

LEADING SPECIALISTS IN THE FIELD OF GENOCIDE STUDIES ON THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

(References from contemporary Encyclopedias)

Israel W. Charny (Israeli psychologist and genocide scholar, executive director of the Institute on the Holocaust and Genocide, Jerusalem, Professor of Psychology and Family Therapy, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, founder of the International Association of Genocide Scholars, editor-in-chief and executive director of GPN – Genocide Prevention Now)

“...The Armenian Genocide represents the first major genocide of the murderous twentieth century in which the awesome power of state machinery was applied for systematic killing (one Israeli scholar has since characterized the Armenian Genocide as “a dress rehearsal for the Holocaust”); moreover, the Armenian Genocide has succeeded in recent years in generating a considerable body of scholarship second only to scholarship on the Holocaust” (p. LXIX).

Charny, Israel W. Editor`s Introduction. In: Charny, Israel W. (Ed.) Encyclopedia of Genocide. Santa Barbara, CA; Denver, CO; Oxford, UK: ABC-CLIO, 1999, Vol. 1.

Alexander Mikaberidze (Hubert H. Humphries Professor of History, Louisiana State University, Shreveport)

“Every war witnessed war crimes, be it cultural violations (destruction of churches, monasteries, libraries, or other places of cultural importance), heinous mistreatment of civilians and prisoners or genocidal massacres of the weaker side. This seems to be especially true for the 20th century that witnessed a staggering loss of human lives. The century opened with the 1904 massacre of the Hereros in Southwest Africa and was then plagued with a succession of genocidal massacres – the 1915-1923 Armenian genocide...” (p. XXIII).

Mikaberidze, Alexander. Introduction. In: Mikaberidze, Alexander (Ed.). Atrocities, Massacres, and War Crimes. An Encyclopedia. Santa Barbara, California, Denver, Colorado, Oxford, England: ABC-CLIO, 2013, Vol. 1.

Alan Whitehorn (Professor of Political Science, Royal Military College of Canada, Kingston, Ontario)

“The Armenian Genocide is a reminder of the risks of not learning the lessons of history, the dangers of genocide denial, and the long-term negative consequences of allowing perpetrators to go unpunished. These were contributing factors to subsequent genocides. The knowledge of past genocides, such as the Armenian case, is a key to understanding and preventing future genocide. The mass slaughter of the Armenians was, however, instrumental in the birth of two important human rights concepts: ‘crimes against humanity’ and ‘genocide’.”

“The Armenian Genocide of 1915 became an important precedent for later genocides such as the Holocaust.”

Whitehorn, Alan. *Armenian Genocide*. In: *Genocide Awareness and Prevention Month 2013*, ABCCLIO:
<http://www.historyandtheheadlines.abcclio.com/ContentPages/ContentPage.aspx?entryId=1797707¤tSection=1797513&productid=61>.

Michael R. Taylor (Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy, Oklahoma State University)

“Genocide is the attempt to eradicate a people due to their race, religion, ethnicity, or nationality, usually by means of mass slaughter. The Holocaust, in which the Nazis murdered about 6 million Jews along with millions of others, is probably the most widely known genocide of the 20th century. Although the Holocaust may be unique in other respects, it is not unique in its being genocide. Over the 20th century and into the 21st century, genocide has occurred in Cambodia, Germany, Iraq, Turkey, and Rwanda, and intervention has been rare. Some of these acts of genocide were probably preventable, and great harm might have been averted had the international community taken swift, decisive action” (p. 508).

“The genocide perpetrated by the government of Turkey in 1915 against its Armenian population was apparently motivated by concerns for national security, as was Saddam Hussein’s genocide directed against the Kurds of Iraq. ...The government of Turkey, allied with Germany during World War I, suspected that some of Turkey’s Armenians were aiding opposing powers. The Armenians were taken to pose a threat to national security, and their elimination was a way of resolving this issue” (p. 509).

Taylor, Michael R. Genocide. In: Bryant, Clifton D. and Peck, Dennis L. (Eds.) Encyclopedia of Death & the Human Experience. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 2009, Vol. 1.

Yves Ternon (French physician and medical historian, an author of historical books about the Jewish Holocaust and the Armenian Genocide, Professor of the History of Medicine, University Paris IV Sorbonne)

“Coined in the twentieth century, the word genocide denotes a crime of exceptional gravity, the most extreme violation of the rights of man: denial of the right to live to many people. ...The uniqueness of the genocide of the Jews, with its specific and exclusive characteristics in this century doesn’t, however, preclude the use of the term genocide in qualifying other crimes. One notes perhaps in particular the annihilation by the Union and Progress Party, at the head of the Ottoman government in the years 1915-1916, of the Armenian communities then living in Ottoman Empire. This genocide was also perpetrated as a ‘final solution’ to a problem which had gone unsolved for 40 years” (pp. 562-563).

Ternon, Yves. The Twentieth Century, a Century of Genocide. In: Charny, Israel W. (Ed.) Encyclopedia of Genocide. Santa Barbara, CA; Denver, CO; Oxford, UK: ABC-CLIO, 1999, Vol. 2.

Winston E. Langley (Provost, Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Member of the Board of Visitors, University of Massachusetts)

“Regarded as the ultimate crime and the gravest possible violation of human rights, genocide occupies a prominent place in human history, including twentieth-century history. In 1915, for example, the Ottoman Turks conducted the systematic extermination of over an estimated 1 million Armenians” (p. 133).

Genocide. In: Langley, Winston E. (Ed.) Encyclopedia of Human Rights Issues Since 1945. London, Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 1999.

Javaid Rehman (Professor of Islamic Law, Muslim Constitutionalism and Human Rights Law, Brunei University, London)

“...Genocide has been practiced since the beginning of human history. Many tragic instances of genocide could be recounted. These would include the horrifying massacres resulting from Assyrian warfare during the seventh and eighth centuries BCE and the Roman obliteration of the city of Carthage and all its inhabitants. Religion has been used as a weapon for generating intolerance and for the ultimate destruction and genocide of religious minorities. Within the texts of religious scriptures, various forms of genocide of religious minorities are sanctioned. The tragic wars of the medieval period and the Middle Ages, the crusades, and the Jihads (Islamic holy wars) translated these religious ordinances to complete and thorough use. Many of the contemporary genocidal conflicts are based around religious supremacy. The process of colonization resulted in the extermination and genocide of indigenous and colonized peoples. More recently, during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the mechanism of genocide has been practiced on a very wide scale. Thus, the Armenian Genocide conducted by the Ottoman Turks between 1895 and 1896 in the massacres of nearly 200,000 Armenians. The Turks repeated this practice of genocide of the Armenian people during World War I” (p. 493).

Rehman, Javaid. Genocide. In: Scutsch, Carl (Ed.) Encyclopedia of the World's Minorities. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Allen D. Grimshaw (Professor Emeritus of Sociology, Indiana University)

“Of all the democides between 1900 and the end of World War II those of Turkey (Armenia) and Nazi Germany are probably best known...” (p. 61).

Grimshaw, Allen D. Genocide and Democide. In: Kurtz, Lester R. (Ed.). Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace and Conflict. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 1999, Vol. 2.

Ervin Staub (Professor Emeritus of Psychology, University of Massachusetts, Amherst)

“Genocidal ideologies can have both nationalist and bitter-world elements. For example, the Nazi ideology included the concept of ‘lebensraum’ or living space, the right of Germans to more territory, clearly nationalist in nature. It also included the concept of the purity of race. While its focus was the protection of Germans from Jews, Gypsies, and others, even genetically inferior Germans, it implied that by eliminating the contamination of higher races by lower ones all the higher races would be improved. The ‘auto genocide’ in

Cambodia was based on a vision of total social equality derived in part from communism, but had nationalistic building blocks and elements. The genocide of the Armenians in Turkey was shaped by a 'pan-Turkish', nationalistic ideology. The violence in Bosnia was based on a combination of fear, hate and ambition that manifested itself in a primarily nationalistic form. ...Scapegoating some group, identifying it as responsible for life problems, provides an explanation for the difficult conditions of life, and makes people feel better about themselves. Pointing to enemies also brings people together, help them unite. The group's culture often includes a history of devaluation of the group that becomes the scapegoat and ideological enemy (the Jews, the Armenians), or a historical rift (between the people in the cities and in the countryside in Cambodia). At times the difficult conditions themselves arise from conflict and enmity with another group, or there is a history of mutual antagonism between the two groups (like Hutus and Tutsis in Rwanda and Burundi). Long-standing traditions of dehumanization and antagonism can be greatly and seedily intensified and catapulted into frenzied extremes relatively easily and in amazingly short periods of time by propaganda campaigns, for example, Hitler's repeated documentations of the Jews in contexts of majestic public events accompanied by stirring pageantry and marital spirit. There was an extensive state-run radio campaign against the Tutsi preceding the Rwanda Genocide in 1994" (pp. 347-349).

Staub, Ervin and Charny, Israel W. Ideology of Genocide. In: Charny, Israel W. Encyclopedia of Genocide. Santa Barbara, CA; Denver, CO; Oxford, UK: ABC-CLIO, 1999, Vol. 2.

Eric D. Weitz (Dean of Humanities and Arts, Professor of History, City College, City University of New York)

"...Genocides take on truly massive proportions when racism or extreme nationalism becomes the guiding principles of the state. The infamous, though not exclusive, examples are the late Ottoman Empire under the Young Turks, Nazi Germany, the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda. In all of these instances, the state promised its followers a future of unbounded happiness and prosperity once the supposed enemy group – Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, Jews in Third Reich, Croats and Muslims in Yugoslavia, Tutsis under a radical Hutu government – was eliminated. At the same time, moderate members of the dominant group who opposed the genocides were also killed. No genocide occurs divorced from other human rights violations" (pp. 410-411).

"...Most modern genocides have occurred in the context of war or vast domestic upheaval, when old rules no longer apply and conditions of instability both heighten the sense of insecurity and open up visions of great transformations, of finally laying to rest internal social divisions and creating a prosperous, harmonious future. The First World War was the landmark event because it created a culture of killing and revealed what highly organized states could accomplish. It is no surprise that the first modern genocide, that of the Armenians, occurred in context of total war when the Young Turk rulers were threatened by the Allied powers and demonized the Armenian population as traitors. At the same time, the Young Turks imagined a vast, homogeneous pan-Turkic empire, which could only be accomplished, they believed, through the deportation and massacres of Armenians. Similarly,

Jews in Nazi Germany were subject to the most severe discrimination in the 1930s, but it was only in the context of total war that the Nazis unleashed the Holocaust” (pp. 409-410).

Weitz, Eric D. *Genocide*. In: Kuper, Adam and Kuper, Jessica (Eds.). *The Social Science Encyclopedia*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

William A. Schabas (Canadian academic in the field of international criminal and human rights law, Professor of International Law, Middlesex University, Professor of International Human Law and Human Rights, Leiden University, President of the International Association of Genocide Scholars)

“The paradigm of modern genocides is of course the Nazi Holocaust or Shoah, the partially successful attempt to exterminate the Jews of Europe. In the twentieth century three other manifestations of genocide stand out: the attack on the Herero people by German colonialists in German Southwest Africa (now Namibia) in 1904, the massacres of the Armenians by the Ottoman Turkish regime in 1915, and the attempted extermination of Rwanda’s Tutsi population by racist extremists in 1994” (p. 294).

Schabas, William A. *Genocide*. In: Forsythe, David P. (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of Human Rights*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009, Vol. 2.

“The beginnings of this new vision of criminal justice were already apparent at the time of World War I, when Britain, France, and Russia warned that they would hold perpetrators to account for ‘these new crimes of Turkey against humanity and civilization.’ But the idea that a state and its leaders could be held accountable for atrocities committed against their own nationals remained extremely controversial, and it was this lacuna in the law that Lemkin worked to fill” (p. 124).

Schabas, William A. *The Law and Genocide*. In: Bloxham, Donald and Moses, A. Dirk (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 2013.

Jerry Fowler

“Already familiar with the Ottoman campaign of murder and deportation against the Armenians that began in 1915, he [Lemkin] understood the murderous implications of Nazi ideology much sooner than most of his contemporaries” (pp. 540-541).

“Use of the term ‘genocide’ continues to provoke fierce debate. Human rights activists and experts quarrel over its application to specific cases of atrocity, such as Cambodia under the Khmer Rouge from 1975 to 1979, the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina from 1992 to 1995, and the civil war in Darfur, Sudan, in the early years of the twenty-first century. Its use takes on an enormous symbolic importance, and suggestions that other terms, such as crimes against humanity, better describe the reality are met with charges of trivialization. ...President George W. Bush argued against using the word ‘genocide’ to describe the massacres of the Armenians by the Ottoman Turks in 1915. President Bush explained his position not with reference to objective facts but instead insisted it was not good policy to anger an ally in the war on terrorism” (p. 295).

Fowler, Jerry. Genocide. In: Christensen, Karen and Levinson, David (Eds.). Encyclopedia of Community. From the Village to the Virtual World. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2003, Vol. 1.

Sally J. Scholz (Professor of Philosophy, Villanova University, editor of *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy*)

“In his 1944 work *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe*, Raphael Lemkin coined the word ‘genocide’ in order to designate the scale of atrocities that he had spent much of his adult life fighting. Lemkin combined the Greek word for people, race, or tribe with a word derived from Latin meaning ‘to kill’. His aim was to identify the mass scale atrocity that targets a people. He recognized that planned and coordinated destruction of a people or a nation aims not solely or even primarily at outright killing but also at the destruction of culture, language, traditions, and social and political infrastructures. ...The genocide that inspired Lemkin to fight for international laws barring acts that intend to destroy a nation or people, is the Armenian genocide during World War I. On April 24, 1915, the Turks of the Ottoman Empire began rounding up thousands of Armenians and forcibly exiling them in a campaign that has come to be recognized as the first major genocide of the modern era. It is estimated that one and a half million Armenians were systematically killed by the military or starved while on the forced marches out of the Ottoman Empire...” (p. 387).

Scholz, Sally J. Genocide. In: Chatterjee, Deen K. (Ed.) Encyclopedia of Global Justice. New York: Springer, 2011, Vol. 1.

A. Dirk Moses (Chair of Global and Colonial History, European University Institute, Florence, editor-in-chief of the *Journal of Genocide Research*)

“The genocide concept is also the culmination of a long tradition of European legal and political critique of imperialism and warfare against civilians. All of the instances about which he [Lemkin] wrote for his projected world history of genocide occurred in imperial contexts or involved warfare against civilian populations. Most of his [Lemkin] case studies from the Eurasian land mass were taken from continental empires: the Roman Empire, the Mongols, the Ottoman Empire, Charlemagne and the spread of German peoples eastwards since the Middle Ages. Here is a typical statement from an article in the *Christian Science Monitor* in 1948: ‘The destruction of Carthage, the destruction of the Albigenses and Waldenses, the Crusades, the march of Teutonic Knights, the destruction of the Christians under the Ottoman Empire, the massacres of the Herero in Africa, the extermination of the Armenians, the slaughter of the Christian Assyrians in Iraq in 1933, the destruction of the Maronites, the pogroms of Jews in Tsarist Russia and Romania – all these are classical genocide cases (Lemkin, Raphael. *War against Genocide*. In: *Christian Science Monitor*, 31 January 1948)’ (pp. 25-26).

“‘Barbarity’ and ‘Vandalism’ are of relevance for genocide because of their focus on group protection. He [Lemkin] had been indignant that the Turkish perpetrators of the Armenian deportations and massacres were able largely to escape prosecution, and appalled by the massacres of the Assyrian Christians in Iraq” (pp. 30-31)

Moses, Dirk A. Lemkin, Culture, and Concept of Genocide. In: Bloxham, Donald and Moses, A. Dirk (Eds.). The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Michael J. Bazylar (Professor of Law, Whittier Law School, Costa Mesa, California)

“The term ‘crimes against humanity’ was first utilized in international law in the 1915 joint declaration of Great Britain, France and Russia in response to the massacres of the Armenian population in Ottoman Empire. The term was formally defined by the Nuremberg Charter, during the prosecution of the Nazi war criminals. Article 6(c) of the Charter defines crimes against humanity as “murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation, and other inhumane acts committed against any civilian population, before or during the war, or persecutions on political, racial or religious grounds in execution of or in connection with any crime within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal, whether or not in violation of the domestic law of the country where perpetrated’ ” (pp. 153-154).

Bazylar, Michael J. Crimes against Humanity. In: Charny, Israel W. (Ed.) Encyclopedia of Genocide. Santa Barbara, CA; Denver, CO; Oxford, UK: ABC-CLIO, 1999, Vol. 1.

Leslie Alan Horvitz (The author of more than twenty novels, including *The Memory Hole, The Donors, Double Blinded, The Dying, and Causes Unknown*, published in Germany, Poland, Hungary, Norway, Japan, Russia, South Korea, Brazil, and the UK, the author of several works of nonfiction, most recently *The Essential Book of Weather Folklore, The Encyclopedia of War Crimes and Genocide, The Weather Tracker, Night Sky Tracker Eureka: Scientific Breakthroughs That Changed the World, and Understanding Depression with Dr. Raymond De Paulo of Johns Hopkins University*)

“The earliest use of the term is found in the Hague Convention of 1907, although it is based in CUSTOMARY LAW during armed conflict. That is to say, the codified law pertaining to crimes against humanity evolved from principles and values that have gained almost universal acceptance throughout history. Even though most international agreements in the early years of the 20th century covered the conduct of armed parties to a conflict, there were exceptions, notably the forced deportations and massacres of Armenians by Ottoman Turks in 1915, which involved the use of military force against an unarmed civilian population. A commission established in 1919 found that Turkish officers had in fact been culpable of ‘crimes against the laws of humanity’ for their treatment of the Armenians, yet both the United States and Japan opposed the criminalizing of these acts because they were violations of moral law” (p. 110).

Crimes against Humanity. In: Horvitz, Leslie Alan and Catherwood, Christopher. *Encyclopedia of War Crimes and Genocide*. New York: Facts on File, Inc., 2006.

“...Adolf Hitler famously cited the annihilation of the Armenians when he made plans to carry out genocidal warfare against the Jews” (p. 25).

Armenian Genocide. In: Horvitz, Leslie Alan and Catherwood, Christopher. *Encyclopedia of War Crimes and Genocide*. New York: Facts on File, Inc., 2006.

“...The outbreak of World War I gave the Ottomans the pretext needed to denounce the Armenians as treasonous and intensify their genocidal campaign, which took place in four

stages. The first stage targeted all able-bodied Armenian men aged 20-45 who were recruited into the army not to fight but to serve as laborers; many of them were later executed. In the next stage, which began in April 1915, prominent figures in the community, including political leaders, intellectuals, and priests, were rounded up, deported..., or executed. Then, in May, the Ottomans deported the remaining Armenian population, claiming that they were being resettled in the deserts of Mesopotamia. Thousands perished from starvation and exposure during these deportations, but about 200,000-300,000 survived. In the fourth stage, additional massacres were ordered to eliminate the remnant of the uprooted population. Three methods of murder were employed: beating with clubs, mass drowning, and burning. Young Turk functionaries fanned out to supervise the operation. Local party leaders and hardened criminals were conscripted to help with the executions.

The massacres did not entirely escape international attention. News reports from the time vividly illustrate the concerns raised by governments and relief agencies in response to the atrocities. On April 27, 1915, for instance, the New York Times, in a story headlined 'Appeal to Turkey to Stop Massacres,' reported that the secretary of state had instructed the U.S. ambassador to Turkey to 'make representations to the Turkish authorities asking that steps be taken for the protection of imperiled Armenians and to prevent the recurrence of religious outbreaks.' The diplomatic efforts were in vain. On July 29 the British Foreign Office reported that the killings of Armenians 'had recently increased both in number and in degree of atrocity.' On August 18 the New York Times carried the headline 'Turks Accused of Plan to Exterminate Whole Population – People of Karahisar Massacred.' Quoting a letter from Constantinople a month previously to a British Member of Parliament, the story recounted the forced deportations: 'We now know with certainty from a reliable source that the Armenians have been deported in a body from all the towns and villages in Cilicia to the desert regions south of Aleppo. The refugees will have to traverse on foot a distance, requiring marches of whom one to two or even more months.

We learned, besides, that the roads and the Euphrates are strewn with corpses of exiles, and those who survive are doomed to certain death, since they will find neither house, work, nor food in the desert. It is a plan to exterminate the whole Armenian people. ... Many have fallen from blows from clubs.'

In early September the American Armenian Relief Fund Committee quoted letters from witnesses on the scene: 'These [Armenian] people are being removed without any of their goods and chattels, and to places where the climate is totally unsuited to them. They are left without shelter, without food, and without clothing, depending only upon the morsels of bread which the Government will throw before them, a Government which is unable even to feed its own troops.' A second letter, written on July 12, observes: 'A population of 1,500,000 are marching today, the stick of forced pilgrimage in hand, toward the Mesopotamian wilderness, to live among Arabian and Kurdish savage tribes. Very few of them will be able to reach the spots designated for their exile, and those who do will perish from starvation, if no immediate relief reaches them.'

Estimates of the total number of Armenians who died as a result of the massacres and deportations vary, ranging up to 1.5 million out of prewar Armenian population estimated at 1.8 million. An Ottoman interior minister has acknowledged that 800,000 were killed outright. Several thousand, however, managed to escape – 250,000 to the Caucasus, either to

present-day Armenia, then under Russian influence, or Georgia. It is believed that about 100,000 Armenian women were forced to convert to Islam. Thousands of other survivors went to Europe or America. In spite of the atrocities, approximately 60,000 Armenians currently live in Turkey, mainly in Istanbul” (pp. 25-26).

Armenian Genocide. In: Horvitz, Leslie Alan and Catherwood, Christopher. Encyclopedia of War Crimes and Genocide. New York: Facts on File, Inc., 2006.

Joshua Castellino (Professor of Law and Head of Law Department, Middlesex University of London)

“Most ‘classical’ example of the death march was the one that occurred as part of the Armenian genocide in Ottoman Turkey (part of the fading Ottoman Empire) in 1915. ...The historical record suggests that the death march was methodically orchestrated, carried out in a systematized manner, clearly intended as genocide, and calculated to achieve this through a host of measures, including outright brutal killings, slow starvation and dehydration, death through trauma and exhaustion. It is estimated that this genocide was responsible for the deaths of up to half a million Armenians. While it is hard to estimate the exact number of those who perished in the march, the ways in which the expelled Armenians met their deaths make this episode of human history stand out, even among other death marches, as singularly brutal and horrifying” (pp. 226-227).

Castellino, Joshua. Death March. In: Shelton, Dinah L. (Ed.). Encyclopedia of Genocide and Crimes against Humanity. Farmington Hills, MI: Thomson Gale, 2005.

Benjamin Lieberman (Professor of History at the Fitchburg State College, MA, USA)

“The Ottoman Empire had already experienced mass violence against Armenians, most notably with the massacres of Armenians carried out under Sultan Abdul Hamid II that peaked in 1895, but the First World War still brought unprecedented radicalization in anti-Armenian policy” (p. 50).

“The persecution of Armenians during the First World War incorporated many of the chief features of ethnic cleansing. ...In this case ethnic cleansing led to genocide” (p. 50).

“In the Ottoman Empire, leaders of the Committee of Union and Progress, the political party that had seized power just before the war, adopted policies of deportation, outright ethnic cleansing, and genocide. Many, though not all, Greeks, were deported from selected coastal regions of the Turkey, and in 1915 Armenians were deported from most of Turkey in a campaign of ethnic cleansing and genocide. ...Across the Anatolia Armenians were ordered out of their homes and for the most part driven south into the deserts of Syria and Mesopotamia. As in many cases of ethnic cleansing, the campaign began in border areas, but it soon spread across most of the Ottoman Empire. This was a coordinated policy carried out against a group identified by both ethnicity and religion. There were a few exceptions to this policy in that the Armenian communities of the largest cities of the western empire, Smyrna (Izmir) and Constantinople (Istanbul), were not destroyed at this time, though Armenians living in Constantinople without their families and some political figures were targeted, and more sweeping deportations of Armenians were considered. At the same time

Turkish deportations of Armenians also led to genocide. Frequent massacres, especially of Armenian men, repeated assaults along routes southward, and the predictable lack of food and water in the desert heat caused the extermination of Armenians. This was ethnic cleansing so severe that it reached the level of genocide” (p. 50)

“...The closest parallels to the Armenian Genocide during the Holocaust can be found in areas where Romania initiated ethnic cleansing during the Second World War: Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina. ...As in the case of the Armenian genocide, extraordinarily violent deportations led to genocide. Of the 125,000 to 150,000 Jews forced into Transnistria only approximately 50,000 survived the war. Much as in the Armenian Genocide, massacres, exposure, starvation, and disease predictably caused large numbers of deaths, though Jews forced into Transnistria in 1941 suffered from cold where Armenians at least in 1915 more often suffered from extreme heat” (pp. 52-53).

Lieberman, Benjamin. 'Ethnic Cleansing' Versus Genocide. In: Bloxham, Donald and Moses, A. Dirk. The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies. New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 2013.

Robert Melson (Professor Emeritus of Political Science and a member of the Jewish studies program, Purdue University, Indiana, President of the International Association of Genocide Scholars, 2003-2005)

“The Armenian Genocide and the Holocaust were the quintessential instances of total genocide in the modern era. Four reasons may be cited for this claim. First, both mass-murders were the products of state-initiated policies whose intentions were the elimination of the Armenian community from the Ottoman Empire and of the Jews from Germany and Europe and even beyond Europe. These were unmistakable instances of what the United Nations has called ‘genocide-in-whole,’ or ‘total genocide,’ to distinguish such instances from ‘genocide-in-part.’ Examples of partial genocide from which both differ are the destruction of Overseas Chinese in Indonesia in 1965, Ibos in Northern Nigeria in 1967, and Muslims in Bosnia in 1992-1996.

Second, both victimized groups were ethno religious communities that had been partially integrated and assimilated into the larger society, the Ottoman Empire and European society respectively. Their destruction was only a war against foreign strangers. It was a mass-murder that commenced with an attack on an internal domestic segment of the state’s own society. Thus the Armenian Genocide and the Holocaust were instances not only of ‘total genocide’ but of ‘total domestic genocide’ – to differentiate these two cases from the genocide of foreign groups, that is, foreign with regards to the borders of the state...

...Third, Armenians and Jews were unmistakably communal or ethnic groups, not political groups or classes whose non-inclusion under the original UN definition of genocide has generated much criticism. Although Armenians and Jews may have occupied certain strata in the social structures of the Ottoman Empire, Germany and Europe, they were not social classes like, for example, the Kulaks of the Soviet Union and the urban Cambodians that were destroyed by the Stalinists and the Khmer Rouge, respectively.

Fourth, both the Armenian Genocide and the Holocaust were the products of modern ideologies and the circumstances of revolution and war. The Armenian Genocide occurred

under the circumstances of the Turkish revolution and the First World War, while the Holocaust was a product of the Nazi revolution and the Second World War.

For centuries Armenians had been tolerated as minority (dhimmi) millet in the Ottoman Empire. They welcomed the Young Turk revolution of 1908, hoping that it would improve their situation, which had become increasingly desperate under the regime of Sultan Abdul Hamid II. However, following the Ottoman military disasters of 1908-1912, the Young Turks abandoned Ottoman tolerance for the ideology of Pan-Turkism, a variant of contemporary organic or integral nationalism, and by 1915, under the circumstances of the First World War, they deported and destroyed the Armenian community.

...Although there are striking similarities between the Armenian Genocide and the Holocaust, there are differences as well. Three may be briefly listed: First, the Armenian millet in the Ottoman Empire, like the Jews of Europe, occupied a distinctively inferior status; however, unlike the Jews, Armenians were never stigmatized as deicides, killers of God. The Jews being viewed as deicides, on the one hand, and their demands for inclusion on the other, may explain why the Jews were met by a racist anti-Semitic movement that demonized and excluded them in a manner quite distinct from the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire.

Second, Armenians were largely a peasant society living on its own lands in Cilicia and the eastern provinces of Anatolia, while the Jews were largely an urban community scattered throughout Germany and Europe and not concentrated on its ancestral lands. The result was that in the period of nationalism, there existed Armenian nationalist political parties demanding territorial autonomy and self-administration; while, with the exception of the Zionist movement, the Jews of Europe were hoping for assimilation and inclusion in their countries of domicile. The Armenian Genocide, in contrast to the Holocaust, therefore, included not only a destruction of the Armenian community, but also the loss of ancestral Armenian lands dating back to the pre-Christian era.

Third, in contrast to the Young Turks who had nationalist and imperial aspirations, the Nazis were a totalitarian movement whose radicalist anti-Semitic ideology had global scope. The result was that the Holocaust, in contrast to the Armenian and other genocides, was global in its intentions and scope as well. For example, the Nazis demanded of their Japanese allies that they hand over their Jews for destruction. Although the Japanese refused, this example illustrates the difference in the ideological intentions between the Nazis and the Young Turks. The former saw themselves in the global war against the Jews, while the latter wished to eliminate the Armenians from Anatolia and the rest of their Pan-Turkic realm. Unlike the Nazis, the Young Turks did not aspire to exterminate their victims the world over” (pp. 69-70).

Melson, Robert. The Armenian Genocide and Holocaust compared. In: Charny, Israel W. (Ed.) Encyclopedia of Genocide. Santa Barbara, CA; Denver, CO; Oxford, UK: ABC-CLIO, 1999, Vol. 1.

Alister McGrath (Northern Irish theologian, priest, intellectual, historian, and Christian apologist)

“The twentieth century opened with a catastrophe which traumatized Christians in the eastern Mediterranean region, and which was an ominous portent of things to come later that

century. The ailing Ottoman Empire found itself caught up in the Great War, and began to fragment following a series of rebellions against Ottoman rule in the Middle East and beyond. The Ottoman Empire was a predominantly Islamic region, which was home to a significant number of non-Islamic peoples, including Armenian Christians. The Armenian people had adopted the Christian faith in 301, and regarded themselves as the oldest Christian nation in the region. In 1915, a series of massacres and forced deportations claimed the lives of between 1 million and 1.5 million Armenians – an event now referred to as the ‘Armenian Genocide. ...While the massacres of April 1915 were directed against non-Islamic religious minorities in general, rather than against Christians in particular, the people most severely affected were the Armenians. These events took place deep within the Ottoman Empire, under wartime conditions which made communication and intervention virtually impossible. Nothing could be done to stop the killings” (287-288).

“However, the Treaty of Sevres was not formally ratified and never came into force. It was replaced by the Treaty of Lausanne (July 24, 1923), which did not contain any provisions respecting the punishment of war crimes. Instead, it set out a ‘Declaration of Amnesty’ for all offenses committed by Turkish agents between August 1, 1914, and November 20, 1922 – including the Armenian Genocide. No action was taken against Turkey, leading many – such as Adolf Hitler – to conclude that the international community was prepared to tolerate such acts of genocide, especially when they took place in the ‘fog of war’ ” (p. 210).

The Armenian Genocide of 1915. In: McGrath, Alister E. Christian History: An Introduction. Malden, MA, Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.

Claude Hargrove (Professor of History, Fayetteville University)

“Fearing military defeat, the Young Turk triumvirate decided to strike out against the group they saw as the enemy within the gates: the Armenian minority. The Armenians were seen as allied with Russia. An Armenian revolt in the town of Van was seen as proof: Enraged by the brutality of Governor Djevdet Bey, the Armenians in Van rose up against the Turkish authorities on April 20, 1915. On May 16, after much hard fighting, the Armenians were rescued when the Russia army captured the town from the Turks.

The Ottoman rulers` response was swift. Under the direction of Talaat Pasha, Armenians began to be forced to leave the Ottoman lands. Throughout eastern Anatolia, Armenian men of military age were rounded up, marched off for several miles, and shot. Armenian women, children, and old men were ordered, at bayonet point, to leave their home villages and move to relocation centers in the Syrian Desert.

No effort was made to provide these forced emigrants with food, water, or shelter, and thousands of them dropped dead of hunger, thirst, exhaustion, or disease during the long march to Syria. Many of them were murdered. Survivors were sometimes raped or forced to convert to Islam.

The deportations began in April, 1915, in Cilicia, a Mediterranean coastal province, and spread into other provinces through October. On August 4, Van was recaptured from the Russians. Only in Smyrna and in Constantinople were most of the Armenians spread. On a few occasions groups of Armenians were able to mount an armed resistance, but generally the Turkish army and police had superior power.

By the beginning of 1916, the deportations had been mostly completed, but occasional outbreaks of violence against Armenians continued until the Turks signed an armistice with the Allies on October 30, 1918. The exact number of Armenians killed through deportations and massacres will never be known; it seems likely that about one million perished” (pp. 312-313).

Hargrove, Claude. Attack on Armenians. In: Dawson, Dawn P. (Ed.). Great Events.1900-2001. Pasadena, CA, Hackensack, NJ, 2002, Vol. 1 (1900-1920).

Andrew J.L. Waskey (Professor of Social Science at the Dalton State College)

“Prior to World War I, territorial advancement of the Russian Empire had led to the creation of a Russian Armenia. During the war, the Russian government recruited thousands of Armenians to join the army and fight against the Ottoman Empire. In 1914, there were perhaps 2 million Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire. In 1915, leaders in Constantinople, notably the Interior Minister Mehmed Talaat Pasha, the Minister of War Enver Pasha, and the Minister of the Navy Jemal Pasha decided that the Armenians were a threat to Turkey and needed to be eliminated. The Turkish ruling triumvirate found a pretext for the massacre with the claim that the Armenians were openly supporting the Russians. The Turkish government planned to proceed in stages. First, they would kill the chief Armenian leaders. The Turks would then disarm the Armenian soldiers in the Ottoman Army and place them in labor battalions on the railroads, where they might be killed off in small groups. The Turks would then move against the outlying Armenian villages, endeavoring to kill all their inhabitants. Finally, the cities would be emptied of their Armenian populations. The Turks planned to kill many of the men and teenage boys. Those who remained, chiefly women and children, would be sent on forced marches to the eastern desert areas. Worn down by exhaustion and starvation, only a minority were expected to survive.

On the night of April 23, 1915, a coordinated Turkish government operation led to the arrest of hundreds of Armenian leaders. Many were executed or soon died in confinement. A few were saved by the intervention of U.S. Ambassador Henry Morgenthau and others. As further punishment for supporting the Russians, the triumvirate ordered local authorities forcibly to relocate the Armenian in Anatolia to Aleppo, and then to remote mountainous or desert locations in the Mesopotamian Desert, such as Deir ez-Zor on the Euphrates River. These relocations were actually extermination marches during which most of the Armenians were murdered, beaten, and raped by Kurds or vengeful Turks. Estimates of the number of Armenians who died from violence, starvation, or disease as a result of this policy, range from between 600,000 and 1.5 million people.

In some locations, the Armenians resisted the forced removals. At Musa Dagh (Mount Moses) on the Mediterranean Sea near Antioch and the Orontes River in the late summer of 1915, the Armenians held out against the Ottoman Army for some 40 days. More than 3,000 Armenians in this location were eventually rescued by the French navy” (pp. 195-198).

Waskey, Andrew J. L. Armenian Genocide (1915-1916)..., pp. 30-33; Waskey, A. J. L. Armenia and the Armenian Massacres. In: Tucker, Spencer C. (Ed.). World War I. A Student Encyclopedia. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, Inc., Vol. I, 2005.

Alex Alvarez (Associate Professor, Department of Criminal Justice, Northern Arizona University, Director of the Martin-Springer Institute for Teaching the Holocaust, Tolerance, and Humanitarian Values)

“The first major example of genocide in the 20th century is generally considered to be the Armenian genocide. It began during the First World War, when the 3,000-year old Turkish Armenian population was largely destroyed. Close to a million and a half Armenian men, women, and children were murdered between the years of 1915 and 1918 by the Turkish government. Faring poorly in the war, the weakened Ottoman government was overthrown by a group of Turkish nationalists often referred to as the ‘Young Turks.’ This new regime scapegoated the Armenian population and blamed them for many of the setbacks during the war as well as a host of other domestic problems. The Turkish Armenian intelligentsia and leadership were arrested first and sent to a variety of secret locations, where they were murdered. Next to die were young Armenian males serving in the military, which were also removed from their positions and placed in penal battalions, where most were killed. In this way, any possible source of resistance was quickly and efficiently eliminated. The remaining Armenians, mostly women, children, and the elderly, were then gathered together and marched out to locations in the interior desert. Along the way, they were attacked by bandits and soldiers, and many died from these attacks and from exposure, exhaustion, and starvation...” (p. 202).

Alvarez, Alex. Genocide. In: Hickey, Eric (Ed.). Encyclopedia of Murder and Violent Crime. Thousand Oaks, CA; London: Sage Publications, 2003.

Bruce Masters (John Andrus Professor of History, Wesleyan University)

“The term Armenian Massacres refers to the massive deportation and execution of ethnic Armenians within Ottoman-controlled territories in 1915. Although the precise circumstances of these events and the total number of dead are hotly contested by scholars from opposing political camps, even the most conservative estimates place Armenian losses at approximately half a million. The higher figure given by Armenian scholars is one and a half million dead. The elimination of Armenian civilians as part of this process was well documented by accounts written by diplomats and missionaries from neutral nations who were present at the scene of the deportations.

This episode started in April 1915 during World War I, after the Ottoman suffered a major defeat at the hands of Russia. Ottoman authorities ordered the deportation of Armenians from eastern Anatolia to the Syrian Desert. The drastic step was taken because of reports that Armenian nationalists had aided the Russian invasion of Ottoman territory; according to some sources, this led Ottoman leaders in Istanbul to fear that all Armenians might prove disloyal in the case of further Russian advances. The process started with the limited deportation of men of military age, many of whom were summarily executed. As Armenians came to fear that conscription would lead simply to the execution of those drafted, armed Armenian resistance to the conscription broke out in Zeitun, near Marash, and later in Van, and the Ottoman authorities used this resistance as an excuse to order the wholesale

deportation of Armenian civilians from other provinces in the line of the possible Russian advance. The order for deportations soon expanded to include the entire Armenian population of the eastern provinces of the Ottoman Empire, perhaps a million people. The area affected included towns in central and southeastern Anatolia that were hundreds of miles from the front lines, a fact that has led many to conclude that Ottoman authorities had embarked on a genocidal policy of 'ethnic cleansing' so that no Armenians would remain in eastern or central Anatolia.

The expulsion of the Armenians was often accompanied by rape, plunder, and murder; many more of the deportees were killed, or died of hunger and exposure, en route to internment camps near Deir ez-Zor, a town on the Euphrates River in present day Syria. Many thousands of others died of starvation and disease in the concentration camps established there" (pp. 54-55).

Masters, Bruce. Armenian Massacres (Armenian Genocide). In: Agoston, Gabor and Masters, Bruce (Eds.). Encyclopedia of Ottoman Empire. New York: Facts on File, Inc., 2009.

Saul S. Friedman (Professor of Jewish and Middle Eastern History, Youngstown State University)

"Western ideology (anthropology, chauvinism, eugenics) and technology (development of the concentration camp, modern transportation, the gas chamber, weapons of mass destruction) have contributed to the eruption of several incidents of genocide on the periphery of Europe in the past century. The first (and, prior to World War II, the bloodiest) was the massacre of the Armenians in 1915-1916. Although the Turkish government continues to deny that there was any plan to exterminate the Armenians, the facts suggest otherwise. Following a botched invasion of Russia, Enver Pasha and Talaat Pasha, members of the Ottoman Empire's ruling triumvirate at that time, decided to blame Armenian traitors for the debacle. Historically, the Armenians had served as whipping boys for anything that went wrong in the Ottoman Empire. A successful, urban, mercantile class, Christians in an Islamic state, the Armenians were accused of following the lead of their Catholicos, or Patriarch, who lived beyond the Caucasus Mountains, at the expense of loyalty to the Ottoman Empire. Now they would pay by being deported by foot or boat or rail to death camps in the Syrian Desert. The U.S. Ambassador Henry Morgenthau, Sr. and the German missionary Johannes Lepsius protested the massacres, to no avail. One million Armenians perished in towns along the Black Sea or in the steamy desert at Deir ez-Zor. The Austrian-Jewish author Franz Werfel later wrote *The Forty Days of Musa Dagh* as a warning to civilization. Unfortunately, more Germans embraced the position of their ambassador, Hans von Wangenheim, who reported to Berlin that the inferior nation must make way for the superior one" (p. 139).

Friedman, Saul S. Genocide in Europe. In: Palmer-Fernandez, Gabriel (Ed.). Encyclopedia of Religion and War. New York: Routledge, 2004, p. 139.

Samuel Totten (Genocide scholar, Professor, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Member of the Council of the Institute on the Holocaust and Genocide, Jerusalem)

“A genocide committed against Armenians by the regime of the Committee of Union and Progress (Ittihad ve Terakki Jemyeti), also known as the Young Turks, in the Ottoman Empire in the period following April 24, 1915 (1915-1923). According to most accounts, at least 1 million – though, on the balance of probabilities, closer to 1.5 million – Armenians were slaughtered as a direct result of deliberate Turkish policies seeking their permanent eradication from the empire. At the time the genocide began, well after the outbreak of World War I, the Turkish military forces were waging war against the Russians in the northeast and the British, French, and Australian and New Zealand Army Corps (ANZAC) forces at Gallipoli, but resources were diverted to the campaign of murdering the Armenian population within the empire. The genocidal measures were far more extensive than any previous anti-Armenian massacres (such as those in 1894-1896 or at Adana in 1909) and saw all the relevant agencies of government directed toward the singular aim of totally destroying the Armenian population. That the genocide took place under cover of war was more than just a matter of interest; the war was in reality a crucial part of genocide’s success. By conducting deportations of Armenians in places far off the beaten track, forcing many victims (primarily women and children, including babies) into harsh, scorching-hot under populated regions of the empire, the Turks were able to exploit the war situation for the purpose of achieving their genocidal aims. Technology, in the form of modern telecommunications and transportation, was employed to coordinate the killing activities and speed up the process, while other minorities supportive of the Turks’ aims, in particular Kurdish and Arab allies, assisted in carrying out the murders. The eventual result was a loss of life – in a relatively short span of time – of what had hitherto been unimagined proportions. The worst of the killing was over within a year, but only because the ferocity of the Turks’ campaign led to a shortage of potential victims. This did not, however, stop the killing, and Armenian communities in various parts of the empire, where they were found, continued to be attacked up through the early 1920s” (pp. 19-20).

Armenian Genocide. In: Totten, Samuel and Bartrop, Paul R. Dictionary of Genocide. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2008, vol. 1.

“For many in Ottoman Turkish society, the racial necessity of the Armenian genocide required a justification that transcended ideology or abstract propaganda. Consequently, biological reasons were often raised for the need to remove Armenians from Turkish society; such reasons looked to medical science for support. Early statements referred to the Armenians as ‘dangerous microbes,’ and Dr. Mehmed Reshid (1873-1919), in particular, formulated ways to bring home to the Armenians their less-than-human status. Reducing them to the level of animals, Reshid pioneered the technique of nailing horseshoes to the feet of living men and marching them through the streets and of nailing Armenians to crosses in emulation of what which happened to Jesus Christ. This conception of his role placed his Turkish identity above that of his calling as a medical practitioner. In other instances, Turkish physicians were known to have killed Armenian children by injecting them with morphine prior to dumping them in the Black Sea, and Red Crescent hospitals were known to have poisoned Armenian children. Ultimately, Turkish physicians played a role in the Armenian genocide in several ways similar to that of the medical profession during the Nazi genocide of the Jews two decades later. Indeed, the perversion of medical science to the cause of genocide pointed to a major failure of the ethical underpinnings of medicine in Turkey early

in the twentieth century, a perversion taken up by others later. After World War I, a trial was held of those apprehended for the massacres that took place at Trebizond during the genocide; the doctors arraigned were for the most part acquitted” (pp. 21-22).

Armenian Genocide, Role of Turkish Physicians in. In: Totten, Samuel and Bartrop, Paul R.. Dictionary of Genocide. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press., 2008, vol. 1.

Cathal J. Nolan (Associate Professor of History and Executive Director of the International History Institute, Boston University)

“From 1915 through 1917 a second and far greater genocide against Armenians by the Ottomans took place. This was mainly a response to Armenian volunteers enlisting in fair numbers in anti-Turkish units fighting in support of the czar’s armies, and to several massacres of the Turks inside Russian-occupied Ottoman territory by an Armenian provisional government that had been proclaimed there in April 1915. The sultan’s forces reacted with a genocide of some 700,000 Armenians from 1915 to 1917. That is a consensus estimate by regional specialists: the actual numbers remain hotly disputed by both communities, with Armenian sources usually asserting a death toll in the range of 1.5 million and some Turkish sources denying the events even occurred. Whatever the precise number, it was large and the attending civilian suffering was enormous. Some of the victims were simply murdered, but most died during forced marches or from gross neglect after being herded into concentration camps set up in the Syrian Desert. For decades, Turkey officially denied the extent (and even the fact) of the carnage, causing deep contention with – and lasting bitterness among – Armenians” (pp. 87-88).

Armenian genocide. In: Nolan, Cathal J. The Greenwood Encyclopedia of International relations. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2002, Vol. 1.

Arne Kislenko (Ryerson University, Canada)

“In 1915, the Ottoman Empire began a systematic campaign of genocide against the Armenians who, along with others in the Caucasus region, struggled for independence during the war. Between 600,000 and 1.5 million Armenians died as a result of Turkish government policies. Many were killed, while many more died of disease and malnutrition in the forced relocation of the Armenian population. The extent of the Turkish action prompted the British government to accuse Turkey of crimes against humanity, the first time the term was ever officially used by the government of a major state. Russia hoped to profit from the atrocity, believing that, as a result, its own Armenian population would fight the Turks more tenaciously. Even after the war, when Britain successfully forced the defeated Turks to hold war crimes trials to account for the massacre, politics prevailed. Against the backdrop of the nationalist revolution in Turkey and war against Greece led by Mustafa Kemal (Ataturk), the Armenian Genocide went largely unpunished. Only two of the nine top Ottoman officials implicated in the genocide were convicted. Although the Treaty of Sevres, imposed by the Allies on Turkey in August 1920, contained five provisions for dealing with war crimes and helped to establish an independent Armenia, most Turks responsible for the atrocities were never brought to justice” (pp. 711-712).

Kislenko, Arne. World War I, Atrocities during. In: Mikaberidze, Alexander (Ed.). Atrocities, Massacres, and War Crimes. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2013, Vol. 2.

Jennifer Ballint (Lecturer in Socio-Legal Studies, School of Social and Political Sciences, University of Melbourne, Australia)

“The role played by law in the Armenian Genocide was primarily that of post-facto legitimation. The enactment of law served both as a mask for killing and an attempt to implicate others in the crime to increase the web of responsibility. The 1915 Temporary Law of Deportation (legitimizing the deportation and thus the death of the Armenian ‘deportees’) was not only passed through the correct channels; it was drafted once the deportations had actually begun. The law relating to the release of prisoners to serve in the Special Organization unit (the unit primarily responsible for the killing of the Armenians) was pressured through Parliament after most of the Armenians had been killed, and after most of the criminals had already been drafted into the unit. The Temporary Law of Expropriation and Confiscation (appropriation of property bill) was the only piece of legislation relating to the Armenian Genocide which appears to have been passed in accordance with usual procedure and not after the fact. It is true that law did frame the massacres. However, the decision to carry out the policy of murder against the Armenians was formulated before any laws were passed. The enactment of the genocide of the Armenians was independent to the enactment of the law” (p. 396).

Ballint, Jennifer. Laws and the Perpetration of Genocide. In: Charny, Israel W. (Ed.). Encyclopedia of Genocide. Santa Barbara, CA; Denver, CO; Oxford, UK: ABC-CLIO, 1999, Vol. 2.

Alfred de Zayas (American lawyer, historian, a leading expert in the field of human rights and international law, a peace activist, UN independent expert on the promotion of a democratic and equitable international order since 2012, Professor of international law, Geneva School of Diplomacy and International Relations)

“Pursuant to Article 230 of the Treaty of Sevres between the Allies and the Ottoman Empire, Turkish officers and politicians responsible for the genocide of non-Turkish populations were to be tried by an international tribunal. On November 23, 1918, an Ottoman Parliamentary Commission started an inquiry into the massacres, which led to the indictment of Enver, Talaat, and former Minister of justice Ibrahim Bey. They were tried in absentia before a Turkish court martial in Istanbul, found guilty pursuant to Articles 45 and 170 of the Ottoman Penal Code, and sentenced to death. The sentences were not carried out, however, because the Young Turk cabinet had resigned and gone into exile shortly before capitulation” (p. 289).

Zayas, Alfred de. Enver, Ismail. In: Shelton, Dinah L. (Ed.) Encyclopedia of Genocide and Crimes against Humanity. Farmington Hills, MI: Thomson Gale, 2005.

Adam Jones (Associate Professor of Political Science, University of British Columbia Okanagan, Kelowna, Canada)

“...Gendercide against ‘battle age’ men has served as a tripwire or precursor of genocide against all members of the target population. The three classic genocides of the twentieth century (against Turkish Armenians in 1915-1916, European Jews from 1939 to 1945, and Rwandan Tutsis in 1994) all share this feature. Armenian men, including eventually the very old and the youngest boys, were mercilessly eliminated from the population prior to, or at start of, the death marches to the Syrian Desert for which the genocide is notorious. These forced expulsions eventually killed hundreds of thousands of Armenian children and women” (pp. 300-302).

Jones, Adam. Gendercide. In: Griffiths, Martin (Ed.). Encyclopedia of International Relations and Global Politics. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Andrea O`Reilly (Associate Professor, School of Women's Studies, York University)

“Every case of genocide is perpetrated in unique political and social circumstances, but all genocides are characterized by intentional, systematic, and organized state-sponsored violence that targets a specific group of noncombatant men, women, and children. The persecution and massacre of women and children is often central to the genocidal plan. For example, during the Armenian genocide (1915-1923), when the Ottoman Empire killed over 1 million Armenian civilians, women and children were raped, massacred, enslaved, and sent on death marches to concentration camps in the Syrian Desert, where many were deliberately starved to death...” (p. 443).

“The UN Genocide Convention enumerates the forcible transfer of children from a persecuted group to another group as an act of genocide. In such cases, the bonds of motherhood are violated and parents are involuntarily separated from their children, who are enslaved, interned, or resettled with another family or in a communal living situation. ... During the Armenian genocide, Armenian children were enslaved or given to Kurdish or Turkish families by desperate parents who sought to save their children from death marches...” (p. 444).

“Systematic mass rape is frequently an element of genocide campaigns. Genocidaires systematically raped and tortured Armenian women and girls during the Armenian genocide, indigenous Maya women and girls during the Guatemalan genocide (1981-1983), Tutsi women and girls during the Rwandan genocide, and non-Arab Darfurian women during the genocidal counter insurgency in Darfur (2003-2005)...” (pp. 444-445).

Characteristics of Genocide. In: O`Reilly, Andrea (Ed.). Encyclopedia of Motherhood. Thousand Oaks, CA, London: Sage Publications, 2010, Vol. 1.

Elisa Von Joeden-Forgey (University of Pennsylvania)

“Common practices across genocides include killing infants in front of their parents, forcing family members to rape one another, destroying women`s reproductive capacity through rape and mutilation, castrating men, eviscerating pregnant women, and otherwise engaging in ritual cruelties aimed directly at the spiritually sacred, biologically generative, and emotionally nurturing structures of family life.

The Armenian genocide is a key example of this genocidal pattern. Over and over again, perpetrators followed a family-based pattern of destruction. When villages were attacked, men were murdered and their surviving family members were raped, expelled, and killed. Perpetrators frequently engaged in inversion rituals and ritual desecrations in the process. As in other cases, rape during the Armenian genocide served many purposes: it was a part of the process of eliticide, the destruction of the group's leadership in order to sow confusion; it publicly demonstrated the perpetrator's mastery over the Armenian life force; it inflicted 'total suffering' on both the men and the women (and, presumably, the boys and girls) who were tortured in two ways – through violent attacks on their own bodies and by having to witness the immense suffering of their loved ones; and it compromised the future integrity of the group by sowing the seeds of psychic and familial dissolution" (p. 73).

Joeden-Forgey, Elisa Von. Gender and Genocide. In: Bloxham, Donald and Moses, A. Dirk (Eds.). The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies. New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 2013.

Roger Smith (Professor of Government, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA)

“Those who initiate or otherwise participate in genocide typically deny that the events took place, that they bear any responsibility for the destruction, or that the term ‘genocide’ is applicable to what occurred. But denial can enter into the very fabric of a society, so that those who come after sustain and even intensify the denial begun by perpetrators. The most strident and elaborate denial of genocide in history follows this pattern. The Turkish Republic, because it was established in 1923, is not formally responsible for the genocide against Armenians, but it continues to this day to deny that the Young Turk government of its predecessor state, the Ottoman Empire, engaged in massive destruction of Armenians from 1915-1917, resulting in the deaths of over one million men, women, and children.

Despite the vast amount of evidence that points to the historical reality of the Armenian Genocide, denial of this genocide by successive regimes in Turkey has gone on from 1915 to the present. Unlike the Holocaust, which has been denied by individuals, the Armenian Genocide has been continuously denied by Turkish governments for eighty years. Out of political expediency, other governments, including that of the United States, have aided and abetted Turkey in its rewriting of history.

The basic argument of denial has remained the same – it never happened, Turkey is not responsible, the term ‘genocide’ does not apply. The current emphasis is on removing the label ‘genocide’ from the Armenian experience. This is done in part by describing the genocide as a civil war within a global war. Paradoxically, it also attempts to deny the Armenian Genocide by acknowledging the Holocaust. In part this involved the claim that Turkey saved many Jews from the Nazis, the unstated premise being that a people who did that could not have killed a million Armenians. It also attempts to exploit the ‘uniqueness’ argument to discredit the 1915 genocide; in this perspective, the Holocaust is the only example of genocide. Moreover, Turkey has also gone to extraordinary lengths, including threats and disruption of academic conferences, to prevent Jews from learning about the Armenian Genocide. It is important for Turkey to stifle awareness among Jews, because for

victims of Nazism to state publicly that Armenians and Jews have both been subjected to genocide carries a kind of moral persuasiveness that non-victims may lack.

Denial is argument, but it is also a set of tactics that in the Turkish case has shifted over the years. In the period immediately after World War I the tactic was to find scapegoats to blame for what was said to be only a security measure gone awry. This was followed by an attempt to avoid the whole issue, with silence, diplomatic efforts and political pressure used where possible.

In the 1960s efforts were made to influence journalists, teachers, and public officials by telling 'the other side of the story.' Foreign scholars were encouraged to revise the record of genocide, presenting an account largely blaming the Armenians or, in another version, wartime conditions. In the 1970s Turkey was successful in its efforts to prevent any mention of genocide in a report of the United Nations (which in later years did acknowledge the Armenian Genocide), and in the 1980s and 1990s in its pressure on the Reagan and Bush administrations to defeat Congressional resolutions that would have authorized a National Day of Remembrance of the of the Armenian Genocide in the Unites States. The Turkish government has also attempted to exclude any mention of the genocide in textbooks, and to prevent its inclusion in Holocaust and human rights curricula.

The Turkish government has attempted to disrupt academic conferences and public discussions of the genocide, notably a conference in Tel Aviv in 1982 with demands backed up with threats over plans to include references to the Armenian Genocide within the interpretive framework of the Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington.

Finally, since the 1980s the Turkish government has supported the establishment of 'institutes' whose apparent purpose is to further research on Turkish history and culture but which also tend to act in ways that further denial.

Despite its past success, Turkey's denial of the genocide has come under increased scrutiny. It continues to spend millions of dollars trying to protect its image and, even though most Armenians would be satisfied with Turkey's acknowledgement of the genocide, to fend off any demands for reparations or restitution of property. On the other hand, as scholarship on the Armenian Genocide has expanded dramatically, the genocide has been officially recognized by, to mention only a few, the European Parliament, the United Nations, various agencies of the governments of France, Israel and Russia, and the U.S. House of Representatives, which in 1996 voted overwhelmingly to withhold three million dollars of foreign aid to Turkey as long as it refuses to acknowledge the genocide.

The facade of denial has cracked, but much remains to be done: scholars, journalists, and teachers, in particular, have vital work ahead of them. In part, it is a matter of answering, and exposing, the denials, but more fundamentally of placing the Armenian Genocide as fully and truthfully on record as possible. Turkey may continue to deny that the genocide took place, but the world will know. Denial keeps open the wounds of genocide, but through solidarity with the victims and the restoration of a people's history, a process of healing can begin" (pp. 161-162, 165-166).

Smith, Roger. Denials of the Armenian Genocide. In: Charny, Israel W. (Ed.). Encyclopedia of Genocide. Santa Barbara, CA; Denver, CO; Oxford, UK: ABC-CLIO, 1999, Vol. 1.

COMPILED BY ARMAN J. KIRAKOSSIAN