

**NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
OF THE REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA
INSTITUTE OF HISTORY**

ARMEN MARUKYAN

**THE FUNDAMENTAL ISSUES OF THE
HISTORY OF THE ARMENIAN
GENOCIDE**



**ՄԵՍՐՈԲ ԱՐՔ. ԱՇԽԵԱՆ
ՍԱՏԵՆԱԸՐ
182**

**ARCH. MESROB ASHJIAN
BOOK SERIES
182**

YEREVAN – 2018

Printed by RA Ministry of Diaspora

**Printed According to the Decision of the Academic Council of
Institute of History of NAS RA**

Translation from Armenian by **A. Khosroeva**

MARUKYAN A.

“The Fundamental Issues of the History of the Armenian Genocide”, - Yerevan, Institute of History, NAS of RA, 2018. 73 page.

A number of fundamental issues are presented and discussed in this current research on the basis of archival materials, documents, and studies of Armenian and foreign scholars and topic specialists. The comprehensive study included the criminal intentions of the Armenian Genocide, the stages of its perpetrations, and the self-defense battles of the Armenians. The book also touched upon the issues of continuation of the genocidal policy towards the Eastern Armenians and the Armenians of Azerbaijan by the Turkish and further Azerbaijani authorities. The Armenian Question was reviewed in the light of international treaties and documents, it has been discussed not only the international recognition and condemnation of the Armenian Genocide, but also the issues and possibilities of overcoming the consequences of this crime.

The book is intended for university students and masters of “History” and “International Relations” specialties, as well as for the teachers in Diaspora’s Armenian communities’ educational institutions. This research also can serve as helpful literature for readers specialized or interested on Genocide Studies.

ISBN 978-9939-860-74-9

PREFACE

The genocidal policy pursued by the Turkish authorities against the Armenian people started in 1894–1896 in Western Armenia by Sultan Abdul Hamid II in the form of the massacres of the Armenians; more than 300 thousand people were killed. This criminal policy was continued in 1908 by the Young Turks who had come to power through a coup. They first implemented the massacres of the Armenians in Cilicia in 1909 annihilating about 30.000 Armenians, and then using the circumstances of the First World War they perpetrated the Armenian Genocide (Mets Yeghern) and exterminated about 1.5 million Armenians. Thus, they put a nearly complete end to the thousands of years' presentation of Armenians in Western Armenia.

In 1918 the Turkish troops, invading Eastern Armenia, continued to exterminate the Armenian population, but already in Russian Empire, particularly in Eastern Armenia, the result of which were the massacres of the Armenians in Akhalkalaki province, Shushi and Baku in 1918. The Armenian killing policy was also inherited by the Kemalists who implemented the massacres of the Armenians of Cilicia and Smyrna in 1919–1922.

Meanwhile in its turn the administration of the Republican Turkey followed the Young Turks' policy of extermination, and parallel to the Armenian Genocide continued the policies of the occupation of the Armenian properties and cultural genocide. By this way it was attempted to eliminate the traces of Armenians as indigenous people from Western Armenia as well as the testimonies about that fact. The persecutions persisted against the small groups of forced Islamized Armenians in different parts of Western Armenia. Consistently the rights of the Armenian community of Istanbul and the Armenian Patriarchate which were stipulated by the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923 were limited. Thus, all the Turkish regimes, regardless of the differences in the forms of public administration and political views,

were unified in the issue of the rejection of the Armenians and inherently continued anti-Armenian policy.

The impunity of the genocide organizers of the Armenian people and the criminal state led to the repetition of the crime: the Jewish Holocaust during the Second World War, the Cambodian Genocide in 1975–1979, the Srebrenica Genocide in the territory of the former Yugoslavia in 1993, the Darfur Genocide in 2003, and finally the genocide of Christians, Yazidis and Kurds in Iraq and Syria by the terrorist groups of ISIS.

During the past century thousands of researches were published not only by the Armenian but also by foreign historians and genocide scholars where the mass extermination of the Armenian people by the Turkish government was qualified as an organized criminal policy. The same is confirmed by the materials of collections published on the documents kept in the archives of different countries. Despite all these Turkey doesn't adjust to historical facts, and even pursues genocide denial policy at the state level. Turkey with this policy, in fact, has moved the issue of the Armenian Genocide from the historical dimension and turned it into a political issue.

A number of governmental and non-governmental international organizations and more than 20 countries have already given a political assessment of the Armenian Genocide defining it as a serious international crime and have condemned it. However, the Republic of Turkey does not want to accept the Armenian Genocide recognition and condemnation resolutions. Moreover, Turkey takes various measures to prevent the statement of the fact of the Armenian Genocide in future.

After the 100th commemoration of the Armenian Genocide, the teaching the history of the Armenian Genocide, and the presentation and discussion of various issues related to it, have acquired a new meaning and significance for the Armenians. With the adoption of the Pan-Armenian Declaration, it has been announced to the world that the Armenians won't be satisfied with the struggle for international recognition and condemnation of the Armenian Genocide, but they will

also fight for the overcoming of the consequences of that crime, which in essence means fighting for reparation and for the Armenian claim. This new strategic emphasis demands to reinterpret the subjects of teaching history of the Armenian Genocide and the presentation of some of the issues.

CHAPTER I

THE MASSACRES OF THE ARMENIAN POPULATION OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE (THE END OF XIX – BEGINNING OF XX CENTURIES)

1.1. The Massacres of the Armenians in Western Armenia and other Armenian Populated Areas of the Ottoman Empire in 1894–1896

By the 16th article of the Treaty of San Stefano and the 61st article of the Treaty of Berlin which concluded the Russo-Turkish war of 1877–1878, the Armenian Question* ceased to be the internal issue of the Ottoman Empire; it was internationalized and became an agenda of European diplomacy. According to above mentioned both treaties the Ottoman Empire undertook an obligation to make reforms in the provinces of Western Armenia to equate the rights of the Armenian population** with the rights of the Muslims, as well as to ensure the

* “The Armenian Question” is well-known in the history of diplomacy as the issue of the rights and security of Western Armenians, the solution of which would have ultimately led to the realization of the right of self-determination of the Armenians living in their homeland – Western Armenia, namely the liberation of Western Armenia from the Ottoman Empire and the restoration of independence. The “Armenian Question” was considered an integral part of “the Eastern Question” known in the European diplomacy as the completeness of the problem of the liberation of non-Muslim peoples under the control of the Ottoman Empire, as well as the problem of the division of the territories of that Empire between the great states.

** According to the statistics of the Armenian Patriarchate in the late 19th century the Armenian population of the Ottoman Empire was distributed as follows:

- a.) 1 million 630 thousand people in the provinces of Western Armenia such as Van, Bitlis, Erzurum, Diyarbakir, Kharberd and Sebastia,
- b.) 380 000 people in the provinces of Cilicia and North Asorik, such as Adana and Aleppo.
- c.) 455 thousand people in Asian Turkey: in the provinces of Trabzon, Kastamonu, Angora, Konya, Bursa, Smyrna, as well as Syria, Lebanon, Mosul, Baghdad and Basra,

security of the Armenian population from Muslims' attacks. But Sultan Abdul Hamid II did not fulfill international obligations and even intensified the pressure on the Armenian population. Abdul Hamid had his own formula for the solution to the Armenian Question which was "If there are no Armenians, there is no Armenian Question". Hence in 1891 he formed special Hamidian cavalry from the Kurds who helped to massacre the Armenians in future.

The Armenian population rebelled against the Armenian exterminating policy of Sultan Abdul Hamid. In 1893–1894 the Armenians resorted to self-defense in Sasun, but their resistance was suppressed by Hamidian regiments, Muslim bands and regular Turkish troops after which the brutal massacre of the Armenian population took place¹. As the Armenian exterminating policy by Abdul Hamid continued, the Armenians were obliged to resort to self-defense in Zeytun and Van, also. Unlike Sasun the Turkish authorities were unable to realize completely their killing policy in those locations and were forced to enter into negotiations with the Armenians and make certain concessions². As a result of the self-defense battles lasted from October of 1895 to January of 1896 the Armenians of Zeytun reached a moral and practical victory over the Turkish armed forces and obliged the Ottoman authorities to negotiate with them.

As a result of the heroic self-defense in Van which lasted from June 3 to June 8 of 1896 the Turkish authorities also had to negotiate with the Armenians, and agreed that the Armenian fighters would abandon Van, provided that the Turkish authorities did not harm the population³. But the Turkish authorities did not fulfill their obligations in the future and tried to exterminate the Armenian fighters moving from

d.) 60 thousand people in the provinces of Adrianopolis and Thessaloniki of European Turkey,

e.) 135 thousand people in the capital Constantinople and in the suburbs, Total: 2 million 660 thousand people.

¹ Spirov D.A., *The Terrible Massacres of the Armenians (1894–1896)*, Yerevan, 1997, pp. 38–41.

² Aghasi, *Zeytun and its Surroundings*, Beirut, 1968, pp. 357–373.

³ Amureyan A., *The Armenian Question, the Liberation Efforts of the Armenians*, Tehran, 1977, p. 68.

Van to Persia. Because of to the self-defense battles in Van it was not possible to implement the massacres and robberies there, which had been done in other places deprived of self-defense.

On October 5 the massacres of the Armenians in Trabzon began by the settled troops. Parallel to the massacre robbery of the Armenian houses, workshops and shops took place. The surrounding Armenian villages and churches were ruined and plundered; some of the Armenians were forced to convert to Islam. The Armenian population of Samsun had the same fate.

During the massacre in Akhisar basically the Armenian merchants were killed, around 200 Armenians shops were plundered. The perpetrators were mainly Turks migrated from Bosnia, Bulgaria and Rumelia. Their actions were directed and encouraged by the local authorities, the police and the soldiers. In connection with those events the Sultanate government sent a circular to all its representatives in foreign countries where the facts were completely distorted to the detriment of Armenians who had allegedly attacked the Muslims¹.

On October 7, 1895 the massacres of Armenians began in the province of Derjan where survived only those ones who agreed to convert to Islam. Two days later during the massacre in Erzincan the city was plundered, the Armenian churches were destroyed. Nearly 70 prominent Armenians were jailed and killed by local authorities.

On October 10, more than one thousand Armenians were killed during the slaughters in the province of Kghi, many villages and about 25 monasteries and churches were destroyed. On the same days Armenian population of 102 villages of Bitlis province became victims of massacres. Some Armenians were able to run away the nearby mountains, but later they died of hunger and cold².

On October 16, the regular army and mobs plundered, destroyed and burnt the movable and immovable properties of the Armenians in

¹ FO, 424/184, No. 153, p. 108.

² *The Armenian Genocide in the Ottoman Empire, The collection of documents and materials*, Yerevan, 1966, p. 89–90.

Urfa. The authorities distributed weapons to the mob and ordered to kill the Armenians and seize their possessions. Basically living in one district of the city, Armenians were able to resist and push back the attackers. The authorities issued a decree to besiege the Armenian quarter and use cannons, but that didn't help them either. The siege continued for fifty days, after which the authorities formally abolished it, commanding to work peacefully¹. On December 16, three thousand soldiers and 1.500 Hamidiye troops were sent to the Armenian quarter of Urfa as a result of which more than eight thousand Armenians were massacred².

On October 16, the massacres of the Armenians in Shabin-Karahisar began. Despite the heroic self-defense, almost the entire Armenian population was massacred, their possessions were robbed, and the houses were destroyed. The number of victims in the city reached two thousand, and in the surrounding 30 villages to the population of three thousand.

On October 18, 1895, 400 Armenians were killed in Karin, and 1.500 shops were robbed. Forty Armenian villages were destroyed in the Field of Karin, and the population of three of them was forced to convert to Islam, Hasan Kale monastery and 20 churches were plundered, and 1.500 Armenians were massacred³.

On October 21, the massacres began in Malatya too, there as in many cities weapons had been distributed to the mob. On November 4–9, the slaughters and the robbery of Armenians continued in Malatya. As a result of self-defense battles and massacres more than three thousand people were killed in Malatya, about one thousand houses were burnt down⁴. On October 25, the massacres took place in Bitlis and Gyumushkhane simultaneously. The surrounding Armenian villages had been significantly damaged; some of them were forced by the local authorities to renounce their religion.

¹ Ibid.

² “Araqs”, Volume B, 1894–1895, St. Petersburg, 1897, pp. 135–136.

³ *The Armenian Genocide in the Ottoman Empire*, pp. 83–84.

⁴ *The History of the Armenian People*, Volume 6, Yerevan, 1981, p. 269.

On October 26, Kharberd and the surrounding 55 villages were destroyed; almost all Armenian churches and schools were ruined and plundered¹. On October 27, the massacres of the Armenian population of Bayburt began immediately after the slaughters and plundering of the nearby villages. Getting news about the horrible situation of the villages, Armenians closed their shops in the city, but the soldiers who arrived from Erzincan forced them to open the workplaces, and immediately after that the massacre and the robbery began. It lasted eight hours; the fanatical mob was supported by the soldiers. As a result, several hundred people were killed; the Armenian churches of the city were plundered and reviled.

On November 1–3, the massacres of the Christian population took place in Diyarbakır, during which about two thousand people were killed. In Diyarbakır 119 Armenian villages were destroyed with 6.000 families. The number of killed and missing people reached 30.000².

On November 3, the massacres began in Marzvan. When the Armenians opened their shops and started trading, the armed mob, soldiers and the bands from nearby towns moved to the market, plundered and destroyed about 1.500 Armenian stores. During the plunder the stores of Greeks were not damaged. Then the crowd attacked the Armenian districts, but the population with strong resistance drove them back. On that day 100 people were killed and 500 were injured. The Armenian districts remained besieged for a long time, many people died of hunger and water shortages³.

Despite the protests of the European powers, the massacres did not stop because they were not accompanied by concrete actions of those countries. Finally, on November 11, during the next meeting of the diplomatic representatives of the Great Powers, by the suggestion of the Russian ambassador the Powers agreed to use warships in the channels. They thought that the presence of the warships in

¹ “Araqs”, Volume B, 1894–1895, St. Petersburg, 1897, p. 140.

² “Ararat”, 1896, May, pp. 95, 122.

³ *The Armenian Genocide in the Ottoman Empire*, pp. 79–80.

Constantinople could have an influence on the sultanate government and prevent the further increasing of the crisis. Abdul Hamid II did not have any choice but finally to allow the warships of the Great Powers to enter Constantinople, and on December 12-16, the warships of Great Britain, France, Russia, Italy and Austria-Hungary entered Dardanelles.

During the spring and summer of 1896 a relative calm dominated in the Ottoman Empire, but it was temporary, as in reality nothing was changed. The Sultanate government was not even prepared to make reforms in the eastern regions. It developed and perpetrated a whole system of massacres of the Armenians in the regions where they constituted a significant percentage of the population.

The attempts of the embassies to stop the massacres of the Armenians in Constantinople were headed by A. Nelidov, the Ambassador of Russia, who was not satisfied with the inefficient notes of protest. He warned the sultan that if the massacres did not stop, he would order the Russian ships to shoot at Boyukdere. The decisive position of the Russian Ambassador forced the sultan to command to disperse the wild mob¹. The events in Constantinople were just an episode in the chain of massacres of the Armenian population in the Ottoman Empire through which it was pursued a Turkish "solution" to the Armenian Question by exterminating the Armenians not only in their historical homeland - Western Armenia but also throughout the country.

During 1894–1896 the number of the massacred Armenians reached 300.000. The slaughters were widespread, intentional and organized; the perpetrators were both: the fanatical Muslim population and the militia along with the regular army.

Thus, with the massacres and forced Islamization of the Armenian population in Western Armenia and other parts of the Ottoman Empire, Sultan Abdul Hamid laid the foundations of the Turkish state policy of genocide committed in a more advanced

¹ Grenville J.A.S., *Lord Salisbury and Foreign Policy*, London, 1964, pp. 75–76.

manner during the First World War by the Young Turks, and then by the Kemalists.

1.2. The Massacres of the Armenians in Cilicia in 1909

After the Young Turks had come to power through a military coup in 1908, it seemed that the new Turkish authorities who got educated in European educational institutions would fulfill their given promises to equate the rights of Christian peoples with the rights of Muslims, and they would maintain the requirements of the re-established constitution. However, in April 1909, not later than a year after the declaration of the constitution the massacres of the Armenians in Cilicia took place which fully revealed the identity and the heredity of the old and the new Turkish “constitutional” regimes.

One of the main reasons for the massacres of the Cilician Armenians was the return of some Armenian villagers migrated from Cilicia. During the Hamidian massacres and during the subsequent years hundreds of villages in Western Armenia and in Armenian Cilicia were emptied and became the property of Turks, Kurds and Circassians. So, the majority of the Cilician Armenians who had been deported from their locations 10–12 years ago, after the coup got the right and returned to require the permission to resettle in their villages. The authorities directed the wave of discontent of the Kurds who had seized the Armenians' belongings, against the Armenian immigrants and against Armenians in general. In Cilicia the Turkish and the Kurdish high society were filled with hatred and revenge against the Armenians. The Turkish government came to the conclusion that there was only one way to stop the progress of the Armenians in Cilicia. It was to annihilate them, starting with the massacres in Adana where the Armenians occupied a leading position both in trade and in the fields of entrepreneurship and agriculture¹.

¹ **Simonyan H.**, *Mass Massacres of Armenians in Cilicia (April, 1909)*, Yerevan, 2009, pp. 33–36.

On April 1, 1909, the armed rabble invaded the Armenian districts of the city of Adana by the order of Mehmet Jevad Bey, the governor of Adana. Jevad Bey commanded his subordinate provincial officials to protect only foreigners, other than that to be ruthless towards the Christians and to encourage the “brave soldiers” in every possible way in course of the massacres. On the eve of the massacre the Muslims were delivered weapons and the perpetrators were released from prisons. The small group of the Armenians occupied positions in the important points of the city and prepared for a decisive fight against more than 30.000 armed people¹. Owing to that resistance the part of the Armenians in Adana survived from the complete extermination.

After the three-day massacres Jevad Bey presided over a meeting of the Turkish and the Armenian outstanding people, during which peace was concluded with the following conditions:

1. Both sides should immediately stop fighting.
2. The Armenians were obliged to be completely disarmed and give weapons to the government within the three days.
3. The protection of the city should be handed over to the recently arrived army which should set up mobile guards in all Armenian and Turkish districts². A “treaty of reconciliation” should be signed putting end to the massacres that had begun on April 1st.

In spite of that, on April 12, the second massacre of the Christians in Adana began, when the Young Turks arrived in Adana as if to restore the order. The massacres lasted during the April 12-14, exceeded the previous one by their brutality. About 30.000 Armenians were killed during the massacres in Cilicia; more than 20.000 of them in Adana province³, the total financial damage amounted to 80 million US dollars⁴.

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid, pp. 61–62.

³ **Topuzyan H.**, *History of the Armenian Communities in Syria and Lebanon (1841–1946)*, Yerevan, 1986, p. 99.

⁴ **Ghazarean H.**, *Genocide-maker Turk*, Beirut, 1968, p. 173.

The massacres of the Armenians in Cilicia were the continuation of the Sultan Abdul Hamid's policy and the beginning of the arriving great crime.

CHAPTER II

THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE AND THE SELF-DEFENSE BATTLES

2.1. The Young Turks' Program of the Extermination of the Armenians and the Preparation of the Genocidal Policy

After coming to the power The Young Turk's Party "Union and Progress" fixed the nationalist policy of Pan-Turkism*. It was directed against non-Turkish peoples of the Empire, first and foremost against the Armenians. Armenia and the Armenians were the obstacles for the creation of the imaginary state "Great Turan"**.

Using the war situation, the Young Turks got the opportunity to implement the program of the extermination of Western Armenians. Meanwhile, the authorities were seeking to dominate the Armenian properties and eliminate unwanted economic opponents for them.

The authors and the perpetrators of the Armenian exterminating program were Talaat, the Minister of Internal Affairs and Grand Vizier (1917–1918), Enver, the Minister of Military Affairs, Djemal, the Minister of Navy and Palestinian Front Commander, Javid, the

* According to the Pan-Turkism ideology a homogenous Turkish population would be created from the peoples of different religions and peoples living in the Ottoman Empire which meant the Turkification or annihilation of all non-Turkish peoples.

** The creation of "Great Turan" was the most important aspect of Turanism, foreign policy of the Pan-Turkism ideology of the Young Turks which implied the creation of a large Turkic state by the unification of the Turkish-speaking territories by the Ottoman Empire. The borders of desired "Great Turan" would spread to the Urals in the north, to Altay in the east, including the territories in Transcaucasia, the North Caucasus, Crimea, Povolzhye, Central Asia and other areas.

Minister of Finance, Dr. Behaeddin Shakir, Nazim and other members of the CUP¹.

The Young Turks' program of mass extermination of the Armenians was first discussed during the IV Congress of the Committee of "Union and Progress" held from September 29 to October 9, 1911. At the closed session of the Congress the program of forcible Turkification of the non-Turkic peoples in the Ottoman Empire, first of all the Armenians and the Greeks, was approved, as well as the deportation and the extermination of that population on the way or in the resettlement areas was anticipated². Before that, taking into consideration that the trust towards the Young Turks had been decreased among the Christians after the massacres of the Cilician Armenians in 1909, the Congress instructed the Central Committee to take steps to weaken alertness among those peoples and restore confidence towards the party. According to the interim program, some Christians who were fluent in Turkish should have been appointed to the secondary positions in the structure of state authorities, Christian children should have been admitted to Turkish schools at the government's expense, the disarmament of Christians temporary should have been halted, but simultaneously the Muslim population should have been armed, the policy of the resettlement of the Christian populated areas by Muslims should have been stopped, without preventing those settlers from moving to the appointed areas at their own expense³.

For the purpose of implementing the Armenian extermination program, before the First World War the Young Turks created "The Special Organization" called not only to coordinate the actions of the gendarmerie and the army units in the act of extermination of the Armenians as well as to take part in it directly. Initially, the members of

¹ *The Armenian Genocide According to the Documents of the Trial of the Young Turks*, by **A.H. Papazyan**, Yerevan, 1988, pp. 14–18.

² **Avakyan A.**, *Genocide of 1915. Mechanisms of Decision-making and Implementation*, Yerevan, 1999, pp. 15–16.

³ *Ibid*, p. 17.

"The Special Organization" were recruited from the Young Turk party and made up 10.000 members. However the number of the organization was extended to 30.000 due to the Kurds and the criminals released later¹. The management of the Eastern Section of "The Special Organization" responsible for the extermination of the Armenians of six provinces of Western Armenia was entrusted to the member of the CUP Dr. Behaeddin Shakir. The management of the organization overall was in the hands of Talaat Pasha, the Minister of the Interior².

Thus, before the First World War the Young Turks had already decided to annihilate the Armenians, an appropriate program had been developed and the mechanisms of its implementation were created.

In mid-January of 1915, the leaders of Young Turks Nazim, Behaeddin Shakir, Enver, Javid, Hasan Fehmi and others were invited to a secret consultation under the leadership of Talaat Pasha, during which the plan of annihilation of the Armenians was resumed. During the meeting the following resolutions were adopted as the "Ten Commandments": to relieve Armenians from all state positions, to close all the Armenian unions, to kill all the Armenians in the army, to seize all the weapons from the Armenians, to annihilate all men, clergymen and teachers up to 50 years old, to convert girls and children to Islam, to provoke the Muslim population to massacre the Armenians, and to deport all the Armenian families who could stay saved³. These instructions were to be kept strictly confidential, and those actions should start everywhere simultaneously, not allowing the Armenians to prepare for protection.

¹ Ibid, p. 28.

² Ibid, pp. 76–78.

³ **Dadrian V.N.**, *The Secret Young-Turk Ittihadist Conference and the Decision for the World War I Genocide of the Armenians*, "Holocaust and Genocide Studies", 1993, Vol. 7, N 2, pp. 174-175.

After the re-establishment of the decision and the clarification of all the actions the Young Turks immediately took action, trying to accomplish the crime of the massacre of the Armenians¹.

2.2. The First Stage of the Armenian Genocide: The Conscription and the Extermination of the Armenian Male Population in the Ottoman Army

In order to facilitate the extermination of the Armenian population in the Empire, the majority of the Armenian male population was isolated and then annihilated. More than 60.000 Armenians aged 18–45 were conscripted into the Ottoman army during the mobilization². They participated in military operations at different fronts. Armenian soldiers were praised by the Turkish command, and even grateful telegrams were sent to Djevdet Bey, the governor of Van for the heroic deeds of the Armenians who had been drafted from the province³.

In spite of that, by the order of February 25, 1915 the Turkish General Command prohibited to appoint the Armenian servicemen as commanders⁴. That order became the basis for the disarmament of the overwhelming majority of the Armenian soldiers serving in the Ottoman army. Henry Morgenthau, the US Ambassador also confirmed that the disarmament of the Armenian soldiers had begun at the beginnings of 1915⁵. They were included in labor battalions for allegedly carrying out engineering work at the rear. There are many testimonies on the hard and inhuman conditions of the Armenian

¹ **Marukyan A.**, *The Problem of the Genocide of the Armenians in Modern Genocide Studies*, Yerevan, 2010, p. 30.

² **Sahakyan R., Khudaverdyan K.**, *The Armenian Genocide in the Lights of the Decades*, Yerevan, 1995, p. 23.

³ **Ussher C. D., Knapp G.H.**, *An American Physician in Turkey. A Narratives of Adventures in Peace and War*, New York, Boston, 1917, p. 217

⁴ **Yavuz E.**, *Armenian Claims in the Light of the Historical Documents*, “Turkish Review”, Ankara, Spring, 1986, Vol. 1, № 3, p. 26.

⁵ **Morgenthau H.**, *Ambassador Morgenthau’s Story*, N. Y., 1918, p. 302.

soldiers serving in the Turkish army¹. In the labor battalions the Armenians and the Greeks were assigned the most difficult work: transportation of goods, building roads and bridges, digging trenches, etc. Food was irregular and poor, in most cases they had to buy food to avoid starvation.

3.000 soldiers were imprisoned in the barracks by the order of head of Archesh. After that 100 people were taken out and shot, others attacked the guards and were able to escape².

Rumors from all the provinces spread that Armenian male population who were forced to work in the labor battalions were killed by Muslim allies. By the orders of the officers, soldiers and military gendarmes expelled the groups of 80 or 100 Armenian men to deaf places and shot them³.

At the first stage of the Armenian Genocide the Young Turks were trying to deprive the Armenians of the power and opportunity of self-defense by conscripting and annihilating the Armenian male population in order to implement the deportation and the extermination of the defenseless population in Armenian settlements easier⁴. However, it should be noted, that the Armenians succeeded in resorting to self-defense in the areas where the population, anticipating the real aims of the authorities to lead the Armenian males to the Ottoman army, refused to be drafted.

2.3. The Second Stage of the Armenian Genocide: The Extermination of the Intelligentsia

¹ **Jacob Kuncler**, *Swiss Missionary: Dedicated to the 40th Anniversary of the Pro Armenian Cause*, Beirut-Aleppo, 1946, p. 63.

² National Archive of Armenia, f. 227, l. 1, f. 438, p. 2.

³ *The Armenian Genocide in the Ottoman Empire*, Collections of documents and materials by **M. Nersesyan, R. Sahakyan**, ed. Nersesyan M., Yerevan, 1991, p. 470.

⁴ **Marukyan A.**, *The Problem of the Genocide of the Armenians in Modern Genocide Studies*, p. 32.

By the next step the Young Turks began to arrest the Armenian public, political and religious figures. The members of “The Special Organization” were sent to the Armenian provinces and to the Armenian populated regions to direct the actions of local authorities against the Armenians. The first imprisonments took place in Zeytun. On October 16, 1914, W. Rossler, the Consul of Germany in Aleppo reported that Nazareth Chaush had been imprisoned and murdered brutally tortured in Zeytun¹. More than 60 Armenian prominent people were imprisoned from town and 30 surrounded villages². On December 18, Rev. Sahak Odapashyan, leading deputy of Sebastia province was killed³.

At the beginning of April, 1915, the governor Djevdet Bey took revenge with Ishkhan (Nikol Poghosyan) and Vramyan (Onik Derdzakyan), ARF figures who had great authority in Vaspurakan. Aram Manukyan managed to escape from the traps of Djevdet and became the head of the self-defense in Van. Also, Aso (Tigran Otyan), Abraham Brutyan, Artashes Solakhyan and Karapet Tanyan, members of Hnchakyan party were arrested and killed in prison of Van⁴.

The main strike to the Armenian intellectuals was on April 24, 1915 and on the next few days in Constantinople and other locations populated by Armenians. According to the pre-made lists the police arrested around 800⁵, and according to the Turkish source 2.345 Armenians⁶. Among them were Grigor Zohrab, Vardges Serenkyulyan Serenkyulyan and Vramyan, the representatives of the Ottoman Parliament, poets Siamanto (Atom Yarchanyan), Daniel Varoujan,

¹ **Lepsius J.**, *Deutschland und Armenien 1914–1918*. Sammlung diplomatischer Aktenstücke, Potsdam, 1919, p. 21.

² **Poghosyan H.**, *The History of Zeytun*, Yerevan, 1969, p. 386.

³ “Zhoghovurd” (The People), Constantinople, 1918, December 14/27.

⁴ **Theodik**, *The Monument of the Martyrs of Intelligentsia*, Yerevan, 1990, pp. 20–41.

⁵ **Sahakyan R., Khudaverdyan K.**, *The Armenian Genocide in the Lights of the Decades*, p. 24.

⁶ **Beylerian A.**, *Les Grandes Puissances, L’ Empire Ottoman et les Arméniens dans les Archives Françaises, 1914–1918*, Paris, 1983, p. 21.

Ruben Sevak, Artashes Harutyunyan, writers, public figures and journalists such as Erukhan (Yervand Srmakeshkanlyan), Ruben Zardaryan, Smbat Byurat, Tlkatintsi (Hovhannes Harutyunyan), Gegham Barseghyan, great composer Komitas, actor Yenovk Shahen, artist Hrant Astvatsatryan, physican Dr. Nazaret Taghavaryan, scientists Tiran Kelekyan, Gagik Ozanyan and many others.

The majority of the Armenian intellectuals exiled from the capital and cruelly got killed on the road of deportation. Few managed to survive; among them were artist Aram Antonyan, publisher Theodik, satirist Yervand Otyan, and others. Komitas, a prominent composer, lost his mind on the way of exile because witnessed the infernal torments of the Armenians.

On June 15, 20 prominent figures of the Hnchakyan party such as Paramaz (Mateos Sargsyan), Vanik (Gegham Vanikyan), Ruben Karapetyan, and others were publicly hanged in Constantinople. They were executed on the basis of the false accusations filed by the Young Turks.

The process of arrest and subsequent elimination of the Armenian intelligentsia was not limited only to the capital, but also to Western Armenia and to other Armenian-populated territories of the Empire.

The murders of the Armenian intellectuals in Urfa were perpetrated by Cherkes Ahmet and Halil, the members of “The Special Organization” who arrested and killed more than 100 Armenians¹. On May 9, mass arrests took place in Malatya. About 1.300 people were arrested included the supreme deputy, members of the provincial assembly, distinguished members of the party². The

¹ **Künzler J.**, *Im Lande des Blutes und der Tränen. Erlebnisse in Mesopotamien während des Weltkrieges*, Potsdam, 1921, p 28.

² National Archive of Armenia, f. 227, l. 1, f. 453, pp. 7-8.

number of Armenian intellectuals arrested in the whole empire reached 2.345 in a short period of time¹.

At the second stage of the Armenian Genocide parallel to the conscription of the Armenian male population into the Ottoman army and their extermination, the Young Turks arrested and eliminated Armenian intellectuals aimed to deprive Armenians of their brain, being afraid that the latter might fail to fulfill the government's criminal program to annihilate the Armenians.

2.4. The Third Stage of the Armenian Genocide: The Deportation and Massacres of the Armenian population

The mass deportation and massacres of the Western Armenians actually began with the exile of the Armenian population of Zeytun. From March 26, 1915, step by step the deportation of the Armenians of Zeytun and provinces began. More than 30.000 Armenians were deported². The Armenians from other locations of Cilicia followed them.

In order to make already existing the massive deportations and massacres of the Armenians throughout the empire “legal” on May 30, 1915, by the initiative of Talaat Pasha, the Minister of Interior, “Temporary Deportation Law” was adopted³.

The male population from 19 Armenian villages of Khlat was killed by Kurdish and Turkish soldiers. More than 9.000 women and children were exiled to Bitlis and then to Siirt where they were all slaughtered. Residents of 26 Armenian villages of Khnus had the same fate⁴.

¹ **Halacoglu Yu.**, *Die Armenien frage*, Klagenfurt-Wien-Ljubljana-Sarajevo, 2006, p. 60.

² **Poghosyan H.**, *The History of Zeytun*, p. 402.

³ **Mevlan Zadeh Rifat**, *The Obscure Folds of the Ottoman Revolution and the Ittihad's Plans*, Yerevan, 1990, pp. 119–120.

⁴ National Archive of Armenia, f. 28, l. 1, f. 109, p. 101.

Some of the Erzurum province exiles did not even reach the destination. They were blocked in a desert place without any water and food condemning starvation. Despite the presence of accompanying Turkish gendarmeries, deported people were attacked by the Kurdish bands. Some Armenians took away the weapon from the slaughterers and attacked first but certainly died in an unequal battle¹.

In Erzurum authorities did not deport only nearly 50 Armenian craftsmen who were making orders for the Ottoman army. But in February of 1916, during the retreat of Turks from Erzurum, those craftsmen were also killed².

After committing crimes in the city of Van and province, Jevdet Bey executed the massacres of 15.000 Armenians in Bitlis³. Severe atrocities and mass killings occurred in Mush and Armenian villages of the same name.

When the deportation of the Armenians began in Sebastia province, residents of Armenian village Dendil declined to obey. They climbed the nearest mountain and occupied positions. The Turkish regular army units attacked in vain for about six weeks. Even the artillery could not break the resistance of the Armenians. Only after shutting off the water to the self-defenders, Armenians were forced to give up, and the resistance was suppressed⁴.

After a few kilometers from their homes and settlements, the expensive items and money were immediately robbed from the Armenians by the gendarmeries accompanying the caravan. The movable property of Armenian houses, shops and workshops were getting plundered by the local Muslim population, and the real estate

¹ National Archive of Armenia, f. 57, l. 5, f. 138, p. 1.

² National Archive of Armenia, f. 57, l.5, f. 56, p. 38.

³ *The Armenian Genocide in the Ottoman Empire*, Collections of documents and materials by M. Nersesyan, R. Sahakyan, ed. Nersesyan M., p. 498.

⁴ **Galoustyan K., Gabikyan M.**, *Four-year Battle of Ag-Tagh*, Marseille, 1932, p. 35.

which was handed over to the authorities practically was seized by the Turkish state¹.

The deportation routes of the Armenian caravans were selected in a way so that they could pass through the locations inhabited by the Muslims who had hostile inclination towards Armenians. In those settlements night halts were made, after which the Muslims were given a sign to attack the Armenians, to kill them, use violence and plunder them. The gendarmeries that accompanied the caravan of Armenians and allegedly guarded their safety were at best watching calmly, sometimes joined the attackers, because in reality they had a task not to defend the displaced but to annihilate them².

A number of southern cities of the Empire like Damascus where the last remnants of the Armenian "caravans of death" reached became slavery markets where Armenian women and girls were forcibly sold to the Muslims³.

At the third stage of the Armenian Genocide under the name of relocation the Armenian population was displaced from the native places to the foreign, hostile environment and was exterminated massively. Parallel with this, the authorities and the local Muslim population mastered the movable and immovable property of the displaced Armenians.

2.5. The Fourth Stage of the Armenian Genocide: The Annihilation of the Survived Armenians in Concentration Camps of Syria and Mesopotamia

According to the order of the Young Turks government, the "caravans of death" of Armenian deportees were driven to Ras al-Ayn,

¹ **Astoyan A.**, *The Pillage of the Century: Expropriation of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire in 1914–1923*, Yerevan, 2013, pp. 36–37.

² **Avakyan A.**, *Genocide of 1915. Mechanisms of Decision-making and Implementation*, p. 91.

³ **Beylerian A.**, *Les Grandes Puissances, L' Empire Ottoman et les Arméniens dans les Archives Françaises, 1914–1918*, p. 206.

Deir el-Zor, Meskene Intelli, Raqqa and other concentration camps in Mesopotamia and Syria.

The Armenian exterminating policy of the Young Turks in those camps must be ended by the nature. Those deserts had not been randomly chosen by the Turkish authorities. According to eyewitnesses the survived Armenians were dying slowly and painfully on hot sands without food and water and in the conditions of epidemic diseases¹.

The Deir el-Zor camp took life of maximum amount of Armenians. According to Jackson, the American Consul in Aleppo, about 300.000 Armenians died there². The second by the number of Armenian martyrs was the Ras al-Ayn camp, where about 70.000 people were killed. The third location was Meskene, where about 55.000 were massacred, and the next place was Intelli, where 40–50.000 Armenians were exterminated³.

However, those rates of the extermination of the Armenians did not satisfy the Young Turks, they needed to finish their criminal policy until the end of the war and hide its traces in the deserts of Mesopotamia. Knowing that the Armenian deportees remained alive, the Ottoman government ordered the local Muslims to form special detachments which were entrusted to annihilate the Armenians still survived in those camps⁴. Particular attention was paid to the fact that the number of Armenians should not exceed 10 percent of the total number of Muslims in those territories. When that threshold was exceeded, it was instructed to delay the flow of Armenian deportees to the camp, so that the detachments formed by the local Muslims were able to exterminate the Armenians who had reached by the previous caravans.

¹ Hamelin A., Brun J.-M., *The Restored Memory*, Yerevan, 1995, p. 34.

² Sahakyan R., Khudaverdyan K., *The Armenian Genocide in the Lights of the Decades*, pp. 29–30.

³ Avakyan A., *Genocide of 1915. Mechanisms of Decision-making and Implementation*, pp. 94–95

⁴ Ibid , p. 93.

2.6. The Heroic Self-Defense of Van

The Turkish authorities, though not in all regions but managed to successfully execute their monstrous program of annihilation of the Armenians. In a number of Armenian populated areas of Western Armenia and Asia Minor the Armenian population showed heroic resistance to the Turkish and Kurdish slaughterers. The first organized self-defense battles took place in the Armenian settlements of the Van province.

The heaviest battles were taking place in the city of Van. The population of Van reached to 41.000 at the beginning of 1914, from which the 23.000 were Armenians, and the 18.000 were Muslims. The Armenian population of the city lived in Aygestan (20.000 people) and Qaghaqamej (transl. – “In the city”) (2.500 people) districts. They were located on 5-6 km distance from each other. Mostly Turks lived in that intermediate area¹.

The situation in the province, the murders of Vramyan and Ishkhan forced the Armenians look ways to escape the massacre. On April 5, 1915, “Self-defense military body of the Armenians of Van” was formed in Aygestan. Initially, Armenak Yekarian, the former member of the Armenakan party and the constitutional ramkavar, and ARF members Kaytsak Araquel (Tigran Abajyan) and Grigor Bulgaraci (Grigor Kyozevan) joined its staff, and later Panos Terlemezian and Aram Manukyan (ARF member) were included in the Military Body². The contemporaries as well as the opponents regarded Aram Manukyan as the spirit and the main organizer of the self-defense of Van³.

Aygestan was divided into 7 defensive regions with 79 positions and 1.053 warriors, and the number of Turkish forces reached to

¹ **A-Do**, *The Great Events in Vaspurakan 1914–1915*, Yerevan, 1917, p. 222.

² *Memories of Armenak Yekarian*, Cairo, 1947, p. 192.

³ *The Armenian Genocide in the Ottoman Empire*, p. 288.

12.000. The enemy had several dozens of cannons. Later, additional two more battalions and four cannons were sent from Erzurum¹.

The self-defense of Van started in the early morning of April 7. The Turkish artillery starts to bomb Aygestan. The enemy undertakes a number of attacks in a few regions, but retreats having significant losses. In the result of the counterattack organized by the Armenian fighters there was a panic among Turks.

The connection between two Armenian populated districts Aygestan and Qaghaqamej was lost. A Military Body was formed in Qaghaqamej, also which divided the district into four defensive regions with 25 positions. On April 7, the first attack of the enemy was thrown away. During the fights of the first day the Turks had 60–70 killed and 80 wounded soldiers².

In the evening of April 21, Jevdet offered the Armenians to surrender through two envoys. According to the German officer with Venezuelan origin Rafael de Nogales who was serving in the Ottoman army, the aim of the governor was to get the defenders out of the city by deception and destroy them but the Armenians refused the offer³.

From April 25 to April 26, the survived Armenian women and children of the villages surrounding Van were driven to Qaghaqamej by Jevdet's command aiming at strengthening the food crisis. On May 4, the meeting between the Armenian residents of two districts of Van, Aygestan and Qaghaqamej, took place.

According to the records of Scheubner-Richter, the Vice Consul of Germany in Erzurum during the self-defense of Van human losses of Turks were 1.000 people, and Armenians lost 300 people⁴. During the siege more than 10.000 shells were fired on Aygestan⁵.

¹ **Lepsius J.**, *Deutschland und Armenien*, p. 484.

² “Van-Tosp”, 1916, January 19, N 30, p. 12.

³ **Nogales R. de**, *Four Years Beneath the Crescent*, (Trans. from Spanish by M. Lee, with an Introduction by Lieutenant-Colonel E. Davis), N. Y. - London, 1926, p. 90.

⁴ **Lepsius J.**, *Deutschland und Armenien*, p. 65.

⁵ **Bryce J.**, *The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, 1915–1916*, London, 1916, p. 38.

The self-defense of Van continued until May 16, when the Turks retreated knowing that the Russian troops and Armenian volunteers are approaching the city.

Thus, the heroic self-defense of Van in 1915 had a glorious victory saving thousands of residents of Vans from the massacre.

2.7. The Heroic Self-Defense of Musa Dagh

At the end of July 1915, the Young Turks government demanded that the Armenians of the Suetia's (Hatay) province in the north-east of the Mediterranean Sea were deported. Suetia constituted of 6 Armenian villages: Kabusia (Kaboussieh), Vakef, Haji Habibli, Yogunoluk, Kheter Bey (Khodr Bey) and Bitias. The majority of residents decided not to obey the order and climb the nearby Musa Dagh Mountain taking with them necessary items and domestic animals. Only 8–10 families in Kessab, most of the residents of the Bitias and Haji Habibli villages, deceived by the authorities' false promises were forced to migrate. Later, Dandini, the Austria-Hungarian Consul in Aleppo informed that nearly 3.000 Armenians from these villages were slaughtered by Ottoman troops¹.

Until August 3 the authorities demanded for several times that the Armenians from above mentioned territories were deported, but the Armenians were disregarding the demands and were furiously preparing for the self-defense. Out of 6.311 residents of six Armenian villages of Suetia the 4.231 climbed up the mountain².

The first battle takes place on August 7. About 200 Turkish soldiers without proper intelligence came towards the Armenian positions. The Ottoman officers had announced that they would take revenge of the Armenians in one day, but the enemy's attack was pushed back by the residents of Musa Dagh. The Turks attack of

¹ *The Armenian Genocide. History. Politics. Ethics.* Edited by **R.G. Hovannisian**, New Brunswick, 1991, p. 255.

² **Gasparyan R.**, *The Armenian Massacres in Cilicia (90s of 19th Century – 1921)*, Yerevan, 2005, p. 126.

August 10 also failed. Armenians made the enemy retreat, passing to counterattack¹. On August 19 the enemy passes to a large scale attack in a few directions. Turkish artillery's fire significantly contributes to their progression. The enemy, who had considerable losses after a fierce and long battle, stops the attack. Despite the military success of the Armenians, the situation remains threatening and dangerous. Those who sheltered on the mountain were yet to expect starvation. Besides, the enemy had brought additional forces, bringing the number of its troops to 15.000². The only way for Suetian Armenians was the Mediterranean Sea where the British and French warships were patrolling. To get their attention the Armenians prepared two flags. On the first one a big red cross was embroidered, and on the second one it was written in English: "The Christians are in danger". On September 5, French navy cruiser "Gishen" suddenly appears in coastal waters of Musa Dagh. The captain of the French warship promises to rescue the Armenians in eight days.

On September 7, the enemy takes a large and powerful attack which continues till late evening, but it doesn't get to any result. On September 10, the desired help reaches. During the two days women, children and elderly people were transported on ships, while male population continued to stay on their positions ensuring the safe evacuation. In total 4.058 Armenians were rescued here which were transported to the city of Port Said in Egypt³.

The self-defense of the Armenian population of Suetia has found its reflection in the well-known novel "40 Days of Musa Dagh" written by famous Austrian writer Franz Werfel.

In the result of separated self-defense battles by the Armenians in Van, Musa Dagh, as well as in Shapin Garahisar (Sebinkarahisar)⁴,

¹ **Andreasyan T.**, *The Loyalty of Zeytun and Self-defense of Suetia*, Cairo, 1915, p. 38.

² **Gasparyan R.**, *The Armenian Massacres in Cilicia (90s of 19th Century – 1921)*, p. 136.

³ **Lepsius Joh.**, *Deutschland und Armenien*, p. 467.

⁴ **Ter-Haroutyunyan H.**, *The Battle of Shapin Garahisar*, Tiflis, 1917.

Urfa¹ and other places it was partially managed to fail the programs of Turkish authorities to exterminate the Armenians living in Western Armenia and other Armenian-populated territories of the Ottoman Empire.

2.8. The Return of the Western Armenian Refugees, and the Rebuilding of the country in 1917

The success of the Russian troops in the Caucasus front gave an opportunity to the Armenian refugees return to their settlements and initiate agricultural activities. 6.000 people, mainly males, returned to Alashkert². The women and children suppose to return only when it would have been possible to provide them with food and accommodation. Those who returned settled in their as well as in others abandoned settlements, where the houses were mainly ruined, the property of the Armenians was robbed and the domestic animals were taken by the Muslims. In this situation it was very difficult for the Armenians to resettle.

The Armenian charity organizations and first of all the “Agricultural Company” has initiated significant rehabilitation works in the Alashkert valley, providing the people with farming tools, seeds, domestic animals, and establishing in some regions nutritional centers, schools, hospitals, etc.

At certain intervals from autumn of 1915 till 1917 not only Armenian but also Russian, American and partly British charity, religious and social organizations and companies carried out significant rehabilitation activities in Van-Vaspurakan. The work done in Van province was more extensive and full as compared with other places of Western Armenia.

The charity organizations in Van-Vaspurakan continued their work even after some retreats of the Russian troops from Van. It was

¹ **Sahakian A.**, *Heroic Urfa and its Armenian Sons*, Beirut, 1955.

² National Archive of Armenia, f. 28, l. 1, f. 379, p. 33.

obvious that their means and opportunities were not enough to solve and provide all the needs of the Armenians living in the province of Van. Anyhow, at the end of 1916 and beginning of the 1917, these works gave the first positive results: the Armenian refugees returned and started to restore their houses and farms.

On February 3, 1916, after the occupation of Erzurum by Russian troops, the All Russian Unions of Towns, Committee of the Armenian Refugees of Karin and Armenian Committee of Moscow start to operate here¹. The Armenian Apostolic Church, charitable and social companies also start to take steps to help the survived Armenian population of Erzurum and of the province².

Armenian organizations operating in Erzurum, unlike the ones in Van and Alashkert, first were trying to take steps to eliminate the entry barrier of Russian military authorities to Erzurum due to non-proliferation of infectious diseases. Rostom and Y. Zavriev, the prominent Armenian public and political figures were sent to Erzurum, having a task to organize the salvation of the surviving Armenians, as well as to solve the difficult and complicated case of the release of the Armenian women and children who were still kept in Turkish and Kurdish families by force. They managed to move about 4.000 Armenians to Erzurum group by group. Finally, the Armenian public and political organizations get a permit from Russian military authorities and settle the massacres survived Armenians in abandoned villages. Health centers, hospitals, orphanages were established. The food storage established in Erzurum provides the local orphanage with food, where by March 27, 1917 the number of orphans reached to 136.

130 residents of Mush located in Caucasus express a wish to return to their homes, and situating in Mush they show a great support to existing immigration authorities. The Armenians of Sasun and Mush, as well as of Erzurum had suffered great human and financial losses. For charity organizations it was prior to create elementary

¹ Armenian Herald, 1917, N 4, January 22, p. 17.

² Ibid.

conditions of existence for resettled Armenians and to release their compatriots who were in Kurdish occupation. Different institutions providing the basic elementary conditions of population were established: food stores, warehouses, hospitals, etc.

After the Russian army left the occupied territories of Western Armenia and after the Turks started their attacks in February of 1918, it was not only possible to continue the renovation works in that areas, but, because of impending danger, the Armenians who had returned, again had to emigrate from their homes.

CHAPTER III

THE CONTINUATION OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE (1918–1922)

3.1. The Massacres of Armenians of the Province of Akhalkalaki in 1918

In March-April, 1918, the situation in Akhalkalaki was exacerbated after the attack of Wehib Pasha's troops and especially after the occupation of Kars region. New Armenian refugees from the territories occupied by Turks established here. Residents of Akhalkalaki managed to negotiate with Turkish militaries and the representatives of Ardahan Muslims, and 1.500 Armenian residents from Ardahan and Olti provinces, mostly women and children, were exchanged with residents of the Turkish villages such as Kokia, Toq, etc.¹.

The Armenian National Council of Tiflis relying on military, national and civilian bodies formed on the spot, despite the aspirations of the Georgian National Council, was able to spread its influence on the disputed Akhalkalaki and Borchalou provinces². Soon Colonel Arakelov was sent to Akhalkalaki, and the formation of the Armenian armed forces started on the spot³.

A Turkish military unit moved to the Akhalkalaki province from the south after the occupation of Shirak and Ashotsk. On May 7 (20), 1918, the enemy invaded Javakhk also from southwest, from Chyldyr⁴. Small and badly armed brigades in Akhalkalaki formed from local population

¹ **Melkonyan A.**, *Javakhk in the 19th Century and in the 1st Quarter of the 20th Century*, Yerevan, 2003, p. 273.

² **Jamalyan A.**, *The Armenian-Georgian Fang*, Hayrenik, 1928, p. 89.

³ **Sanosyan A.**, *The Self-defense of the Akhaltsikhe and Akhalkalaki Provinces in 1918*, Yerevan, 1992.

⁴ **Melkonyan A.**, *Javakhk in the 19th Century and in the 1st Quarter of the 20th Century*, p. 280.

were able to organize a resistance near Kartsakh, around the mount Gyoq Dagh. Due to the heavy defensive battles of the Armenian armed forces, it was possible to provide the emigration of some part of the province population¹.

The Turks and local Meskhetians who invaded Gavar, robbed the villages and killed some part of the remaining population. Hundreds of capable Armenian men taken captive were separated and were banished to Turkey, and more than thousand old men and women were exiled to the refugee camp of Bakuria. Residents of Khoreniya and Takhcha villages were also killed. On the way to Tsalka, at the foot of Abol Mount several Turkish spies succeeded in persuading the majority of the people, almost 800 residents of Khoreniya, to return to the village by false promises of security guarantees. Then they and 300 residents of Takhcha village, blockaded in barns by Turks, were brutally annihilated². More than 18.000 people died in Bakuriani forests from June to November of 1918. Almost the same was the number of victims of the Armenian refugees sheltered in the Tsalka and Manglisi regions. By the next spring the number of losses of Akhalkalaki refugees reached to 40.000³.

The Turkish troops and a rabble moved to the southern villages of the province: Kartsakh, Sulda, Dadesh and Gumburdo. Many residents of Gumburdo, including women, fell into an unequal battle. Turks captured hundreds of men in Gumburdo, part of them was killed in Kura Valley, and the others strangled being dropped into wells. Massacres took place in the other villages of the province, also. Nevertheless, the Turks met persistent resistance at the entrance to Alastani, Moliti, Tabatskuri and other villages.

As a result of Turkish invasion, hunger and epidemics, 42–45% of the Armenian population of Akhalkalaki province was exterminated.

¹ Personal fond of Leo, Institute of History, NAS of RA, f. 1, l.1, f. 242, pp. 4–5.

² National Archive of Armenia, f. 200, l. 1, f. 17, pp. 34–35.

³ **Melkonyan A.**, *Javakhk in the 19th Century and in the 1st Quarter of the 20th Century*, p. 294.

3.2. Massacres of the Armenians in Baku, 1918

On March 30, 1918, the civil fights between the Azerbaijani National Party “Musavat” and Baku's Soviet government led by S. Shahumyan started. On April 1, the three day battles ended with the defeat of Musavatists.

In May of 1918, a secret meeting of the Azerbaijani government and Musavat party activists was held in Gandzak, where a program of massacres of the Armenians in Nukhi, Aresh, Gyokchay, Shamakhi and Baku provinces was elaborated. The self-defense of Baku had a crucial meaning not only for the Armenians of the Baku and Elizavetpol (Elizabethpol) governorates, but also for the future of the Republic of Armenia¹.

Turkish troops started military operations on June 15, disarming the Armenian population of Gandzak. On June 26, H. Srvandzian's brigade managed to win a brilliant victory in battles at Qaramaryan and take a control over the lines of Qaramaryan-Kurdamir and Zubovka-Petropavlovsk. On June 27-30, there were heavy battles around Gyokchay where the enemy retreated having great losses. Receiving additional weapons, the enemy went on a large-scale attack on Gyokchay on July 1. This time the self-defense forces of Baku were defeated which brought a threat for the Armenian population of Baku and Elizavetpol. Occupying the Gyokchay province the Turkish troops along with Tatars massacred many Armenians who were sheltered there. A part of 700 Armenians was killed in only Gyokchay, and the survivors, including more than 50 women and girls, were distributed in Tatar villages².

On August 1, Nuri Pasha ordered to continue the attack on Baku. The battles restarted on August 2. On August 4, the British detachments came to help the defenders of Baku under the command of Colonel Stocks, and later, on August 17, General Densterville, the commander-in- chief of the British Armed Forces, also arrived to

¹ **Stepanyan G.**, *History of Armenians in Baku City*, Yerevan, 2011.

² National Archive of Armenia, f. 223, l. 1, f. 36, p. 45.

Baku. On August 29, the Turks, getting reinforcement, started a decisive attack on the English-backed front. On September 1, the Turks occupied the villages of Balakhani, Ramani, Sabunchi, Surakhan and Khrdalan. In the morning of September 13, the Turkish troops continued the attack, and on the next day after heavy battles Baku was surrendered to the enemy. The Armenian population was evacuated from the city. On September 15, the Turkish troops invaded the city and during three days cruelly massacred 30.000 Armenians¹.

The genocidal policy of the Turkish government which began with the First World War, thus was not limited by the extermination of the Armenians in Western Armenia and other parts of the Ottoman Empire, but moved to other Armenian-populated areas of Eastern Armenia and the Russian Empire.

3.3. The Extermination of the Armenians of Cilicia and Smyrna by Kemalists (1919–1922)

After occupying Cilicia by Entente countries in February of 1919, the Turkish authorities began to provoke the Muslim population against Christians.

The French authorities assured to Cilician Armenians, that they could feel themselves secure in Cilicia under French patronage, although the further developments provided just the opposite.

Mustafa Kemal, one of the most respected officers of the Ottoman Empire army that had lost the First World War, began military operations in Cilicia which had its motives. First, in 1919–1922, on the entire territory of the Ottoman Empire only Armenians were established in Cilicia with relatively heavy masses and they were seeking to create autonomy there. Second, it was easier to fight

¹ National Archive of Armenia, f. 121, l. 2, f. 95, pp. 94–99.

against the smaller French forces in Cilicia than the well-armed Greek army in Smyrna. Already by January of 1919, the Turkish officers had organized the Adana front which covered the whole Cilicia. M. Kemal had planned to attack from Konya and Sebastia in three directions: Mersin-Adana, Hadjin-Sis and Aintab-Marash. Feeling the coming danger and trusting the promises of the French, Cilician Armenians immediately started the resistance. On January 23, the soldiers of Qlej Ali who had invaded the city, burn down the Armenian districts, the church of St. Mary, 2.000 Armenians were killed¹.

On February 8-9, the French military unit located in Marash destroys the Turkish positions with the artillery fire. However, on February 10, the Turks sent an envoy to the French commander, after which the commander of the winning side gives an order to retreat. The reason for that order was conditioned with the French viewpoint, that by giving Cilicia to Turkey they will be able to keep Syria. After the withdrawal of French forces, the Turks started act barbarically: they were not even saving the women and children. 13.600 Armenians settled in Marash were killed with swords, 8.000 were deported by the authorities². By the fall of Marash the Kemalists' invasion in Cilicia increased.

The next attack of the Kemalists was directed against Hadjin where about 8.000 Armenians were settled. The military body is being created in Hadjin led by Sargis Chepechyan. The Supreme Council of self-defense of Hadjin also operated by the leadership of Archbishop Petros Sarajyan, religious leader of Hadjin. All the men of age 16–50 were recruited. The self-defense council informs the French authorities about the self-defense of Hadjin though the latter doesn't provide any assistance. On March 15, Kemalists surrounded the entire Hadjin. The Armenians deny the ultimatum of the Turks from March 28 to surrender, after which the seven month heroic battle of Hadjin begins. On October 19, 1920, early in the morning the Turks bombed the city, kill all the Armenian population of Hadjin. Only 387

¹ Galustean G.H., *Marash or Germanic and Hero Zeytun*, New York, 1934, p. 837.

² Arzumanyan M.V., *Renaissance from the Calamity*, Yerevan, 1973, p. 419.

people managed to pass the siege ring, and get to Adana fighting on the way and having 22 victims¹.

In June-July, 1920, the Kemalists threatened the Armenians of Adana. On July 11, the Muslim population of Adana attacks the Armenian population of the city. The French detachment of 3.000 people, including Armenians, goes through counterattack. The conflicts continue till the middle of September, later the situation partly stabilizes.

The situation in Aintab was also hard where 17.000 Armenians had settled. On April 1, 1920, when the French forces left the city, Turks started to attack again, and the battle of Aintab started lasting about one year (April 1, 1920 - February 8, 1921). On February 8, 1921, the Turks asked for reconciliation, but on March 9, a Turkish-French agreement was signed in London according to which the French were handing the Turks the Aintab, Kilis and other places. Under these circumstances, the population of Aintab took the migration route, leaving their homes.

In May-September 1919, about 1.200 Armenians had settled in Zeytun and its surroundings trying to create minimal living conditions. On January 20, 1920, the enemy first attacks the villages of Zeytun, where people didn't have any way of defending themselves. At the beginning of March, Zeytun was already in blockage, although its population was persistently continuing to resist the dominant Turkish army for a long time.

On June 18, 1921, the Turkish side presents an ultimatum to the Armenians demanding them to surrender. On June 22, the Turks, bringing cannons to Zeytun, demand the Armenians to surrender and move to Marash, giving them only 5 hours. On September 2-3, after unequal battles 118 people managed to reach Kilis, the French territory, and survive².

¹ **Sahakyan R.G.**, *The Turkish-French Relations and Cilicia from 1919–1921*, Yerevan, 1970, p. 186.

² **Vard-Mekhak**, *The Retreat of Zeytun*, Constantinople, 1922, p. 37.

The genocidal policy of Kemalists had its utterance on the Armenian and Greek population of Smyrna. On September 9, 1922, the Turkish forces entered Smyrna and destroy the Armenian district. On September 10, M. Kemal arrives to the city and the next day gives a command to massacre the Armenian population and occupy their properties.

Some part of the Armenian population in Smyrna had to self-defense. On September 13, Kemalists burnt down the Armenian district of Smyrna. One part of the Armenians went to city port to be saved somehow, but dozens of ships full of Armenians, as well as Greeks, sunk through the fires of the Kemalists' canals. Only a little part of them managed to pass to Greece. About 100.000 Armenians and Greeks were massacred in Smyrna.

3.4. The Western Armenian Refugees and the Armenian Orphans in the Republic of Armenia (1918–1920)

The Western Armenians, who survived the Genocide committed by the Young Turks during the First World War, escaping massacres, crossed into Eastern Armenia, Georgia and the North Caucasus. In the middles of May, 1918, hundreds of thousands of refugees were resettled in Eastern Armenia. The newly-proclaimed Republic of Armenia was called to support refugees. Parliamentary standing Committee for Refugees, and also the government ministries of care and interior affairs were engaged in refugees' issues. On September 28, 1918, the Armenian Parliament adopts a law on "Caring about refugees in need", according to which capable refugees would be provided a job, and incapable ones – pension. The authorities started to provide the abandoned lands to the families of refugees. It was stipulated by another law to open job positions by state means for refugee women. 1.500 benches and 20.000 knobs were put into

operation¹. In 1919, the certain sustainability of the social and economic life of the republic had a beneficial impact on refugees, also. The government allocates 36.2 million rubles loan to organize the immigration of 50.000 refugees in the province of Kars and for the purpose of their resettlement in their former lands².

In spring of 1920, when the Great Powers de facto recognized the Republic of Armenia and developed a future reconciliation agreement with Turkey, the immigration issue of Western Armenians to Western Armenia was put on the practical ground.

In March 1920, an immigration commission was set up which was supposed to deal with the organizing of return of Western Armenians who had migrated to other countries. The Armenian delegations located in Paris, Western Armenian executive bodies and Armenian political parties were also dealing with immigration issues.

By the law of October 11, 1918, the authorities also took care of Western Armenian orphans. A. Khatisyan, the minister of care had made a program of work related to refugees, including the issue of orphans. There were 40.000 orphans in Armenia, out of which only 15.612 were under the care of charitable organizations. There were about 50 dozens of orphanages in the republic. The largest of them was the orphanage of Alexandrapol with 1.219 orphans³.

From May 1, 1919, by the contract the orphanages under the subordination of the Armenian Ministry of Care were handed over the “American Committee for Relief in the Near East” (Amercom). During September-December of 1919, about 65 million rubles loan for orphanage benefits were provided⁴. Starting from the second half of 1919, for upbringing and teaching working skills for 2.250 orphans was designed to open 35 workshops of joinery, shoemaking, sewing, etc.⁵.

¹ National Archive of Armenia, f. 200, l. 1, f. 86, pp. 6–8.

² National Archive of Armenia, f. 243, l. 1, f. 9, p. 33.

³ National Archive of Armenia, f. 199, l. 1, f. 22, pp. 8, 84.

⁴ **Avetisyan S.**, *The Activity of the American Committee for Relief in the Near East in Armenia 1918–1930*, Yerevan, 2009, pp. 79, 97.

⁵ National Archive of Armenia, f. 117, l. 1, f. 1880, p. 3.

By August 1, 1920, 50.000 children were receiving food, 108.000 tons of foodstuffs were distributed in the republic as aid, and the total cost of expenses was 21 million US dollars.

After the establishment of the Soviet Union works to integrate the West Armenian refugees and immigrants and Armenian orphans in Armenia continued, also.

CHAPTER IV

THE ARMENIAN QUESTION IN THE INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS, AND THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

4.1. Boundary between Turkey and Armenia by the Treaty of Sevres and by the Arbitral Award of US President Woodrow Wilson

The reconciliation Treaty of Sevres, signed on August 10, 1920, was the last among the treaties signed between victorious and defeated powers during the First World War. By the Article 88 of the treaty de facto was recognized the independence of Armenia, and by the Article 90 the issue of the future Armenian-Turkish borders was entrusted to US President Woodrow Wilson. By the Article 90 of the Treaty of Sevres Turkey committed to recognize the future Armenian-Turkish border and “starting from the day of arbitrary decision was made it would refuse from all the rights and legal advices of gave up territories”¹.

In terms of the right of peoples of self-determination, for the first time by the Treaty of Sevres the Kurdish Issue was raised at the international level, it was planned to create a separate country - Kurdistan. Historian Adonts was reasonably concerned about the fact that Dersim and Kharberd tribes, which in reality geographically and ethnically constituted the inseparable part of the Armenian Highland, were to be given to Kurdistan. Thus, the future Kurdish state was

¹ *Armenia in the Documents of International Diplomacy and Soviet Foreign Policy (1828–1917)*, Editor **J. Kirakosyan**, Yerevan, 1972, p. 676.

partly to be created at the expense of the Armenian territories. The basis for such decision Adonts still considered the French-Russian secret agreement signed during the war in 1916, which was preceded by the British and French secret Agreement of Sykes-Picot, through which the Western Armenia was split along right the Kharberd line¹. In this case, in the absence of a counterbalance state, the Armenian delegations did not have anything to do but to put up with the loss of not only that territory but also Cilicia, comforting by the fact that a significant part of the historical homeland would be added to Armenia.

Through Woodrow Wilson's arbitration the Supreme Leadership of the Allied Powers was restricted by concrete areas. By implementing Armenian-Turkish boundaries the arbitrator was to be restricted to the provinces of Van, Bitlis, Erzurum and Trabzon, the latter would have secured Armenia's access to the Black Sea, without which the arbitration would be incomplete and the powers were obliged to undertake the possible measures, so that the US president could set out an access to the sea for Armenia².

On November 22, 1920, the US president signed his arbitral award 10 days before the sovietization of Armenia. After the sovietization, in December 6, the arbitral award made by the US president was officially abolished to the Supreme Council of the Allied Powers in Paris. The official and full name of the award is "The US president's award on the boundary between Turkey and Armenia, Armenia's access to the sea, and on the dismantling of the Turkish territory adjacent to the Armenian border." The US president as an arbitrator, within its jurisdiction, exercising the Armenian-Turkish border, was confirming the title and rights of the Armenian people on Van, Bitlis, Erzurum and Trabzon provinces, which were formerly known as territories of Ottoman Empire, thus an access to the Black Sea was also provided. The total amount of territory transferred to

¹ **Adonts N.**, *About the Solution of the Armenian Question*, Yerevan, 1989, p. 19.

² **Barseghov Yu.**, *The Arbitral Award of US President on Turkish-Armenian Boundary*, Yerevan, 1995, p. 14.

Armenia under the arbitral decision supposed to be 3.599 square kilometers, which was about 40 percent of Western Armenia¹.

The fixing of the provision “the Turkish territory adjacent to the Armenian border” in the title of the arbitral award was very important. From the logic of the title of the arbitral award it was derived not only the withdrawal of Kemalists military forces from the four provinces transferred to Armenia but also the withdrawal of those forces from the Armenian-Turkish new boundary to the depths of Turkey articulated by the arbitral award.

4.2. The Attempts of Turkey to Cancel Wilson’s Arbitral Award and the Treaty of Sevres with the Agreements of Alexandrapol, Moscow and Kars

Under the Treaty of Alexandrapol, the Turks obliged Armenia to refuse from the rights granted to it by the Treaty of Sevres. They were trying to separate new territories from the Republic of Armenia (in total 20.7 thousand square kilometers). But the agreement was signed on the night of December 2-3, 1920, following the signing of the Treaty of Yerevan on December 2, by which the authority was handed over the Armenian Revolutionary Committee. In this case the Treaty of Alexandrapol was signed by the Armenian side by the government representatives who had put down their responsibilities, who had no authority to do so, thus they had exceeded their authority, and therefore the contract could not have been legal. Furthermore, according to Article 15 of the Treaty of Alexandrapol, the agreement must be valid within one month, but it has not been ratified at all². That is, apart from being illegal, the Treaty of Alexandrapol has not even been valid.

¹ **Papyan A.**, *Legal Basis for Armenian Claims (Collection of Articles)*, Yerevan, 2007, p. 6.

² **Torikean Sh.**, *The Armenian Question and the International Law*, Beirut, 1976, p. 107.

After the sovietization of Armenia the neutralization of the Treaty of Sevres and Wilson's arbitral award the Turks connected with the Bolshevik Russia. According to the Treaty of Moscow signed on March 16, 1921, the Armenian territories of Kars, Ardahan, Surmalu were handed over the Turkey, while Nakhchivan was handed over Azerbaijan's custody, on a condition that it won't be handed over to the third country¹ (to Armenia). The Treaty of Moscow was signed without Armenia's presence and without taking into consideration its will, so it could not be mandatory for the latter. Bolsheviks and Kemalists probably realized this too, and this is expressed in the Article 15 of the Treaty of Moscow, with which Russia was obliged to take measures that the Transcaucasian republics recognized the articles belonging to it in the treaties signed with Turkey in the future². It meant that Russia was primarily compelled to force Armenia recognize the terms of its illegal transaction signed with Turkey.

The Soviet Russia hurried to keep its promise given to Turkey. By its initiative in the October of the same year a document was signed in Kars between Turkey and the three countries of Transcaucasia – Armenia, Georgia and Azerbaijan. The Treaty of Kars was the copy of the Treaty of Moscow by which Russia and Turkey were trying to legitimize illegal deal³. The Treaty of Kars literally repeats the text of the Moscow Treaty and in that way “legalizes” Moscow's illegal deal between Bolsheviks and Kemalists.

After attempts to neutralize Armenia's rights stipulated in the documents of Sevres with bilateral illegal agreements of Moscow and Kars, Turks wanted to put an end to this issue through the international multilateral agreement which was intended to be signed at the Lausanne Conference. According to Kemalists' calculations after the sovietization of Armenia the former countries of Entente would no longer support Armenia, which was already under the

¹ *Armenia in the Documents of International Diplomacy and Soviet Foreign Policy (1828–1917)*, pp. 500–501.

² *Ibid*, p. 504.

³ **Torikean Sh.**, *The Armenian Question and the International Law*, p. 107.

influence of the Soviet Russia. But according to Treaty of Lausanne signed on July 24, 1923, only the western borders with Bulgaria and Greece and southern borders with Syria and Iraq were determined, and there was no a single word about the eastern border, and especially about the border with Armenia¹. The claim that the issue had already been settled by the Treaties of Moscow and Kars does not endure the criticism by the reason that the bilateral deal with the Soviet Russia which was an ideological and political opponent of European countries could not be obligatory for the countries that had taken part in the Lausanne Conference.

¹ http://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/Treaty_of_Lausanne

4.3. The Consequences of the Armenian Genocide. Cultural Genocide

The deprivation of the Armenian people of its land – **the deprivation of motherland**, is the main loss of the Armenian Genocide. Meanwhile, for the perpetrators of the genocide it was the most important reason and goal of committing that crime¹. As it is about the loss of a major part of Armenia – 9/10, so it is necessary to clarify, what consequences it had and how it has touched upon the further functioning and development of the Armenian people.

The human losses of the Armenian people after the Genocide amounted 1.5 million. However, when clarifying the number of human losses, the number of Armenians who have been Islamized during the genocide policy should also be taken into account, who are also considered as human losses, because as a result of this assimilation process they have stopped to consider themselves as Armenians.

Psychological complexes: after the Genocide the Armenian people has acquired many psychological complexes and fears that have negatively affected their future activities². The psychological consequences of the Armenian Genocide directly and indirectly affect and continue to affect not only the survivors of the Genocide but also the next generations.

Connected with **the financial losses** of the Armenian Genocide it is mainly mentioned the memorandum provided by the heads of the Armenian delegations Avetis Aharonyan and Poghos Nubar Pasha in Paris Peace Conference in 1919, according to which the financial losses of Armenians in 1915–1919 are estimated about

¹ **Melkonyan A.**, *The Lessons and Messages of the Armenian History*, Yerevan, 2013, p. 427.

² *The Strategic Consequences of the Armenian Genocide*, “The Byzantine Heritage” (Information-Analytical Magazine), Yerevan, 2002, N. 3, p. 16.

19,130,982,000 French francs¹. However, this calculation done in a short time and cannot be considered final and is a subject to review.

Loss of cultural heritage: The perpetration of the Armenian Genocide caused huge cultural losses to the Armenian people. In 1914, according to Turkish official information the Western Armenians had 83 prelacies, 1.860 Armenian churches and chapels, 451 monasteries and about 2.000 schools². According to UNESCO's data of 1974, after 1915, 913 buildings were left standing from the monasteries and churches of Western Armenia, of which, 464 were completely destroyed, 252 were turned into ruins, and 197 had a serious need for rehabilitation during the further years³. Obviously, the Armenian prelacies and schools were in the same situation. It should be stated, that when we speak about "continuing genocide", we mean Turkey's stately continuing policy of destruction of Armenian historic-architectural monuments, churches and monasteries, which aim was to eliminate in Western Armenia everything that reminds Armenians as the real owners of that land. The manifestation of cultural genocide against Armenians should also be considered the destruction of thousands of Armenian manuscripts, in which the millennial scientific thought and genius of the Armenian people were summed up.

It should be stated, that the policy of destruction of the Armenian historical and cultural heritage was continued by the next Turkish regimes. As the result of the policy of cultural genocide by the Turkish authorities many Armenian monuments, created during millenniums and considered as indivisible values of universal civilization, were erased from the face of the earth.

The primary targets of barbarism were those monuments, which with their existence, pointed at the presence of Armenians in their

¹ *Losses Caused to the Armenian people as a Result of the Genocide*, by **L. Barseghyan**, Yerevan, 1999, p. 13.

² **Astoyan A.**, *Expropriation of Armenians' Properties in the Ottoman Empire (1915–1923): Evidences, Facts and Documents*. "Vem", 2010, N 3 (31), Annex, pp. XVI–XVII.

³ *Armenian-Turkish Relations: Key issues and Perspectives*. Parliamentary hearings, December 19–20, 2007, Yerevan, 2011, p. 144.

historical homeland most strikingly. Among them were monasteries and churches, and Armenian cemeteries rich with thousands of tombstones and khachqars (cross stones). Mainly Armenian writings were being eliminated from the Armenian bridges, sources and residential structures.

In 1928, in Western Armenia Armenian settlements and geographical indigenous Armenian names of the places and locations were renamed.

During 1940–1960 in Western Armenia the Armenian monuments were destroyed also by the military of the country. The monuments that had remained serve as a barn, warehouse, even as a prison, in other cases, they turned into the mosques. There were rumors among the Muslims living in Western Armenia that Armenians had hidden their treasures in Armenian churches and cemeteries, which leads to the destruction of these monuments by the hands of local Muslims¹.

Implementing the program of misappropriation and adoption of the Armenian civilization heritage the Turkish authorities have begun to carry out restoration of the Armenian churches in recent years. These steps are not aimed at the restoration of these historical and cultural values, but on the creation of an illusion of Turkey as a tolerant and civilized country in the world.

Thus, the genocide committed against the Armenian culture pursues two main goals: first to prove that Western Armenia has never been the cradle of the Armenians and, secondly, the Armenian Genocide did not happen in Turkey.

Currently, the destruction or the adoption of the Armenian historical and cultural monuments implemented by the Republic of Turkey, also the denial of the Armenian Genocide should be viewed as another stage of genocidal policy.

4.4. The Formation of the Armenian Diaspora.

¹ Hovhannisyan A., *Turkey: Cultural Genocide*, Yerevan, 2005.

As a result of the genocide committed during the First World War in the Ottoman Empire the entire Armenian nation was physically destroyed and expelled from its homeland – Western Armenia, by force. The deported Armenians sheltered almost in all the countries of all continents, resulting in the formation of a new state of the Armenian people – the Diaspora.

Initially, Armenian refugees began to accumulate in the Middle East, mainly in Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, as well as in Egypt and Greece¹. However, the Armenian Diaspora did not form at once. The period of its formation lasted for about one and a half decades. The immigrant Armenians, who kept their existence under difficult conditions, expected that the Great Powers after winning during the First World War will keep their promises to Armenians and will give them an opportunity to return to their homeland and create guarantees for safe and dignified life there.

After the disappearance of promises of Great Powers to solve the Armenian Question and deep disappointment, the Western Armenians had nothing to do but to try to establish in new countries, put up with social-economic and social-political life of those countries, and at the same time, do not fall into this foreign environment and continue to remain the Armenian.

The main means of the national-ethnic survival of the Diaspora were educational and cultural activities, which carried out the Diaspora-based cultural unions founded by political parties. The spiritual-national activities of the Diaspora were also organized through community structures: churches, schools, clubs and cultural centers. As a rule, the communities were organized around the church, which was recognized by the authorities as a governing body of the community. The main role was given to the Armenian Apostolic Church. The Armenian Catholic and the Armenian Protestant (Evangelical) churches also had important activities. Charitable organizations, patriotic unions also took part in the life of the

¹ **Dallakyan K.**, *History of the Armenian Diaspora (Brief Overview)*, Yerevan, 2004.

Diaspora¹.

Along with the deployment of the Armenian refugees in different countries, the primary task was to provide them with jobs. Unemployment had a character of a national disaster. It was necessary to accept the citizenship of that country to obtain a job. Unlike many countries, this problem was relatively easily solved in Bulgaria and Lebanon.

Ties between Armenia and Diaspora started from the first years of Diaspora formation. But at the end of the 1920s, in the result of the USSR policy the connection of Soviet Armenia with the Diaspora was stopped.

1940–1950 are conditionally considered as the stage of self-establishment of the Diaspora. After the removal of the Armenian Question from the agenda of the Great Powers, Paris lost its significance as a center for the activities of public and political institutions of Armenian Diaspora, gradually yielding its place and role to Beirut – the capitol of Lebanon, where central bodies of national parties and other Diaspora organizations were concentrated. It was relatively easy for Armenians to get citizenship and find a job here².

1960–1970's are conditionally considered as the phase of Diaspora awakening, during which the Armenians succeeded in the various spheres of economy of the countries of residence and even confirming their leading positions in some places. At this stage, also the relations with Soviet Armenia activated, which was conditioned by the immigration of a large number of Diaspora Armenians in the previous period as well as by the new policy of USSR's³.

From 1980s conditionally begins and continues the phase of integration of Diaspora, during which the struggle for both the Armenian Genocide and the international recognition of the Republic of Artsakh was considerably activated. After Armenia proclaimed its

¹ **Melkonyan E.**, *The History of AGBU*, Yerevan, 2005.

² **Topuzyan H.**, *History of Armenian Communities in Syria and Lebanon (1841–1946)*, Yerevan, 1986.

³ **Dallakyan K.**, *History of the Armenian Diaspora*, p. 145.

independence, Armenia and the Diaspora established new quality relationships, which were aimed at the strengthening of the homeland as well as the solution of the problems of the preservation of the Armenian identity in the communities of Diaspora.

CHAPTER V

THE POLICY OF THE PERSECUTION OF THE ARMENIANS IN AZERBAIJAN. THE INTERNATIONAL RECOGNITION OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE AND THE ISSUE OF REPARATION

5.1. The Policy of Genocide and Ethnic Cleansing against the Armenians of Azerbaijan (1988–1990)

In response to justified steps of the Armenian people of Nagorno-Karabakh's autonomous region to join the Soviet Armenia, the authorities of Soviet Azerbaijan, guided by the genocidal experience accumulated at the beginning of the century by the Turkish authorities, as well as Musavat ancestors, started implementing a policy of genocide and ethnic cleansing towards the Armenians of Azerbaijan.

February 27–29, 1988 and January 13–20, 1990, the massacres and deportations of the Armenians took place in Sumgait and Baku, in response to the self-determination demand of the people of Nagorno-Karabakh. It was a criminal policy that was initially adopted by the Azerbaijani authorities, which was based on the policy of genocide committed against the Armenians by the Ottoman Empire and Kemalist Turkey. Like the Sumgait massacres, Baku massacres were also organized and aimed to intimidate the Armenians and force them to refuse their legitimate demands, and throw them out not only from Sumgait and Baku, but also from entire Karabakh. The slogan of many Azerbaijani leaders in those days was “Death to Armenians”.

It is obvious that the mass murder of Armenians in Sumgait and

Baku were organized by the fact that all the local governments were ordered to compile the list of the Armenian residents before hand and to forbid Armenians to go to work¹. If it was done from February 28 in Sumgait, then in Baku started from December 25, 1989. In both cases, the call for deportation and annihilation of the Armenians exploded after the addresses of the Armenians were separated and the period when mass massacres would begin was clarified².

On January 13, A. Panakhov, the leader of Azerbaijani Popular Front Party and A. Vezirov, the first secretary of the Central Committee of the Azerbaijan Communist Party, speaking on television called on the Azerbaijani people to attack the Armenian-populated settlements of Nagorno-Karabakh and Azerbaijan. After their speeches, attacks and barbarities against the Armenian families began in Baku. On January 13, the tortured bodies of dozens of Armenians were smashed on the streets of Baku. Starting that day the persecutions in Baku had an organized form. The city was “cleansed from the Armenians” home by home. The Armenians who were miraculously saved were sent to a port where they were finally robbed and deported mainly to Krasnovodsk in Turkmenistan³.

The USSR political leadership also was partially guilty in the genocide and ethnic cleansing of the Armenians of Azerbaijan since it did not take any step to prevent the massacres of the Armenians⁴. Soviet troops appeared at a time when the fanatic crowd had almost finished their cruel actions, but even after the arrival, they did not take any practical measures to stop the murderers.

According to official data, 32 Armenians were killed in Sumgait, while the number of dead Armenians actually exceeded 100⁵. According to official data, the number of Armenians killed in Baku exceeded 200, but the real number of victims was not found out, as no

¹ **Ulubabyan G., Zolyan S., Arshakyan A.,** *Sumgait ... Genocide ... Publicity?* Yerevan, 1989.

² **Mosesova I., Hovnanyan A.,** *The Massacres of Baku*, Yerevan, 1992.

³ “The Soviet Kharabakh”, 16. 01.1990.

⁴ **Hakobyan T.,** *Green and Black, The Diary of Artsakh*, Yerevan, 2008, p. 99.

⁵ *Sumgait ... Genocide ... Publicity?* p. 55.

judicial examination was carried out. As a result of the genocidal policy of the Azerbaijani authorities, not only the Armenian community of Baku with 252.000 Armenians was eliminated, 400.000 Armenians from Azerbaijan were deported, but also a large-scale military aggression against the self-determined Armenian population of Nagorno-Karabakh started which led to serious human and financial losses.

5.2. The Process of International Recognition and Condemnation of the Armenian Genocide

The first serious step of international recognition and condemnation of the Armenian Genocide should be regarded the moment when during the mass extermination policy of the Armenians the Triple Entente Powers – Russia, France and Great Britain adopted a joint declaration on May 24, 1915, by which the responsibility for the mass killings of the Armenians was put on the Turkish authorities by giving them a qualification of crime aimed at “against humanity and civilization”¹. Later, this formulation was defined by the United Nations as genocide with the term “genocide”.

On November 4, 1918, The Ottoman Parliament annulled the Temporary Deportation Act of May 30, 1915, adopted and illegally implemented by the Young Turks, which served as a “legal basis” for the Young Turks regime for mass deportation and extermination of the Armenians. Thus the fact of the Armenian Genocide perpetrated by the Young Turks was recognized by this resolution of the Ottoman Parliament. The special fifth parliamentary commission was set up to investigate the crimes committed by the former Young Turks during the war, including mass killings of the Armenians. Later whose materials were transmitted to Turkish military tribunals for investigating

¹ *International Relations in the Era of Imperialism*, Documents from the archives of the Tsarist and Temporary Governments, 1878–1917, Moscow-Leningrad, 1931–1940, part III, volume 7, part 2, p. 252.

cases of Young Turkish leaders. As a result of the trials of the Armenian deportations and massacres in the Turkish military tribunals, members of the Young Turks were remotely sentenced to death¹.

During the November and December of 1918, in the Ottoman Parliament the fact of the condemnation of the mass killings of the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, the abolition of the “Law on Deportation”, and the sentence to death the individuals who were responsible for the Armenian extermination by Turkish military tribunals, in essence, meant that the legislative and judicial authorities of that country recognized the fact of the Armenian Genocide in an original way.

In 1965, the national awakening, consistent struggle and propaganda connected with the 50th commemoration of the Armenian Genocide gave the positive results. The issue of the Armenian Genocide came out from the silence of the decades and again appeared in the attention of the international community. The first genocide of the 20th century began to be discussed and condemned in the press, by parliaments of different states and international organizations, and as a result many states and organizations adopted resolutions recognizing and condemning the Armenian Genocide.

On April 20, 1965, the Uruguay Senate and the House of Representatives decided to set the April 24 as a commemoration day for the Armenian Genocide victims, and on August 9, 1972, a resolution was made on the recognition and condemnation of the Armenian Genocide. The Uruguayan Parliament adopted the law on the recognition and condemnation of the Armenian Genocide on March 26, 2004.

On July 15, 1965, World Congress of the Supporters of Peace in Helsinki condemned the Armenian Genocide².

In 1974, on 30th Session of the UN Commission on Human

¹ *The Armenian Genocide According to the Documents of the Trial of the Young Turks*, by **A.H. Papazyan**. Yerevan, 1988.

² **Hovhannisyan N.**, *Armenocide is Recognized Genocide*, Yerevan, 2010, p. 194.

Rights the Armenian massacres in the Ottoman Empire were qualified as the first genocide of the 20th century. On July 2, 1985, the 38th Session of the UN Commission on Human Rights described the massacres of Armenians in 1915–1916 as an example of genocide¹.

On August 24, 1975, the House of Representatives of Cyprus adopted a resolution on declaring the April 24th as a commemoration day of the Armenian Genocide victims, and on April 29, 1982, the same body described the crime against the Armenian people as genocide. On April 2, 2015, the Parliament of Cyprus adopted a law criminalizing the denial of the Armenian Genocide.

On August 10, 1983, the World Council of Churches convened in Vancouver, Canada, condemned the Armenian Genocide and urged the UN to accept that fact. The World Council of Churches unanimously condemned the Armenian Genocide at the regular congresses held in May of 1989 in San Antonio (USA) and in April of 2015 in Yerevan (Armenia)².

April 13–16, 1984, the special session of Permanent Peoples' Tribunal convened in Paris adopts a resolution requiring condemnation of the Armenian Genocide and compensation for damage caused to Armenian people³.

On June 18, 1987, The European Parliament adopted the resolution “On the Political Solution of the Armenian Question”, which underlined that the massacres of the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire in 1915–1917 called the genocide, according to the UN Convention on Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide from December 9, 1948, and, on this basis, the Council of Europe was required to exert pressure on Turkey to recognize the Armenian

¹ *Armenian Genocide: The Responsibility of Turkey and the Commitments of the International Community*, Moscow, 2003, Volume 2, part 1, pp. 665–666.

² **Hovhannisyan N.**, *Armenocide is Recognized Genocide*, p. 195.

³ *The International Community Condemns the Armenian Genocide*, Compiler and Introduction by Author **Barseghyan L.A.**, Yerevan, 1999, p. 5.

Genocide as well¹. The European Parliament condemned the Armenian Genocide by the resolutions adopted on September 28, 2005, and on April 5, 2015, on the occasion of the 100th commemoration of the Armenian Genocide.

The process of international recognition and condemnation of the Armenian Genocide has gained greater volumes when the Armenian state started to represent the Armenian Cause. On November 22, 1988, the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic adopted a law condemning the Armenian Genocide of 1915, on August 23, 1990, by the Declaration of Independence of Armenia adopted by the Supreme Soviet stated, that “The Republic of Armenia pro the process of International Recognition of the Armenian Genocide in Ottoman Turkey and Western Armenia in 1915”². This position adopted by Armenia in the issue of the Armenian Genocide was an additional impetus for the international recognition and condemnation of the crime.

On May 5, 1993, the Armenian Genocide was recognized and condemned by the resolution of the Argentine Senate. Later on, the Argentinean Senate also adopted resolutions on the Armenian Genocide on August 20, 2003, then the declaration on March 31, 2004, a decision on April 20, 2005, and adopted a special statement on April 19, 2006. On March 18, 2004, the bill on Armenian Genocide was put into circulation in Argentine legislature and the corresponding law was adopted on January 15, 2007.

On April 14, 1995, the State Duma of Russia issued a statement on the condemnation of the Armenian people's genocide. The State Duma also adopted declarations recognizing and condemning the Armenian Genocide in 2005 and on April 24, 2015.

On April 23, 1996, the House of Commons of Canada announced April 20–27 of every year as a week of remembrance of the

¹ *European Parliament Resolution on a political solution to the Armenian question*, Doc. A2-33/87, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/intcoop/euro/pcc/aag/pcc_meeting/resolutions/1987_07_20.pdf

² *Declaration of Independence*, signed on August 23, 1990.

inhumanity of people toward one another. On June 13, 2002, by the decision of the Canadian Senate, the Armenian Genocide was recognized and condemned as the first genocide of the 20th century. Also, on April 21, 2004, the House of Commons of Canada adopted a resolution condemning the Armenian Genocide.

On April 25, 1996, the Hellenic Parliament adopted a law to commemorate April 24th as the Day of Remembrance of the Armenian Genocide. On September 9, 2014, The Greek Parliament House with majority of votes adopted a law by which a criminal liability was imposed for the denial of the genocide of Jews, Armenians and Pontic Greeks.

On May 3, 1997, by the decision of the Parliament of Lebanon April 24th was proclaimed as a day of unity with the Armenian people. On May 11, 2000, the Parliament of Lebanon adopted a resolution on the Armenian Genocide for the second time.

On March 26, 1998, the Senate of Belgium condemned the Armenian Genocide of 1915. On July 24, 2015, also a resolution on the Armenian Genocide was adopted by the Chamber of Representatives of Belgium.

On April 22, 1998, the National Assembly of the Republic of Artsakh adopted a resolution condemning the Armenian Genocide.

On March 29, 2000, the Swedish Parliament adopted a resolution recognizing and condemning the Armenian Genocide.

On November 10, 2000, the Vatican in its statement considered the Armenian Genocide as the beginning of all the horrors of the 20th century. On April 12, 2015, Pope Francis I called the Armenian Genocide as the first genocide of the 20th century during the mass in Vatican.

On November 16, 2000, the Italian Parliament adopted a resolution condemning the Armenian Genocide.

On January 18, 2001, the French National Assembly and the Senate adopted a joint bill recognizing the Armenian Genocide, ratified by the French president on January 29.

On December 16, 2003, the Swiss National Council recognized

the Armenian Genocide. On November 30, 2004, the Slovak National Council made a decision to recognize the Armenian Genocide.

On December 21, 2004, the Lower House of the Parliament of Netherlands issued a statement on the recognition of the Armenian Genocide.

On April 19, 2005, the Armenian Genocide was recognized and condemned by the Sejm of the Republic of Poland.

On June 15, 2005, the German Bundestag adopted the first resolution on the Armenian Genocide. On April 23, 2015, the German president Joachim Gauck condemned the Armenian Genocide in his speech, and on June 2, 2016, the German Bundestag adopted a new resolution recognizing and condemning the Armenian Genocide.

On July 14, 2005, National Assembly of Venezuela adopted a resolution recognizing the Armenian Genocide.

On December 15, 2005, the Constituent Assembly of Lithuania adopted a resolution recognizing the Armenian Genocide.

On July 7, 2007, the Senate of Chile unanimously adopted a resolution condemning the Armenian Genocide. On April 14, 2015, a resolution on the Armenian Genocide was also adopted by the Chamber of Deputies of Chile.

On November 19, 2007, a decision was made to recognize and condemn the Armenian Genocide at the plenary session of the MERCOSUR Parliamentary Assembly.

On March 11, 2010, the Rikstag - the Swedish Parliament, adopted a resolution recognizing the genocide of the Armenians, Assyrians and Pontic Greeks committed in the Ottoman Empire in 1915.

On November 27, 2014, the Armenian Genocide was recognized and condemned by the resolutions adopted by the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies of Bolivia.

The Armenian Genocide was also condemned by the state and municipal legislative bodies of many countries that have not yet officially recognized it.

It was absolutely expected that in 2015, at the 100th

commemoration of the Armenian Genocide new countries would join to recognize and condemn that crime.

Thus, on April 22, 2015, the Austrian parliament adopted a resolution recognizing and condemning the Armenian Genocide in commemoration of the centennial of the genocide committed against the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire.

On May 6, 2015, the Parliament of Luxembourg adopted a resolution recognizing and condemning the Armenian Genocide.

On May 29, 2015, the Armenian Genocide was recognized and condemned by the bill passed by the Federal Senate of Brazil.

On October 29, 2015, the Armenian Genocide was recognized and condemned by the resolution adopted by the Senate of Paraguay.

On January 26, 2017, the Danish Parliament has adopted a resolution recognizing and condemning the Armenian Genocide.

International recognition and condemnation of the Armenian Genocide still continues. Hopefully the new countries are going to condemn one of the greatest crimes against humanity, the first genocide of the 20th century.

The pressure of the international community and the Turkish progressive society will sooner or later lead to the recognition of the genocide against the Armenians by the Republic of Turkey and overcoming the consequences of that crime.

5.3. The Principles of the Pan-Armenian Declaration, and the Problem of Overcoming the Consequences of the Armenian Genocide

The Armenian people have been struggling for recognition and condemnation of the genocide committed against them for a few decades. Throughout that period, the parliaments and international organizations in different countries adopted the resolutions recognizing and condemning the Armenian Genocide, which are extremely important, as they have been given a principled

assessment of what happened to the Armenians at the beginning of the 20th century describing it as genocide and pointing out at the state that committed the crime. However, despite all these, Turkey continues to deny the crime committed against the Armenians at the state level. In these conditions, it becomes clear that fighting for international recognition of the Armenian Genocide cannot be finalized, and the time has come to overcome the consequences of this crime and for compensation. The first serious step has already been made in this direction when on January 29, 2015: the “Pan-Armenian Declaration of the Centennial of the Armenian Genocide” was officially adopted at the memorial to the Armenian Genocide victims.

With this document, the State Committee on Coordination of Events for Commemoration the 100th Anniversary of the Armenian Genocide and Regional Committees operating in the Diaspora, speaking on behalf of all Armenians, based on the condemnation of the Young Turks' regime in 1919–1921 by verdicts of the Ottoman military courts, on the joint Declaration of the Allied Powers of May 24, 1915, on the Sevres Peace Treaty of August 10, 1920, and on the US President Woodrow Wilson's Arbitral Award of November 22, 1920, guided by the United Nations General Assembly Resolution 96 (1) of December 11, 1946, and the UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide adopted on December 9, 1948, as well as UN Convention on the “Non-applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity” of November 26, 1968, and stated with the relevant principles and provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and all other international tools on human rights of December 16, 1966, that from that moment the joint struggle of the Armenian people to launch not only the global recognition of the Armenian Genocide, but also the overcoming of the consequences of genocide starts¹.

It is quite natural that by putting the “Overcoming the Armenian

¹ Pan-Armenian Declaration on the Centennial of the Armenian Genocide, <http://www.president.am/hy/press-release/item/2015/01/29/>.

Genocide” formulation in the official circulation, which is the diplomatic expression of the Armenian claim, the idea of reimbursement, was not supplemented in this document of a declarative nature, what is being understood under the notion of “the consequences of the Armenian Genocide” and to what extent is it possible to overcome those consequences, since there are consequences that are absolutely irreducible.

The logical next step of the body that adopted the Pan-Armenian declaration should be the adoption of “A package-document of historical and legal requirements of overcoming the consequences of the Armenian Genocide to be introduced to Turkey”. The paragraph 6 of the Pan-Armenian Declaration, in fact, refers exactly to that, declaring that a file of legal claims as a point of departure in the process of restoring individual, communal and pan-Armenian rights and legitimate interests¹. Acceptance of a “package of claims” or “file” is important in the sense that in that way, a common national approach will be formed on the consequences of the Armenian Genocide and demands to Turkey.

The damages and losses to the Armenian people during the perpetration of the Armenian Genocide, and the consequences of their non-elimination can be conditionally divided into the following groups: a) homelessness, b) human losses, c) cultural heritage loss, d) financial losses, e) mental disorders and psychological complexes.

The main consequence of the Armenian Genocide, the demand of overcoming homelessness, can be justified, for example, by the Arbitral Award of US president Woodrow Wilson of November 22, 1920, which was adopted in accordance with the international legal norms during the implementation of the Genocide².

The claim for the restoration of cultural heritage losses as a result of the Armenian Genocide can be justified under Article 42, part 3 of

¹ Ibid.

² **Marukyan A.**, *The Political and International Legal Significance of the Arbitral Award of US President Woodrow Wilson*, “Meds Yeghern: From Condemnation to Compensation” (Collection of Articles), Yerevan, 2011, p. 97.

the Treaty of Lausanne of July 24, 1923, concerning the protection of the rights of non-Muslims, according to which the Turkish government has pledged to take full protection of churches, synagogues, graves and other religious institutions of minorities. The requirement of this article is not only to abandon and not to abolish the churches, but also to strengthen and repair them¹. Besides, the Armenian cultural heritage in Turkey may also be protected by the UNESCO charter provisions, since both Armenia and Turkey are members of that organization.

As for the financial losses of the Armenian people during the genocide, then in the shortest time approximately 19,131 billion of French francs² presented by Avetis Aharonyan and Poghos Nubar Pasha, the heads of the Armenian delegations to the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, are certainly quite approximate and subject to adjustments. A brilliant case-law to compensate the financial losses of the Armenian Genocide can be the Luxembourg Agreement signed between Israel and the Federal Republic of Germany on September 10, 1952, by which Germany began to compensate the Holocaust financial losses to the Jews³.

From the viewpoint of restoring the psychological consequences of the Armenian Genocide, *satisfaction* can be used in the international law*, the first manifestation of which should be the denial of Turkey's denial policy of the Armenian Genocide, the recognition of the crime committed, and the official apology. These actions of satisfaction are just the first steps necessary to overcome the consequences of the Armenian Genocide, which will follow the process of overcoming the consequences of the Armenian Genocide,

¹ http://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/Treaty_of_Lausanne

² *The Losses of the Armenian People as a Result of the Genocide*, p. 9.

³ **Marutyan H.**, *Germany's Financial Compensation to Jewry: Formation, Process, Present Condition*. "The Problems of Western Armenians' Demand" (Scientific International Conference), Cyprus-Nicosia, 18–19 April 2008, "A Collection of Scientific Reports", Moscow, 2008, p. 83.

* A form of reimbursement of moral damage through illegal actions caused by the state.

restoration of the rights of the motherland and compensation of financial consequences.

The clarification of the consequences of the Armenian Genocide in the “package of claims” or “file” and the formulation of the legal requirements arising from it are certainly not sufficient for their implementation. It is also necessary to create a tactical, practical file that will help to overcome the consequences of the Armenian Genocide, the “Action Plan for the overcoming of the consequences of the Armenian Genocide”, in which it will be pointed out the methods and mechanisms through which it can be possible to overcome the above-mentioned consequences. This document, unlike the Pan-Armenian Declaration and the “Requirements Package” or “File must be closed and for the limited use, not allowing the opponent to know beforehand, to take action with preventive steps to neutralize the unfavorable consequences for him¹. In action plan it should be fixed the separation of work between Diaspora and Armenia in overcoming the consequences of the Armenian Genocide, based on their competences, capacities and experience. The program should also specify the directions, through which should be carried out works simultaneously with both legal and political dimensions².

It should be noted that on the centennial of the Armenian Genocide the Republic of Armenia acted as a pioneer in the struggle against the crime of genocide. On March 24, 2015, the National Assembly of RA adopted a statement condemning the genocide of the Assyrians and Greeks in the Ottoman Empire in 1915–1923. On April 15 of the same year, in the RA law “On Holidays and Memorial Days” a change was made, by which December 9, the day of the adoption of The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide by United Nations in 1948, proclaimed the day of condemnation and remembrance of genocides. This initiative of Armenia reached its logical end when on September 11, at the 103rd

¹ **Marukyan A.**, *The Problems of Overcoming the Consequences of the Armenian Genocide and the Historical-legal Justifications*, Yerevan, 2014, p. 286.

² *Ibid*, p. 286.

plenary meeting of the 69th session of the UN General Assembly, the Armenian resolution was adopted by consensus, by which December 9th was proclaimed an international day of commemoration of the victims of the genocide crime, dignity and crime prevention.

The first and second global forums “Against the Crime of Genocide” and “Aurora” awards for the people who fight against genocide were organized in Yerevan in 2015 and 2016 with the participation of famous scientists, clergymen, journalists and politicians from different countries.

Despite these outstanding achievements, there is still much to be done in the direction of recognition, condemnation and overcoming the consequences of the crime committed against the Armenian people. In this regard, we must remember that the overcoming of the consequences of the Armenian Genocide is not only a matter of restoring the rights of the Armenians and securing the national security of the Republic of Armenia, but also our sacred duty in the memory of innocent victims.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	3
CHAPTER I	
THE MASSACRES OF THE ARMENIAN POPULATION OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE AT THE END OF XIX – BEGINNING OF XX CENTURIES	
1.1. The Massacres of the Armenians in Western Armenia and other Armenian Populated Areas of the Ottoman Empire in 1894–1896	6
1.2. The Massacres of the Armenians in Cilicia in 1909	12
CHAPTER II	
THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE AND THE SELF-DEFENSE BATTLES	
2.1. The Young Turks' Program of the Extermination of the Armenians and the Preparation of the Genocidal Policy	15
2.2. The First Stage of the Armenian Genocide: The Conscription and the Extermination of the Armenian Male Population in the Ottoman Army	18
2.3. The Second Stage of the Armenian Genocide: The Extermination of the Intelligentsia	20
2.4. The Third Stage of the Armenian Genocide: The Deportation and Massacres of the Armenian population	22
2.5. The Fourth Stage of the Armenian Genocide: The Annihilation of the Survived Armenians in Concentration Camps of Syria and Mesopotamia	25
2.6. The Heroic Self-Defense of Van	26
2.7. The Heroic Self-Defense of Musa Dagħ	29

2.8. The Return of the Western Armenian Refugees, and the Rebuilding of the country in 1917	31
--	----

CHAPTER III
THE CONTINUATION OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE
(1918–1922)

3.1. The Massacres of Armenians of the Province of Akhalkalaki in 1918	34
3.2. Massacres of the Armenians in Baku, 1918	36
3.3. The Extermination of the Armenians of Cilicia and Smyrna by Kemalists (1919–1922)	38
3.4. The Western Armenian Refugees and the Armenian Orphans in the Republic of Armenia (1918–1920)	41

CHAPTER IV
THE ARMENIAN QUESTION IN
THE INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS, AND THE CONSEQUENCES
OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

4.1. Boundary between Turkey and Armenia by the Treaty of Sevres and by the Arbitral Award of US President Woodrow Wilson	44
4.2. The Attempts of Turkey to Cancel Wilson’s Arbitral Award and the Treaty of Sevres with the Agreements of Alexandrapol, Moscow and Kars	46
4.3. The Consequences of the Armenian Genocide: Cultural Genocide	49
4.4. The Formation of the Armenian Diaspora	52

CHAPTER V
THE POLICY OF THE PERSECUTION OF
THE ARMENIANS IN AZERBAIJAN: THE INTERNATIONAL
RECOGNITION OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE AND
THE ISSUE OF REPARATION

5.1. The Policy of Genocide and Ethnic Cleansing against the Armenians of Azerbaijan (1988–1990)	55
5.2. The Process of International Recognition and Condemnation of the Armenian Genocide	57
5.3. The Principles of the Pan-Armenian Declaration, and the Problem of Overcoming the Consequences of the Armenian Genocide	64

ARMEN MARUKYAN

**THE FUNDAMENTAL ISSUES OF THE
HISTORY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE**

Cover and content design: N. Adamyan

Publisher: L. Muradyan

Signed for printing: 12.12.2018

Copies: 200

**ՀՀ ԳԻՏՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆԵՐԻ ԱԶԳԱՅԻՆ ԱԿԱԳԵՄԻԱ
ՊԱՏՄՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԻՆՍՏԻՏՈՒՏ
ИНСТИТУТ ИСТОРИИ НАН РА
INSTITUTE OF HISTORY OF NAS RA**

ՀՀ, 0019, Երևան, Մարշալ Բաղրամյան պող. 24/4
РА, 0019, Ереван, пр. Маршала Баграмяна 24/4
24/4, Marshal Baghramyan Ave., 0019, Yerevan
<http://www.academhistory.am>