American support for the recognition of the so-called Armenian genocide since the earthquake of 1988 in Armenia.²⁸⁹

In the United States of America, the Armenian lobbying groups and political parties managed to form a pro-Armenian public opinion, and submit three resolutions in regard to the allegations on the events of 1915 in the Cold War period. The first attempt

²⁸⁸Libaridian, op. cit., pp.250-264.

²⁸⁹Dekmejian, op. cit., p.435.

came from an Armenian organization in the U.S. against Turkey, when a Turkish-American Treaty signed on August 6, 1923 at Lausanne. A group of pro-Armenians, who comprised of members of the U.S. Congress, clergies, and charity organizations, attempted to influence the U.S foreign policy in regard to Turkey.²⁹⁰ The opposition to the Lausanne Treaty had started after it was signed in 1923. The Armenians congregated under a pro-Armenian committee to protest the treaty, which was the Armenian Committee Opposed to the Lausanne Treaty (ACOLT), which was earlier called as the Armenian Committee for the Independence of Armenia. Vahan Cardashian, who was an Armenian-American lawyer, and James W. Gerard, who was the pre-war U.S. Ambassador to Germany, tried to blockade the relations between the U.S. and Turkey. In that process, ACOLT organized the Armenians to send protest letters to the State Department, and to the United States Senators in order to condemn the Lausanne Treaty. In addition, ACOLT published some propaganda publications to circulate the U.S. Senate discussions in that period. For these publications, such prominent Americans wrote many articles. For instance, Henry Morgenthau wrote an article entitled “A Treaty with Red-Handed Despotism,” William S. Davis, “Why the Lausanne Treaty Should Not Be Ratified, and David H. Miller, “For a Treaty Negotiated Not Dictated.”²⁹¹

Although the Lausanne Treaty was signed in 1923, it could not be approved in the U.S Senate until the year 1927. Between Turkey and America, the diplomatic problem was overcome, when the diplomatic relations were restored by means of exchanging notes and diplomats. Namely, formal diplomatic relations were established on the basis of a *modus vivendi* in 1927. In that process, Ahmet Muhtar was appointed as Turkey’s Ambassador to the United States. However, when Muhtar went to Washington, D.C., he faced with protests of the Cardashian-Gerard Group.²⁹² As mentioned in the previous chapters, despite some serious difficulties in Turkish-American relations following the

²⁹⁰ Trask, op. cit., pp.37-38.

²⁹¹ Yilmaz, op. cit., pp.191-192.

²⁹² Ibid., p.192-193.

end of Lausanne Conference, political relations were developed gradually in World War II.²⁹³

The second attempt came, when the Cyprus issue emerged in the Mediterranean region. The Armenian lobbying groups increased its pressure on the United States foreign policy regarding with the Cyprus issue between the years 1960s and 1970s. An arm embargo was imposed on Turkey with the influence of the Greek and the Armenian lobbying groups in the U.S.²⁹⁴ The Cyprus issue was used to destabilize Turkey in the region by those groups. With the Turkish landing in Cyprus in July 1974, the Greek and the Armenian lobbying groups began to work together. They managed to organize both the Greeks and the Armenians in order to form an anti-Turkish public opinion in the U.S.²⁹⁵ In that process, the Armenian, and Greek lobbied to blockade the United States aid to Turkey.²⁹⁶

The third attempt was made in the 1990s, when the USSR dissolved. The Armenian lobby succeeded in directing to the U.S. foreign policy in regard to the economic and the humanitarian assistances to the former USSR. The Armenian Diaspora lobbied in order to blockade diplomatic and economic relations between the U.S. and Azerbaijan. The U.S. Congress adopted the Freedom Support Act in order to stabilize democratic forms of the governments and to support economic growth in 1992. However, the U.S. Administration followed a hypocritical policy toward the issue of economic and humanitarian assistances. On the one hand, the American Congress was granting a large-scale financial assistance for Armenians, on the other hand it curtailed humanitarian aid to Azerbaijan due to the Armenian lobby activities in Washington, D.C.²⁹⁷

²⁹³ Harry N. Howard, "The Bicentennial in American-Turkish Relations," in *Middle East Journal*, Vol. 30 (3), Summer 1976, p.300.

²⁹⁴ Mehmet Ali Birand, *Diyyet*, (İstanbul: Ağaoğlu Yayınları,1980), pp.65-66.

²⁹⁵ Bölükbaşı, op. cit., pp.214-216.

²⁹⁶ Laçiner, op. cit., p.175-177.

²⁹⁷ Kasım, op. cit., pp.170-175.

The fourth attempt was made to blockade the U.S. financial assistance to Turkey. The House of Representatives adopted the Resolution 3540 for the U.S. financial assistance to Turkey. However, based on this resolution, Turkey should have accepted the allegations on the events of 1915 in order to benefit from the U.S. financial assistance. Based on the resolution “Economic Support Fund’ may be made available to the Government of Turkey, except such funds that the Government of Turkey has (1) joined the United States in acknowledging the atrocity committed against the Armenian population of the Ottoman Empire from 1915 to 1923 and (2) taken all appropriate steps to honor the memory of the victims of the ‘Armenians genocide’ .”²⁹⁸

The fifth attempt was made to pass the Armenian resolutions from the U.S. Senate. As known that, there were some problems between Turkey and the United States of America, which were not originated directly from their bilateral relations. Among the problems, perhaps the most popular one was the Armenian Resolution, which was submitted three times to the House of Representatives in the Cold War period. Through the three joint resolutions (in 1975, in 1984, and in 1990), the Armenian question was brought into the United States’ political agenda.²⁹⁹

4.2.1. Armenian Lobby Institutions in the United States of America

The Armenian lobby is very influential non-governmental organization in the United States. Into the American political system, the Armenian lobby is a grass-root organization, which is categorized as “outside lobbying” by political scientist. Goldstein, who was a political scientist, defines the grass-root lobbying as follows that “the identification recruitment and mobilization of constituted- based political strength capable of influencing political decisions.” In that perspective, it could be stated that the

²⁹⁸ Lütem, op. cit., p.377.

²⁹⁹Through five Armenian joint resolutions, the Armenian question was brought into the United States’ political agenda in different dates as follows in 1975, 1984, 1996, 2007, and 2009. For more detailed information see: Laçiner, op. cit., pp.184-188.

main goals of outside lobbying are to influence the U.S. Congress, and to organize public relations.³⁰⁰

The Armenian-American lobby is very prominent ethnic lobby organization in the United States in spite of its smaller size than the Greek and Jewish lobbies. After the year 1970s, the Armenian lobby increased its effect on the U.S. foreign policy. The first Armenian American lobby organization the Armenian Assembly of America (AAA) was established in 1972, which became a turning point for the Diaspora Armenians and the Armenian case in Diaspora. When AAA was founded, the Armenian lobbying process began officially in the U.S. There are two umbrella organizations, which are the Armenian Assembly of America (AAA) and the right-wing Armenian National Committee of America (ANCA) in the U.S. Besides these organizations, there are more than 450 Armenian-American non- governmental organizations. It is assumed that the Diaspora Armenians who live in the United States have spent nearly 40 million American Dollars to form a pro-Armenian public opinion.³⁰¹ In addition to these, as it was mentioned in the chapter II, there are three Diaspora parties that are the Armenian Revolutionary Federation (ARF), the Armenian Democratic Liberal Party (ADL-Ramgavars), and the Socialist Armenian Democratic Hunchakian Party (SDH). Among these parties, the ARF is very influential in the American political system. It became the major opponent power to the Soviet communist system in the Armenian SSR. Unlike the ARF, the other two parties supported to the Soviet regime. These two parties accepted Turkey as a genuine threat factor against the Armenian SSR, although the Armenians lived under the control of the Moscow Government. After Armenia declared its independence from the USSR, these two parties supported the presidency of Levon Ter-

³⁰⁰ Şuhnaz Yılmaz, "Impact of Lobbies on Turkish-American Relations," in Mustafa Aydın and Çağrı Erhan, (eds.), *Turkish-American Relations: Past, Present and Future*, (London; New York: Routledge, 2004), pp.181-182.

³⁰¹ Simon Payaslian, "After Recognition," *The Armenian Forum*, Vol. 2, No.3, Winter 1999, p.49.

Petrossian, whereas the ARF preserved its opponent identity toward Levon Ter-Petrossian.³⁰²

Some prominent Armenian community leaders and representatives of two Armenian Diaspora political parties, the ARF and the ADL, established the Armenian Assembly of America (AAA) in Washington, D.C. in 1972.³⁰³ It has a nation-wide network, which has consisted of volunteer activists, lay leaders, and staff in Washington DC, Los Angeles, New York, Boston, Yerevan, Stepanakert, and Alexandropol. AAA has aimed to form a public opinion in regard to Armenia and the Armenian question in the U.S. The Assembly has worked closely with the U.S. Congress, and other foreign policy institutions in Washington, D.C. In addition, AAA has supported academic researches on the so-called Armenian genocide, and it has held meetings, conferences, and journeys for the American Senators to the Republic of Armenia. AAA is also interested in social issues by means of its affiliated organizations. The Assembly worked for Nagorno-Karabakh's self-determination, and the Armenian's independence movement in the late 1980s.³⁰⁴

The Assembly's grassroots advocacy program the Armenian-American Action Committee (ARAMAC) has worked closely with the U.S. Congressmen, the media organizations, the think tanks, and the academic environments. ARAMAC has directed the Armenian-Americans to contact members of the U.S. Congress, and the White House as well as the mass media organs. It has worked to create a sensitive public opinion on key issues in regard to the Armenian question and the Republic of Armenia in the U.S. It has also presented education opportunities to the young Armenians through summer schools in the U.S. In addition, it has worked as a news source for the Assembly that has published the *Assembly's Annual Report*. Its popular publications are *Armenia*

³⁰² Yılmaz, op. cit., p.188.

³⁰³ Ibid., pp.189-190.

³⁰⁴ Kantarcı, op. cit., pp.157-158.

*This Week, Assembly This Week, and Month in Review, and Monthly Digest of News Form Armenia.*³⁰⁵

The other grass-root organization in the Armenian Diaspora is the Armenian National Committee of America (ANCA). It is the very influential ethnic organization into the policy-making processes. The ANCA represents the ARF. To materialize its aims, it has worked closely with other ethnic groups, and organizations specifically with the American Hellenistic Institute (AHI), the Kurdish-American organizations, and the human rights groups.³⁰⁶ The ANCA has published a monthly review *Transcaucasia: A Chronology*.³⁰⁷ It has used effectively media to form a pro-Armenian public opinion against Turkey and Azerbaijan. It has supported financially the academic researches on the Armenian question, and arranged meetings, conferences, and journeys for the U.S. Senators. The ANCA also has dealt with political and educational activities.³⁰⁸ It has become sponsor for the young Armenian-Americans' education expenditures, and provided travel opportunities to them to visit Washington, D.C. Moreover, it has given importance to the social issues such as the Armenia Tree Project.³⁰⁹

Another affiliated Armenian organization is the Armenian National Institute (ANI), which has made research on the so-called Armenian Genocide, and worked for affirmation of the so-called Armenian genocide in the world. ANI has conducted research activities through the U.S. archives, and other archives in some countries. In addition to these, it has closely worked with other affiliated organizations of the Assembly like the Armenian Genocide Museum and Memorial that locates in Washington, D.C.³¹⁰

³⁰⁵ Ibid., pp.157-160.

³⁰⁶ Yılmaz, op. cit., p.190-191.

³⁰⁷ Ibid., p.190.

³⁰⁸ Kantarcı, op. cit., p.159.

³⁰⁹ Ibid., p.160.

³¹⁰ Tayyar Arı, *Amerika'da Siyasi Yapı, Lobiler ve Dış Politika*, (İstanbul, 1997), p.274.

4.3. The Resolutions on the So-Called Armenian Genocide and Their Impacts on Turkish-American Relations

As mentioned before, approximately one million Armenians live in the United States of America so that the Diaspora Armenians have a major vote potential for the U.S. Senators. Almost half of the Armenians have lived in California, and the other half lived in large urban centers in the Northeast and Midwest such as New York, Massachusetts, and Michigan.³¹¹ Although 42 states in the U.S. have accepted the allegations on the events of 1915 as if it was genocide, the White House has not recognized officially the so-called Armenian genocide up until today.³¹²

Between the years 1970 and 1990, the pro-Armenians lobbied for the designation date April 24 as an official day of mourning for the Armenians who passed away in the events of 1915. In parallel to the Cyprus crisis, the first joint resolution (House Joint Resolution 148) on the so-called Armenian genocide was introduced to the House of Representatives with the support of the American Congressmen.³¹³ In 1974, the House of Representatives passed a joint resolution calling for a “National Day of Remembrance on April 24, the sixtieth anniversary of the genocide.”³¹⁴ According to the House Joint Resolution 148:

To designate April 24, 1975, as “National Day of Remembrance of Man’s Inhumanity to Man.” Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that April 24, 1975, is hereby designated as “National Day of Remembrance of Man’s Inhumanity and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day as a day of remembrance for all the victims of genocide, especially those of Armenian ancestry who succumbed to the genocide, especially those of Armenian ancestry who succumbed to the genocide perpetrated in 1915, and

³¹¹ Yılmaz, op. cit., p.188.

³¹² Lüttem, op. cit., p.118.

³¹³ Ibid., pp.118-119.

³¹⁴ Peterson, op. cit., pp.165-166.

in whose memory this date is commemorated by all Armenians and their friends throughout the world.³¹⁵

The acceptance of this resolution was an important step for the Diaspora Armenians. However, it caused some problems between Turkey and the U.S in the following years. Once the Armenian Diaspora managed to bring the Armenian question into the United States' political agenda, an anti-American reaction increased in Turkey. In that process, the main opposition party Republican People's Party (RPP) proposed to Turkey's withdrawal from NATO. Turgut Özal, who was Deputy Prime Minister for Economic Affairs in the Süleyman Demirel Government, criticized the U.S. Congress' approach toward the Armenian resolution. Also, he accused the U.S. Congressmen of encouraging the Armenian terrorism through the Armenian resolution in the U.S. Senate.³¹⁶ He stated that:

We see all these resolutions and attempts in the U.S. Congress are thoughtlessness. We are shocked that same follow such a dirty and cheap policies diming short term gaining before the local elections. This kind of decisions provide a clear support to ASALA and other Armenian terrorist organizations bloody attitudes which also target the U.S. citizens, too. If tomorrow one more innocent Turkish diplomat is massacred by these murderers will those, who accepted this resolutions fell any responsibility such murders?
317

In spite of the fact that the House of Representatives passed the joint resolution calling for a National Day of Remembrance in April 24, the 60th anniversary of the so-called Armenian genocide, it failed to become law with the support of the State Department. It opposed to the Armenian Resolution not to jeopardize the U.S. interests, and her security in the region during the Cold War period. The U.S. Administration did not want to damage the Turkish-American relations in the Cold War period so that they

³¹⁵ Lütem, op. cit., p.375.

³¹⁶ Laçiner, "Turgut Özal Period...", pp. 173-176

³¹⁷"Özal'dan ABD'ye Sert Tepki: İlişkiler Zedelenebilir, Çirkin Politika," *Cumhuriyet*, September 15, 1984.

lobbied in favor of Turkey in the U.S. Congress.³¹⁸ One year later, in 1976, President Jimmy Carter delivered a message for the first time on the 61st anniversary of the so-called Armenian genocide.³¹⁹ He preferred to use the word “tragedy” to refer the events of 1915 instead of the term genocide in his message as follows:

I feel close to you because you were the first Christian people, first Christian nation, and because of that, your deep religious beliefs, I doubt that any other people have ever suffered more. I know that through the early years of the foundation of your people’ home, you suffered a great deal. Nevertheless, it’s generally not known in the world that in the years preceding 1916, there was a concerted efforts made to eliminate all the Armenian people, probably one of the greatest tragedies that ever befell any group. Moreover, there were not any Nuremberg trials. There were not any high public figures that recognized how much you and your families had to suffer.³²⁰

In 1980, a new era began with the election of Ronald Reagan as the leader of the Republicans. In that election, the Republicans held the majority in the United State Senate, and it ended the Democratic Party’s majority in the House of Representatives. During the first administration period of President Reagan, relations between Turkey and the United States improved gradually in regard to the United States’ military interests in the Middle East region. Meanwhile, a military coup happened in Turkey on September 12, 1980. The armed forces intervened at the rule under the leadership General Kenan Evren. In that process, a military council was established to rule the country until the year 1983.³²¹ In international political arena, the western countries began to criticize the military regime in Turkey whose democracy came to a standstill. Its relations with Europe became more stressful due to the military intervention into the regime, and Turkey’s human rights violations.³²²

³¹⁸Peterson, op. cit., pp.165-166.

³¹⁹ Lütem, op. cit., p.118.

³²⁰Ibid., p.378.

³²¹George McGhee, *The U.S.- Turkish- NATO Middle East Connection: How the Truman Doctrine Contained the Soviet in the Middle East*, (New York: St. Martini Press, 1990), p.168.

³²² “European Commission Accuses Turkey of Rights Violation,” *Ottawa Citizen*, January 28, 1984.

However, Turkey protected her strategic importance for the United States during the Cold War period in which the Turkish-American relations underwent the major changes. These two countries established close military and political ties against the Soviet threat. When the USSR dissolved, the road map of Turkish and American relations fundamentally began to change. The U.S. had some worries on the substantial political system in Turkey in the 1980s. The Turkish-American relations continued their close partnership in regard to the developments in the Middle East, although the armed forces intervened in the political regime in Turkey. In the international political arena, the Iranian Revolution in Tehran and the Soviet Intervention in Afghanistan increased Turkey's importance again. In 1979, the Iranian monarchy replaced with an Islamic Republic under Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, who was the leader of the Iranian Revolution. This revolution was perceived as a threat against the United States in the region. Then, the Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan in December 1979, which created a shock wave in the U.S. Actually this invasion was a genuine threat to the interests of the U.S. in the Gulf region.³²³ Hence, due to the Iranian revolution, and the Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan, the United States continued to see Turkey as an important strategic partner for the U.S security in the region. In that process, Turkey was evaluated as a potential base for operation in the Gulf or Eastern Mediterranean. In the early 1980s, a treaty called the U.S.-Turkish Defense and Economic Cooperation Agreement of 1980 was signed for the regulation of U.S. military bases in Turkey and military and other aids in different areas.³²⁴ The commander- in -chief of Allied Forces of Southern Europe, Admiral William Crowe underlines the Turkey's importance for the U.S. in his statement as follows: "Turkey sits on the flank of any Soviet thrust into Iran or the Gulf and is the only alliance nation which is Muslim and geographically located in the Middle

³²³ Altunışık, op. cit., pp.152-153.

³²⁴ McGhee, op. cit., p.168.

East challenge without considering Turkey's orientation, terrain, airspace forces, and bases."³²⁵

Meanwhile, President Reagan delivered a speech on the so-called Armenian genocide in 1981. Unlike President Carter, he used the term genocide to refer to the events of 1915. There is an interesting point that after the year 1981, President Reagan did not deliver any speech or message in his presidential era, in parallel to the rise of the U.S. interest in the Middle East.³²⁶ President Reagan states in his message that:

The millions of deaths, the gas chambers, the inhuman crematoria, and the thousands of people who somehow survived with lifetime scars are all now part of the conscience of history. Forever must we remember just how precious is civilization, how important is liberty, and how heroic is the human spirit? Like the genocide of the Armenians before it, and the genocide of the Cambodians which followed it -- and like too many other such persecutions of too many other peoples -- the lessons of the Holocaust must never be forgotten.³²⁷

In Turkey, Özal Government was established after the general elections in 1983. When Turgut Özal began to govern, the Bilateral Defense and Economic Cooperation Agreement was brought into the political agenda in 1985. Based on this agreement, it was expected that the United States of America would modernize the Turkish Army, and assist the Turkish economy.³²⁸ In 1984, the House of Representatives adopted the House Joint Resolution 247 to designate the date April 24 as "National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man." According to this resolution:

To designate April 24 1985, as "National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man". Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that April 24, 1985, is hereby designated as "National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day as a day of remembrance for all the victims of genocide, especially the one and one half-million people of Armenian ancestry who were the victims of the

³²⁵ Altunışık, op. cit., p.154.

³²⁶ Lüttem, op. cit., p.188.

³²⁷ Ibid., p.379.

³²⁸ Laçiner, "Turgut Özal Period...", p. 173.

genocide perpetrated in Turkey between 1915 and 1923, and whose memory this date is commemorated by all Armenians and their friends throughout the world.³²⁹

This resolution underlined that the so-called Armenian genocide was conceived by the Turkish Ottoman Government, and implemented from 1915 to 1923, which resulted in the extermination of one and a half million Armenians.³³⁰ However, the previous resolution the House Joint Resolution 148 only touched upon the so-called Armenian genocide, which was committed in 1915 without referring Turkey, as follows “... those of Armenian ancestry who succumbed to the genocide perpetrated in 1915.”³³¹

In 1984, Prime Minister Turgut Özal warned the U.S. Administration not to damage the Turkish- American relations via the Armenian resolutions. Also, in a written statement, the Prime Minister Özal criticized the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in regard to the Armenian resolution as follows: “We submit to the world public opinion that these resolutions lend support to the international terrorism. Armenian terrorists, who say they seek to avenge mass killings of Armenians early in this century, have attacked Turks and Turkish sites in many countries.”³³²

Meanwhile, in parallel to the Armenian resolution, the Turks showed their reactions toward the political developments in the United States. Both rightist and leftist people demanded to froze the Turkish-American relations. In that process, the Populist Party Deputy Avni Güler and the Populist Party leader Necdet Calp proposed the Government’s withdrawal from NATO.³³³ However, Prime Minister Özal evaluated this political development as an election strategy of President Reagan, and did not pay attention what these politicians have demanded.

³²⁹ “ABD Senatosu Dış İlişkiler Komitesi Kararından: Türkiye, 2500 Yıllık Ermeni Yurdu,” *Cumhuriyet*, September 14, 1984, p.8.

³³⁰ Lütem, op. cit., p.376.

³³¹ Ibid., p.374.

³³² “Around the World; U.S. House Resolution Angers Turkish Premier,” *New York Times*, 1984.

³³³ “Özal’dan ABD’ye Sert Tepki: İlişkiler Zedelenebilir, Çirkin Politika,” *Cumhuriyet*, September 15, 1984.

In the meantime, there appeared reactions against the draft Armenian resolutions in the U.S. by the American intellectuals. For example, when Anthony Lee Coello submitted a draft resolution (H.Res.192) to the House of Representatives on June 4, 1985,³³⁴ a group of historians and scholars prepared a statement to protest the Armenian resolution. This statement appeared as an advertisement in the *New York Times* newspaper, and *Washington Post* newspaper on May 19, 1985. In this statement, both Turkish and American scholars declared that the use of words “Turkey” and “genocide” could not be accepted in that resolution.³³⁵ In their statement, they rejected the draft resolution by underlining that:

...From the fourteenth century until 1922, the area currently known as Turkey, or more correctly, the Republic of Turkey, was part of the territory encompassing the multi-national, multi-religious state known as the Ottoman Empire. It is wrong to equate the Ottoman Empire with the Republic of Turkey in the same way that it is wrong to equate the Hapsburg Empire with the Republic of Austria. The Ottoman Empire, which was brought to an end in 1922, by the successful conclusion of the Turkish Revolution which established the present day Republic of Turkey in 1923, incorporated lands and people which today account for more than twenty-five distinct countries in Southeastern Europe, North Africa, and the Middle East, only one of which is the Republic of Turkey. The Republic of Turkey bears no responsibility for any events which occurred in Ottoman times, yet by naming Turkey' in the Resolution, its authors have implicitly labeled it as guilty of 'genocide' it charges transpired between 1915 and 1923; As for the charge of 'genocide' no signatory of this statement wishes to minimize the scope of Armenian suffering. We are likewise cognizant that it cannot be viewed as separate from the suffering experienced by the Muslim inhabitants of the region. The weight of evidence so far uncovered points in the direct of serious inter communal warfare (perpetrated by Muslim and Christian irregular forces), complicated by disease, famine, suffering and massacres in Anatolia and adjoining areas during the First World War...³³⁶

These scholars also underlined that the area where the Armenians living became battlefield as follows that “the resulting death toll among both Muslim and Christian communities of the region was immense. But much more remains to be discovered before historians will be able to sort out precisely responsibility between warring and

³³⁴ “Ermeni Tasarısı Kongre’de,” *Milliyet*, April 26, 1985, p.12.

³³⁵ Laçiner, *Ermeni Sorunu, Diaspora...*, p.219.

³³⁶ “Attention Members of the U.S. House of Representatives,” *New York Times Sunday*, May 19, 1985.

innocent, and to identify the causes for the events which resulted in the death or removal of large numbers of the eastern Anatolian population, Christian and Muslim alike.”³³⁷ Moreover they underlined that the written records must be given to the scholars, and the archives must be opened to be able examine exactly what happened in the past, and then the politicians can make charges on the past events. They ended their statement with the words warning the politicians to be careful before making a charge, which can the credibility of the American legislative process. The last paragraph of their statement is as in the following:

...As the above comments illustrate, the history of the Ottoman-Armenians is much debated among scholars, many of whom do not agree with the historical assumptions embodied in the wording of H.J. Res. 192. By passing the resolution, Congress will be attempting to determine by legislation which side of the historical question is correct. Such a resolution, based on historically questionable assumptions, can only damage the cause of honest historical inquiry, and damage the credibility of the American legislative process.³³⁸

While the Diaspora members were lobbying to be passed the Armenian resolutions in the U.S. Senate, the European Parliament accepted the allegations on the events of 1915 as the first genocide of the twentieth century in 1987. Paralleling to the European Parliament’s decision, a new Armenian resolution came to agenda of the U.S. House of Representatives. As a response, Şükrü Elekdağ, Turkish Ambassador to Washington, was recalled to Ankara. At the same parallel, the Turkish Prime Minister Turgut Özal, and Turkish President Kenan Evren warned the U.S. Administration. Also, President Evren canceled his diplomatic visit to the U.S. In that process, members of the Armed Commission in the House of Representatives lobbied against this resolution. Finally, it was rejected like other Armenian resolutions.³³⁹

Interestingly, in the late 1980s, the issue of Armenian resolution was not brought into political agenda of the U.S. due to the two reasons; the first was the U.S.

³³⁷ “Attention Members of the U.S. House of Representatives,” *New York Times Sunday*, May 19, 1985.

³³⁸ “Attention Members of the U.S. House of Representatives,” *New York Times Sunday*, May 19, 1985.

³³⁹ Laçiner, op. cit., pp.218-219.

presidential election, and the second was Nagorno-Karabakh conflict in the Caucasian region.³⁴⁰ Namely, between the years 1988 and the 1989, the issue of the Armenian resolution was shelved. In that period, Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, and the earthquake in Armenia affected the Armenian Diaspora. However, this did not last long, and problems emerged again in the Turkish-American relations. Collapse of the USSR decreased Turkey's strategic importance up until the Gulf crisis occurred in the international political system.³⁴¹

Senator Robert Dole, and his wife, Elizabeth, who would soon become head of the American Red Cross, visited the earthquake-stricken Armenia in August 1989. When this couple returned to the United States, the Senator Dole submitted a new Armenian resolution to the House of Representatives with support of fifty-four the U.S. Senators in September 1990.³⁴² According to this resolution:

The 24th April 1990 will be declared a 'national memorial day in commemoration of 75 years after the Armenian Genocide in the years 1915 - 1923'. The president will be authorized and will call upon the American people and half people of Armenian descent who were victims of genocide committed by the government of the Ottoman Empire between the years 1915 and 1923, before the establishment of the Republic of Turkey.³⁴³

Upon this resolution in 1990, President George W. Bush delivered a message as follows; "on the seventy-fifth anniversary of the massacres, I would like to join the Armenians and all people to observe the April 24 as a Memorial Day for commemorating the one and half million victims of the Armenian nation." Thus, as President Reagan, he did not deliver any message regarding with the April 24 after the year 1990.³⁴⁴

³⁴⁰“ABD Kongresi Soykırım Tasarısını Erteleledi,” *Cumhuriyet*, May 22, 1985.

³⁴¹Altunışık, op. cit., p.154.

³⁴²Peterson, op. cit., p.171.

³⁴³ Yair Avon, *The Banality of Indifference: Zionism and the Armenian Genocide*, (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 2000), p.103.

³⁴⁴ Lütem, op. cit., p.380.

In that process, a Gulf crisis emerged in the Middle East region. President Turgut Özal advocated to Turkey's active participation to the Gulf crisis. He evaluated this crisis as an important opportunity to recover relations with the United States. Nonetheless, neither the Turkish parliament nor the Turkish public opinion were not eager to take part in the Gulf crisis. An extraordinary meeting was held in the Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA) in 1991. When the war began, the TGNA passed a bill to send troops abroad and receive foreign troops on Turkish soil on September 4, 1991. Based on Article 92 of the Turkish Constitution, the Turkish Government seized a full authority in all matters except the declaration of war. Consequently, this article opened a new way for the U.S. to use the Turkish airbases, especially İncirlik.³⁴⁵

Meanwhile, Senator Dole's resolution draft (H.Res.212) was accepted to six against eight votes in the U.S. Senate Justice Commission. When it was accepted in the U.S. Senate Justice Commission, the White House and the Secretary of State stated that the U.S. Administration would not give support to the draft resolution on the events of 1915.³⁴⁶ Mesut Yılmaz, who was the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Turkey, and Nüzhet Kandemir, who was the Turkish Ambassador to Washington, met Secretary of State James Baker and American Ambassador to Ankara Mark Grossman in Washington where Yılmaz stated that Turkey would take measures in the military liaison area. According to Yılmaz's statement, it would not permit the American Naval to use the Turkish ports, and the American F-16 Fighting Falcons not to benefit from NATO air training area near Konya, and modernization of American bases in Turkey.³⁴⁷ As a result, the U.S. Senator Robert Byrd of West Virginia vowed to filibuster the resolution not to pass. After the failure of two cloture votes, and influence of the U.S. Administration, Senator Dole had to withdraw the resolution³⁴⁸ like other two

³⁴⁵ Altunışık, op. cit., pp.155-156.

³⁴⁶ "Beyaz Saray'da Ermeni Pazarlığı," *Milliyet*, October 20, 1989, p.14.

³⁴⁷ "Yılmaz: 'Vahim Gelişme,'" *Milliyet*, October 19, 1989, p.14.

³⁴⁸ Peterson, op. cit., pp.170-172.

resolutions in 1985, and in 1987 to establish a memorial day for the so-called Armenian genocide.³⁴⁹

In 1991, an interesting development occurred concerned to the recognition of the so-called Armenian genocide in Turkey. Özal signaled to recognize the so-called Armenian genocide in 1991. However, he backed up when political opponent Süleyman Demirel and some generals criticized him not to be sensitive toward the Turkey's national matter. In that process, Nüzhet Kandemir convinced Özal not to jeopardize the Turkish national interest in the world.³⁵⁰

In 2000, a new Armenian draft resolution (H.R.596) was introduced to the House of Representatives. Among supporters of this resolution, there were some important political players such as Hillary Clinton, Joe Lieberman, John Kerry and John Edwards.³⁵¹ With efforts of President Bill Clinton, who sent a letter to Speaker of House Dennis Hastert, this resolution was withdrawn.³⁵² Then, Adam Schiff submitted a new Armenian resolution to the House of Representative on January 30, 2007. It was passed from House of Foreign Affairs by 27 to 21 votes. Sean McCormak the Secretary of State Spokesman and Defense Secretary Robert Gates warned Congressmen not to harm the U.S. interests in Turkey. According to Gates, the U.S. should not jeopardize its military liaison due to the fact that Turkey's air base İncirlik, which is a strategic district for the United States force in Iraq and Afghanistan³⁵³. Nancy Pelosi, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, criticized Gates and McCormak because of their approaches toward the draft resolution on the events of 1915. She states her opinion as follow:

³⁴⁹ Avon, op. cit., p. 103

³⁵⁰ Sefa Kaplan, "Soykırımı Tanısak Fena Olmaz mı?," *Hürriyet*, March 7, 2005.

³⁵¹ "Ermeni Tasarısı İçin Kritik Karar," *Radikal*, July, 09, 2003.

³⁵² "İşi Bitiren Clinton Oldu," *Radikal*, October, 21 2000.

³⁵³ "House Committee Approves Armenian Genocide Resolution", online at <http://www.cnn.com/2007/POLITICS/10/10/us.turkey.armenians/index/html>, (accessed on April 19, 2009)

When I came to Congress 20 years ago, it was not right time because of the Soviet Union. Then, that falls and then it was not right time because of the Gulf War one. Then, it was not right time because of over flight to Iraq. Now it is not right time because of expected Gulf War II. Therefore, there is never been a good time so it is important to pass the resolution because many of survivors are very old.³⁵⁴

In that period Turkey has begun to work with some influential Washington D.C. based lobbying firms including DLA Piper, Livingston Group and Fleishman- Hilliard to conduct lobby activities in the U.S. Senate. Some global brands such as BP and Boeing Companies gave support to Turkey.³⁵⁵ In the political arena, prominent politicians, including Henry Kissinger, Madeleine K. Albright, James A. Baker, Warren Christopher, Lawrence S. Eagleburger, Alexander M. Haig, Colin L. Powell, lobbied in favor of Turkey.³⁵⁶ Also, Jewish people lobbied for Turkey in Washington D.C. Both the U.S. and Israel were eager to protect their strategic ties with Turkey. As known that, in the Middle East region, Turkey is the regional ally of Israel. In addition to this, Turkey is very remarkable market for her defense industry. Due to the effective lobbying activities of some important players and countries in the U.S. Senate, the resolution was withdrawn like other ones.³⁵⁷

Democrat Senator Robert Menendez of New Jersey and Republican Senator John Ensign of Nevada introduced a new Armenian resolution on November 4, 2009. In parallel to the new political developments after the election of President Obama, most people have assumed that the resolution would be passed in the U.S. Senate. Indeed, there are several points, which have strengthened hands of the Armenian lobby

³⁵⁴“Pelosi Says She’ll Press on With Armenian Genocide”, online at <http://www.cnn.com/2007/POLITICS/10/14/us.turkey/index.html>, (accessed on April 19, 2009)

³⁵⁵ Ali H. Aslan, “How Did Last Minute Hopes Turn Into Disappointment ?” *Today’s Zaman*, October 12, 2007.

³⁵⁶“Turkey’s Lobbyist Enlist Former U.S. Secretaries of State To Kill Armenian Genocide Resolution,” Azad Hye, online at <http://www.azad-hye.net/news>, (accessed on March 17,2010)

³⁵⁷ Jim Lobe, “U.S.-Turkey: Armenian Genocide Vote Threaten Ties at Key Moment,” *IPS Inter Press Service*, March 05, 2010, online at <http://ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=50569>, (accessed on March 17,2010)

institutions and the Armenian Diaspora in the U.S. First, the Democrats have held the majority in the House and the Senate. As it is known that, Speaker Pelosi, Secretary of State Clinton, and President Obama have accepted the whole allegations on the so-called Armenian genocide. Even, President Obama became a co-sponsor of the Armenian resolution in 2007, and made pledges to the Armenians to support allegations on the events of 1915 in his presidential election campaign. Second, based on some claims, after the Iraq War, Turkey has begun to lose her geo-political importance for the U.S. Administration.³⁵⁸ Third, many people have asserted that the Jewish lobby would not support Turkey in regard to the Armenian resolutions in the U.S. Senate due to the diplomatic crisis which occurred at the Davos World Economic Forum. The American Jewish Congress, and the four Jewish Institutions in the U.S. sent a letter to the Prime Minister of Turkey Recep Tayyip Erdoğan to criticize his general approach toward the President of Israel Shimon Peres, and to express their concerns over the Turkish foreign policy in the Middle East region, and especially Turkey's bilateral relations with Israel.³⁵⁹

All in all, despite all anti-Turkish movement in the United States Senate, the Turkish-American strategic partnership has not entered to the dead-end streets. Between the years 1980 and 1990, the Armenian Diaspora, and the Armenian lobbying groups in U.S. worked to pass the Armenian resolutions on the events of 1915. The Diaspora Armenians and Armenian lobbying groups tried to move the Armenian question into the international arena. They influenced many countries for the recognition of the 1915 events as if it was genocide. After the year 1985, more and more parliaments recognized the Armenians allegations, and designated the date April 24 as a commemoration day to remember the Armenians who passed away in the events of 1915.³⁶⁰ In the Cold War period, although the U.S. foreign policy went under a strong influence of the Armenian

³⁵⁸Fatma Demirelli and Ercan Yavuz, "Turkey not Fretting over Possible 'Genocide' Blow after Davos Storm," *Today's Zaman*, February, 03, 2009.

³⁵⁹"Yahudi Lobisi 'Kuşatılmışlık' Çelişkisi Taşıyor," *Sabah*, January 23, 2001.

³⁶⁰"Türkiye Soykırımı Tamiyan Ülkelere Dava Açabilir," *Hürriyet*, March 20, 2010.

Diaspora, these whole attempts failed. As mentioned above, the Armenian resolutions came into agenda of the U.S. Senate five times. However, these resolutions have not been become law up until today, although almost forty-two states have accepted allegations on the events of 1915 as the so-called Armenian genocide in America. The White House has not officially recognized it so far.³⁶¹ Since the Cold War period, the strategic significance of Turkey has been constant for the U.S., which has been conducting close cooperation with Turkey to protect her interests in the Middle East region. In the future, if a crisis emerges in regard to the Armenian resolutions, it may affect Turkish's bilateral relation with the United States. In addition, it may negatively influence the Middle East and the Armenia – Azerbaijan peace processes, the Iraq's reconstruction process, the U.S. operations in Afghanistan, and the transfer of Caspian energy resources from the region to the western markets.³⁶²

³⁶¹By 2009, in America 42 States have recognized the so-called Armenian genocide. These states are: Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Nord Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin. For detailed information see: Lütem, "Günümüzde Ermeni Sorunu", p.120.

³⁶² Soli Özel, Şuhnaz Yılmaz and Abdullah Akyüz, *Rebuilding a Partnership: Turkish-American Relation for A New Era, A Turkish Perspective*, (Istanbul: Tüsiad Publication, 2009), pp.69-77.

CONCLUSION

Considering the given information on how the Armenian question was brought into political agenda, the details of the rise of Armenian nationalism and its influence on reviving the Armenian question, it is possible to assess the role of international political actors who made the Armenian question an instrument against Turkey. Before summarizing the main conclusions of this study, we will first mention the reasons how the Armenian question re-emerged as an aspect of Armenian nationalism and its effects on Turkey between the years 1960 and 1990.

As told in the first chapter, the Turks and the Armenians lived together side by side on the same land with peace and safety up until Armenian nationalism spread throughout the country. The living standards of the Ottoman Armenians were partially good. Under the Ottoman millet system, the Ottoman Government protected them. Of course, the Armenians, who lived in eastern part of the Ottoman Empire, had not same living conditions like other Armenians, who lived in İstanbul and other cities in the western region. In Istanbul, the Ottoman Armenians were very influential ethnic community in the Ottoman economy and bureaucracy areas. Many prominent Armenian families contributed to the Ottoman art, architecture, music, painting, and literature with their precious works. After the French revolution, the rising nationalist feelings did not pass the Armenian community by in the Ottoman Empire. It directed the Ottoman Armenians to demand an independent state within the Ottoman Empire. In that perspective, the Armenian literature played an important role to emphasize the idea of freedom. Second, the Ottoman Empire began to implement reforms to the Ottoman political system. Westernization, modernization, and secularization processes encouraged the Armenian nationalists to present their complaints on the administrative issues. Through the Armenian National Constitution of 1860, the Armenian community was secularized and the Armenian Patriarch's influence on the Armenians was curtailed. From that date onwards, Armenian nationalism was politicized. Third, a mutual relationship began between the imperialist states and the Armenian nationalists. In the

Eastern Question framework, those imperialist states conducted policies to obtain military, strategic, and commercial interests on the Ottoman lands. Like other Ottoman subjects who lived in the Balkan Peninsula, the Armenian community was used under the pretext of their rights' protection. On the other hand, the Armenian nationalists continued to support their imperialist policies on the Ottoman lands to establish cooperation with them and to establish an Armenian State in the future. After the Ottoman-Russian War of 1877-1878, the Armenian question became a subject of international politics. In parallel to the developments in the Balkan Peninsula, the Armenian nationalists organized revolutions in order to materialize their aims. When World War I broke out, this issue gained a different dimension for the Ottoman Empire. Because of the Armenian revolutions and the Armenians' cooperation with the Entente Powers, the Ottoman Government took some precautions to suppress their revolts and cooperation during World War I that the Armenian question utterly emanated from domestic problem of the Ottoman Empire with the events of 1915. Although the Armenian question had an important place in foreign policies of the Allied Powers, it was shelved at the end of the Lausanne Peace Conference.

As examined in the second chapter, during World War I, the majority of the Ottoman Armenians began to migrate from the Ottoman Empire to either the western countries or the Middle Eastern ones where they formed the roots of Armenian Diaspora. In the 1920s, when the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic was founded, Armenian nationalism was revived under the communist regime. In that process, the Armenian national identity was developed through efforts of the Armenian national elites. Interestingly, a parallel process of identity reinforcement took place in the Armenian Diaspora. However, under the Stalin rule, the developing Armenian nationalism was curtailed with his oppressive Russification policies. At the end of World War II, the Armenian question was moved to the international politics when the Russian leader Stalin made the Armenian question an instrument to destabilize Turkey in the Cold War period. At the end of Stalin rule, Khrushchev softened his oppressive policies on Armenian nationalism. On the one hand, Armenian nationalism was revived in the

Russian Armenia; on the other hand, a new period began for the Armenians who lived in the Middle Eastern countries with rising of Arab nationalism. In that process, a vast majority of Armenians migrated to Europe and the United States.

As put forward in the third chapter, Armenian nationalism erupted on the fifth anniversary of the so-called Armenian genocide. In 1965, when the Armenians gathered in Yerevan to commemorate the Armenians, who passed away in the events of 1915, and to demand land from Turkey, dissident Armenian nationalism surfaced in the world. From the year 1965 onwards, the rising of Armenian nationalism brought about radicalization of the Armenians who lived in abroad. Between the years 1975 and 1985, the Armenian terrorist organizations kept alive the Armenian Question through bloody terrorist attacks. In parallel to the Cyprus crisis, this time the United States of America used the Armenian question as a political tool against Turkey. As a response to the Peace Operation in Cyprus, the first Armenian resolution on the so-called Armenian genocide was submitted to the U.S. Congress in 1975. Then, Armenian lobby activities began in the United States when the first Armenian lobby organization the Armenian Assembly of America (AAA) was founded. Meanwhile, Armenian nationalism gained a different dimension in the Gorbachev era in that period. The Armenians began to demand Nagorno-Karabakh region, which fed Armenian nationalism in Soviet Armenia, but their demands was not responded in an affirmative way.

As mentioned in the fourth chapter, Nagorno Karabakh conflict became a catalyst in the Armenian nationalist movement. They demanded to establish an independent Armenian State from Moscow. In 1991, the Republic of Armenia was established. When Armenia gained its independence, the Armenian question has become a deadlock issue toward the normalization relations between Turkey and Armenia. Although the first Armenian President Levon Ter-Petrossian tried to establish diplomatic relation with Turkey, the Armenian question and the Armenian Diaspora's insistence on keeping this issue alive to strengthen the Armenian ethnic identity against the assimilation threat obstructed the normalization process since the post-Cold War period. In Washington, D.C., the Armenian question has been kept alive with efforts of the Armenian lobby

institutions and the wealthy Armenian Diaspora members. In the Cold War period, the Armenian resolutions were submitted three times to the U.S. Congress to proclaim April 24 as a “National Day of Remembrance of Man’s Inhumanity to Man.” Against the Armenian Resolutions in the U.S. Congress, the Turkish Government warned many times to the U.S. Administration. Also, she used the Turkey’s military bases against a political trump to prevent the Armenian resolutions to be passed from the U.S. Senate.

From time to time, this question was shelved, but if Turkey is wanted to be destabilized in the international political arena, this old issue is instantly warmed up with efforts of the Armenian Diaspora. In this thesis, it has proven that the Armenian question was brought into political agenda with support of the imperialist states, which fed Armenian nationalism. In the Ottoman Empire, the Russian’s policies encouraged Armenian nationalists against the Ottoman Government, which supported Armenian nationalists and their terrorist attacks in the Ottoman Empire. At the same parallel, it did not avoid supporting the Armenian terrorist organizations in the Cold War period. During World War II, the Soviet leader Stalin moved this question to the political agenda. Of course, the main reason was to destabilize Turkey in the region. The other reason was to take supports of the Armenians against the Dashnak-Nazi cooperation. For this aim, he softened his pragmatist policy toward the Armenian Patriarch and allowed to be founded many Armenian Churches in Soviet Armenia.

Like the Soviet Russia, the United States made the Armenian question an instrument to use against Turkey in parallel to the Cyprus crisis. From the Cyprus crisis onwards, the Armenian resolutions have been submitted to the U.S. Senate. When Turkey’s strategic importance decreased for the United States’ national interest at the end of Cold War period, the Armenian question entered a different phase. Many states parliaments accepted the allegations on the events of 1915 and many U.S states began to recognize the so-called Armenian genocide. However, the U.S. Administration has not recognized officially these allegations up until today due to national interests of the U.S in the Middle East and Caucasian regions. The reflections of the Armenian resolutions on the Turkish- American relations became very stressful. These resolutions affected

negatively Turkey's bilateral relations with the United States. Among the Turkish politicians, for the first time, Turgut Özal stated the recognition of the events of 1915 as the first genocide of the twentieth century. In the Cold War period, as a reaction, Turkish politicians proposed to Turkey's withdrawal from NATO membership.

All in all, I come across four basic conclusions. The first one is that the Armenian question is neither a historical, nor a humanitarian, nor a religious issue. On the contrary, it is a purely political issue, which was created artificially by the imperialist states in the late nineteenth century. This is the first definite conclusion I reach. The second conclusion is that Armenian nationalism emerged with secularization of Armenian society and the reconstruction of identity, which based on national rather than religious principles. Armenian nationalism's development processes both in the Ottoman Empire and in the Soviet Russia are very good case examples for Gellner's modernization and nationalism theory. The third conclusion is that the Armenian question was revived and then moved to international political arena by a few important political actors inside some specific processes. In the Cold War period, this question was re-emerged deliberately by two these super-powers. The fourth conclusion is that when Armenia became an independent country in 1991, the Armenian question's dimension altered. This question went beyond the Armenians' lobby activities in different countries' parliaments in the world due to the fact that it became an official policy of the Republic of Armenia against Turkey.

Last but not least, the Armenian question sparked fire of Armenian nationalism in 1965 in Soviet Armenia. Between the years 1960 and 1990, this issue was used as a political trump to destabilize Turkey in the political arena in the Cold War period. Since the Cold War, the Diaspora Armenians have continued to keep alive the Armenian question to demand land and compensation from Turkey. However, if they continue to insist on their allegations, no one will win and it would affect negatively the Republic of Armenia and its bilateral relations with Turkey. On the other hand, the normalized relations with Turkey will contribute a lot not only to the Republic of Armenia but also to the regional peace at Caucasus as well as peace at world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I-BOOKS AND ARTICLES

- Adalian, P. (1999). *Encyclopedia of Genocide*. Santa Barbara, California: ABC-CLIO, Inc.
- Ahmad, F. (1969). *The Young Turks; the Committee of Union and Progress in Turkish politics, 1908-1914*. Oxford : Clarendon Press.
- Aktan, G. (2007). "Devletler Hukukuna Göre Ermeni Sorunu." In Ömer Engin Lütem, (Ed.), *Ermeni Sorunu Temel Bilgi ve Belgeler*. Ankara: Avrasya Stratejik Araştırmalar Merkezi: 25-33.
- Altunışık, M. (2004). "Turkish-American Security Relations: The Middle East Dimension." In Mustafa Aydın and Çağrı Erhan, (Eds.), *Turkish-American Relations: Past, Present and Future*. London; New York: Routledge:151-180.
- Armaoğlu, F.(1997). *19. Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi (1789-1914)*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınevi.
- Arı, T. (1997). *Amerika'da Siyasi Yapı, Lobiler ve Dış Politika*. İstanbul: Alfa Basım Yayım.
- Astourian, S. H. (2000) "From Levon Ter-Petrossian to Kocharian Leadership Change in Armenia." Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies Working Paper Series, online at <http://www.iseees.berkeley.edu>, (accessed on 10.09.2009)
- Avon, Y. (2000). *The Banality of Indifference: Zionism and the Armenian Genocide*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.
- Baç-Müftüleri, M. (1997). *Turkey's Relations with a Changing Europe*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
- Bakalian, A. P. (1993). *Armenian-Americans: From Being to Feeling Armenia*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publisher.
- Balakian, P. (2003). *Burning Tigris: Armenian Genocide and America's Response*. New York: Harper Collins.

Barsoumian, H. (2004). "The Eastern Question and the Tanzimat Era." In Richard Hovhannisian (ed.), *The Armenian People From Ancient to Modern Times*, Vol II. New York: Palgrave Macmillian.

Bayur, Y. H. (1983). *Türk İnkılâbı Tarihi*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayinevi.

Bildirici, Y. Z. (1999). *The Massacres the Armenians Committed in Adana Province and the French-Armenian Relations*. Ankara: KÖK Sosyal ve Stratejik Araştırmalar Vakfı.

Binark, İ. (2000). *Archive Documents about the Atrocity and Genocide Inflicted upon Turks by Armenians*. Ankara: Board of Culture Arts and Publications.

Birand, M. A. (1980). *Diyet*. İstanbul: Ağaoğlu Yayınları.

Bloxham, D. (2007). *The Great Game of Genocide : Imperialism, Nationalism, and the Destruction of the Ottoman Armenians*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.

Bournoutian, G. (2002). *A Concise History of the Armenian People: From Ancient Times to the Present*. Costa Mesa, Calif.: Mazda Publishers.

_____. (2004). *A History of the Armenian People*. Costa Meza, California: Mazda Publisher.

Boztemur, R. (2005). "Religion and Politics in the Making of American Near East Policy 1918-1922", *JSRI*, No: 11, Summer, 45-59.

Bölükbaşı, S. (1988). *The Superpowers and the Third World: Turkish-American Relations and Cyprus*. Maryland: University Press of America.

Bryson, T. A. (1979). *United States / Middle East Diplomatic Relations, 1784- 1978*. Metuchen: Scarecrow Press.

Çaycı, S. (2007). "Uluslar arası Hukuk Açısından Ermeni Sorunu ve 1915 Olayları." In Ömer Engin Lütem, (Ed.), *Ermeni Sorunu Temel Bilgi ve Belgeler*. Ankara: ASAM:171-180.

Çelik, Y. (1999). *Contemporary Turkish Foreign Policy*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger.

Dekmejian, R. H. (2000). "Armenian Diaspora: A Conceptual Framework," in Richard Hovhannisian (Ed.), *The Armenian People From Ancient to Modern Times* Vol.:2. New York: Palgrave Macmillian: 413-444.

DeNovo, J. (1963). *American Interests and Policies in the Middle East 1900–1939*. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press.

Erhan, Ç. (2001). *Türk-Amerikan İlişkilerinin Tarihsel Kökenleri*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.

Gellner, E. (1997). *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Gordon, L. J. (1932). *American Relations with Turkey, 1830-1930: An Economic Interpretation*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Gunter, M. M. (1986). *Pursuing the Just Cause of Their People*. New York ; Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.

_____. (1984). “Contemporary Aspects of Armenian Terrorism.” In *International Terrorism and the Drug Connection*, (Ankara: Ankara University): 103-146.

Görgülü, A. (2008). *Turkey-Armenian Relations: A Vicious Circle*. İstanbul: TESEV Publications.

Göyünç, N. (2001). “Turkish-Armenian Cultural Relations.” In Türkaya Ataöv, (Ed.), *The Armenians in the Late Ottoman Period*. Ankara: The Turkish Historical Society:23-42.

Gürün, K. (2001). *The Armenian file : The Myth of Innocence Exposed*. Nicosia, North Cyprus : K. Rustem.

Halaçoğlu, Y. (2001). “Realities Behind the Relocation.” In Türkaya Ataöv (Ed.), *The Armenians in the Late Ottoman Period*. Ankara: The Turkish Historical Society: 100-142.

_____. (2007). *Facts on the Relocation of Armenians (1914-1918)*. Ankara: Turkish Historical Society.

Hale, W. (2003). *Türk Dış Politikası 1774-2000*. (Petek Demir,Trans.) İstanbul: Arkeoloji Sanat Yayınları.

Harris, G. S. (2004). “Turkish-American Relations Since the Truman Doctrine.” In Mustafa Aydın and Çağrı Erhan, (Eds.), *Turkish-American Relations: Past, Present and Future*. London ; New York : Routledge.

Hart, P. T. (1990). *Two NATO Allies at the Threshold of War: Cyprus, a First Hand Account of Crisis Management: 1965-1968*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Hovannisian, R. (1987). "The Historical Dimension of the Armenian Question, 1878-1923." In Richard Hovannisian, (Ed.), *The Armenian Genocide in Perspective*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers: 19-43.

_____. (2004). *The Armenian People From Ancient to Modern Times*. Vol II. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

_____. (2004). "The Republic of Armenia." In Richard Hovhanisian (Ed.), *The Armenian People From Ancient to Modern Times*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan: 303-347

_____. (2004). "The Armenian Question in the Ottoman Empire, 1876–1914." In Richard Hovannisian, (Ed.), *Armenian People from Ancient to Modern Times*. Vol. II. New York: St. Martin's Press: 203-239.

_____. (2006). "Determination of the Armenian Genocide." In Richard G. Hovannisian, (Ed.), *Looking Backward, Moving Forward: Confronting the Armenian Genocide*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers: 23-51.

_____. (2008). *The Armenian Genocide: Wartime Radicalization or Premeditated Continuum*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

Hyland, F. P. (1991). *Armenian Terrorism, the Past, the Present, the Prospect*. Oxford, Westview Press.

Howard, H. N. (1976). "The Bicentennial in American-Turkish Relations", *Middle East Journal*, Vol. 30 (3), Summer: 291-310.

Ishakian, A. (2008). *Democracy Building and Civil Society in Post-Soviet Armenia*. London:New York: Routledge.

Kaligan, D. M. (2009). *Armenian Organization and Ideology under the Ottoman Rule, 1908-1914*. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers.

Kantarçı, Ş. (2001). "Ermeni Lobisi: ABD'de Ermeni Diasporasının Oluşması ve Lobi Faaliyetleri," *Ermeni Araştırmaları*, No: 1, Ankara, Mart-Nisan-Mayıs: 139-169.

Karal, E. Z. (1975). *The Armenian Question: 1878-1923*. Ankara: Gündüz.

Karpat, K. (1975). "Turkish-Soviet Relations." In Kemal Karpat, ed., *Turkey's Foreign Policy in Transition: 1950-1974*. Leiden : E. J. Brill: 73-108.

Kasım, K. (2001). "Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict from Its Inception To The Peace Process", *Armenian Studies*, Issue 2, June-July-August: 170-185.

_____.(2004). "Armenia's Foreign Policy: Basic Parameters of Ter-Petrosyan and Kocharyan Era", *The Journal of Turkish Weekly*, October 13, 2004, online at <http://www.turkishweekly.net>, (accessed on 20.02.2010)

Kedourie, E. (1995). "Nationalism." In Omar Dahbour, and Micheline R. Ishay, (Eds.), *The Nationalism Reader*. New Jersey: Humanities Press International: 160-169.

Khalapyan, H. (2006). "Zabel Esayan." In Lerna Ekmekcioğlu and Melissa Bilal, (Eds.), *Bir Adalet Feryadı, Beş Ermeni Feminist Yazar (1862-1933)*. İstanbul: Aras Yayıncılık.

Kundakçı, H. (2006). *Emperyalizmin Maşası Ermeniler* İstanbul: Alfa.

Kuyumjian, R. S. (2010). *Teotig Biography (Including a Translation of Teotig's "Monument to April")*. Princeton and London: Gomitas Institute.

Laçiner, S. and Kaya İ. (2002). *Armenian Issue and Jews*. Ankara: Institute for Armenian Research Publication.

Laçiner, S. (2008). *Ermeni Sorunu, Diaspora ve Türk Dış Politikası*. Ankara: USAK.

_____.(2009). "Turgut Özal Period in Turkish Foreign Policy: Ozalism," *USAK Yearbook*, Vol.2: 153-205.

Lane, A. (2001). "The Cold War as History." In Klaus Larres and Ann Lane, (Eds.), *The Cold War: Essential Readings*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.:1-17.

Libaridian, G. (2004). *Modern Armenia: People, Nation and State*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

Lütem, Ö. E. (2007). "Giriş". In Ömer Engin Lütem, (Ed.), *Ermeni Sorunu Temel Bilgi ve Belgeler*. Ankara: ASAM: 1-4.

_____.(2007). "Lozan'dan Sonra Ermeni Sorunu." In Ömer Engin Lütem, (Ed.), *Ermeni Sorunu Temel Bilgi ve Belgeler*. Ankara: ASAM: 33-47

_____.(2007). "Günümüzde Ermeni Sorunu". In Ömer Engin Lütem, (Ed.), *Ermeni Sorunu Temel Bilgi ve Belgeler*. Ankara: ASAM.: 85-123.

_____. (2007). "Ermeni Sorununun Olası Gelişmeleri". In Ömer Engin Lütem, (Ed.), *Ermeni Sorunu Temel Bilgi ve Belgeler*. Ankara: ASAM.: 123-130.

McCarthy J. and McCarthy C. (1989). *Turks and Armenians: A Manual on the Armenians Question*. Washington, D.C., Committee on Education Assembly of Turkish American Associations.

McCarthy, J. (2001). "The Population of the Ottoman Armenians." In Türkkaya Ataöv (ed.), *The Armenians in the Late Ottoman Period*. Ankara: The Turkish Historical Society: pp.65–85.

_____. (2005). "The Reality of Armenian Issue", online at http://www.mfa.gov.tr/presentation-by-prof_-justin-mccarthy-at-the-tgna-on-the-reality-of-armenian-issue_-conference-on-march-24_-2005_.en.mfa, (accessed on 20.02.2010)

McGhee, G. (1990). *The U.S. - Turkish- NATO Middle East Connection: How the Truman Doctrine Contained the Soviet in the Middle East*. New York: St. Martini Press.

Melson, R. (1992). *Revolution and Genocide: On the Origins of the Armenian Genocide and the Holocaust*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Mirak, R. (1983). *Torn Between Two Lands Armenians in America to World War I*. Boston, Harvard University Press.

_____. (2004). "The Armenians in America." In Richard Hovhannisian, (Ed.), *The Armenian People From Ancient to Modern Times* . New York: Palgrave MacMillan: 489-413.

Nalbandian, L. (1963). *The Armenian Revolutionary Movement : The Development of Armenian Political Parties Through the Nineteenth Century*. Berkeley : University of California Press.

Nassibian, A. (1984). *Britain and the Armenian Question: 1915-1923*. New York: St. Martin Press.

Oleynik, I. (2002). *Armenia Foreign Policy and Government Guide*. Washington, D.C., International Business Publications.

Öke, M. K. (1996). *Yüzyılın Kan Davası Ermeni Sorunu, 1914-1923*. İstanbul: İrfan Yayınevi.

Özkan, Z. (2001). *Tarihsel Akış İçerisinde Terörden Politikaya Ermeni Meselesi*, İstanbul: Er Ofset.

Özcan, M. (2008). *Harmonizing Foreign Policy : Turkey, the EU and the Middle East*. Burlington: Ashgate.

Özel, S., Yılmaz Ş. and Akyüz A. (2009). *Rebuilding A Partnership :Turkish-American Relation for A New Era, A Turkish Perspective*. İstanbul: Tüsiad Publication.

Öztuna, Y. (2001). "The Political Milieu of the Armenian Question." In Türkkaya Ataöv, ed., *The Armenians in the Late Ottoman Period*. Ankara, the Turkish Historical Society.

Palabıyık, S. (2007). "Türkiye-Ermenistan İlişkileri (1918-2007)." In Ömer Engin Lütem, (Ed.), *Ermeni Sorunu Temel Bilgi ve Belgeler*. Ankara: ASAM Publication:233-265.

Payaslian, S. (1999). "After Recognition," *The Armenian Forum*, Vol. 2, No.3, Winter: 33-56.

Peretz, D. (1971). *Middle East Today*. New York: Holt Rinenart and Winston.

Perinçek, M. (2007). *Rus Devlet Arşivlerinden 100 Belge Ermeni Meselesi*. İstanbul: Doğan Kitap.

Peterson, M. D. (2004). *Starving Armenians: America and the Armenian Genocide, 1915-1930 and After*. Charlottesville / London: University of Virginia Press.

Saray, M. (2003). *The Principles of Turkish Administration and Their Impact on the Lives of Non-Muslim People Peoples: the Armenians as a Case Study*. Ankara, Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları.

Sarııay, Y. (2007). "Decree of April 24 and Armenian Committee Members Arrested in İstanbul." *Review of Armenian Studies*, 15/16: 69-82.

Shafak, E. (2006). "Accelerating the Flow of Time - Soft Power and the Role of Intellectuals in Turkey." *World Literature Today* 80 (1): 24-26.

Shaw, S. (1973). *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, Vol. 2. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Smith, A. (2003). *Chosen People : Sacred Sources of National Identity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sonyel, R. S. (1987). *The Ottoman Armenians: Victims of Great Power Diplomacy*. London, K. Rustem & Brother.

_____. (2000). *Falsification and Disinformation: Negative Factors in Turco-Armenian Relations*. Ankara, Center for Strategic Research.

_____. (2000). *The Great War and the Tragedy of Anatolia: Turks and Armenians in the Maelstrom of Major Powers*. Ankara: Atatürk Supreme Council for Culture, Language and History Publications of Turkish Historical Society.

_____. (2000). *Turkey's Struggle for Liberation and the Armenians*. Ankara: Center For Strategic Research.

Suny, R. G. (1993). *Looking Toward Ararat*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

_____. (2004). "Soviet Armenia." In Richard Hovannisian (Ed.), *The Armenian People From Ancient to Modern Times*, Vol.II, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan: 347-389.

Süslü, A. (1990). *Ermeniler ve 1915 Tehcir Olayları*. Ankara: Sistem Ofset Ltd.

Şimşir, B. (2000). *Şehit Diplomatlarımız (1973-1994)*. Ankara, Bilgi Yayınevi.

_____. (2005). *Ermeni Meselesi (1774-2005)*. Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.

Trask, R. (1971). *The United States Response to Turkish Nationalism and Reform, 1914-1939*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Tololyan, K. (2004). "Armenian Diaspora." In Ember, Melvin, Carol R. Ember, and Ian Skoggard, (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Diasporas: Immigrant and Refugee Cultures Around the World*. New York: Springer: 35-46.

Türkdoğan, B. (2006). *1915'ten Günümüze Tehcir (Türk'ler ve Ermeni'ler)*. İstanbul: IQ Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık.

Uras, E. (1988). *The Armenians in History and the Armenian Question*. İstanbul, Documentary Publication.

Walker, J. C. (1991). *Armenia and Karabakh: The Struggle for Unity*. London: Minority Rights Group.

_____. (2004). "World War I and the Armenian Genocide." In Richard G. Hovannisian, (Ed.), *The Armenian People from Ancient to Modern Times Vol. II*. New York, St. Martin's Press: 239-275.

Yanardağoğlu, E. (2009). "Maintaining Old Tradition of Media Diversity in Europe: The Non-Muslim Minority Media in Turkey." In Alec Charles, (Ed.), *Media in the Enlarged Europe: Politics, Policy and Industry*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press: 199-207.

Yılmaz, R. (2009). "Armenian Foreign Policy During Levon-Ter Petrossian and Robert Kocharian Period", *Journal of Qafqaz University*, number 26, online at <http://www.qafqaz.edu.az/journal/20092602armenian.pdf>, (accessed on 02.25.2010)

Yılmaz, Ş. (2004). "Impact of Lobbies on Turkish-American Relations." In Mustafa Aydın and Çağrı Erhan, (Eds.), *Turkish-American Relations: Past, Present, and Future*. London: New York: Routledge.

Türel Y. (2004). *Uluslararası Politikada Ortadoğu (Birinci Dünya Savaşından 2000'e*. Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları.

Zürcher, E. J. (2007). *Turkey A Modern History*. London, New York: I.B. Tauris & Co L

II-NEWSPAPER ARTICLES (PUBLISHED AND ONLINE)

"ABD Kongresi Soykırım Tasarısını Ertelede," *Cumhuriyet*, May 22, 1985.

"ABD Senatosu Dış İlişkiler Komitesi Kararından: Türkiye, 2500 Yıllık Ermeni Yurdu," *Cumhuriyet*, September 14, 1984.

"Around the World; U.S. House Resolution Angers Turkish Premier," *New York Times*, September 15, 1984.

Aslan, A. (2007, October 12). "How Did Last Minute Hopes Turn Into Disappointment?" *Today's Zaman*.

"At the Origins of Commemoration: The 90th Anniversary of Declaring April 24 as a Day of Mourning and Commemoration of the Armenian Genocide," *Massis Weekly*, online at <http://www.massisweekly.com/Vol29/issue11/pg11.pdf>, (accessed on April 4, 2009).

“Attention Members of the U.S. House of Representatives,” *New York Times Sunday*, May 19, 1985.

Bardakçı, M (2003, April 27). “O Heykelin Altına “Soykırım” Yazmak En Azından Gomidas’a Hakarettir,” *Hürriyet*.

“Beyaz Saray’da Ermeni Pazarlığı,” *Milliyet*, October 20, 1989.

Demirelli F. and Yavuz E. (2009, February, 03). “Turkey not Fretting over Possible ‘Genocide’ Blow after Davos Storm,” *Today’s Zaman*.

“Ermeni Tasarısı Kongre’de,” *Milliyet*, April 26, 1985.

“Ermeni Tasarısı İçin Kritik Karar,” *Radikal*, July, 09, 2003

“European Commission Accuses Turkey of Rights Violation,” *Ottawa Citizen*, January 28, 1984.

“House Committee Approves Armenian Genocide Resolution”, online at <http://www.cnn.com/2007/POLITICS/10/10/us.turkey.armenians/index/html>, (accessed on April 19, 2009)

İşi Bitiren Clinton Oldu,” *Radikal*, October 21, 2000.

Kaplan, S. (2005, March 7) “Soykırımı Tanısak Fena Olmaz mı?,” *Hürriyet*.

Karayan, S. Y. (2007). “From the Book Shelf –Two Must Read Books: 'The Fatal Night and Ayashi Pandic, 'The Prison of Ayash'.” *Massis Weekly*, online at <http://www.massisweekly.com/Vol27/issue45/pg11.pdf>, (accessed on May 15, 2009)

Lobe, J. (2010, March 05). “U.S.-Turkey: Armenian Genocide Vote Threaten Ties at Key Moment,” IPS Inter Press Service, online at <http://ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=50569>, (accessed on March 17, 2010).

“Özal’dan ABD’ye Sert Tepki: İlişkiler Zedelenebilir, Çirkin Politika,” *Cumhuriyet*, September 15, 1984.

“Pelosi Says She’ll Press on With Armenian Genocide,” online at <http://www.cnn.com/2007/POLITICS/10/14/us.turkey/index.html>, (accessed on April 19, 2009)

- Şahin, A. (2000, October 20), "Follow up Interview with Berktaç," *Milliyet*.
- "Turkey's Lobbyist Enlist Former U.S. Secretaries of State To Kill Armenian Genocide Resolution," *Azad Hye*, online at <http://www.azad-hye.net/news>, (accessed on March 17, 2010)
- "Türkiye Soykırımını Tanıyan Ülkelere Dava Açabilir," *Hürriyet*, March 20,2010.
- "Yahudi Lobisi "Kuşatılmışlık" Çelişkisi Taşıyor," *Sabah*, January 23, 2001
- Yetkin, M. (2009, October 10). "Ermeni Normalleşmesi Anormal Başladı," *Radikal*.
- "Yılmaz: 'Vahim Gelişme,'" *Milliyet*, October 19,1989.