

TRUE

Sahib JAMAL, Ph. d

# The **HISTORY** against the **PSEUDO-GENOCIDE**

## THIS HISTORY HAS BEEN TOLD WRONG"

### IN OCCASION WITH ANNUAL "ARMENIAN GENOCIDE" SHOW

Authorities of Armenia and leaders of Armenian communities in Russia and USA, as well as in other countries of the world have noticeably activated their efforts for achievement of the international recognition of the so-called "Armenian genocide" recently. This campaign based on the roughest historical falsifications and slander about Turkish and Azerbaijan people, creates ground for political and international-legal reconditions and for legalization of the separatist claims against Turkey and Azerbaijan. Therefore, declaration of reality on so-called "genocide" (for more conformity to the text we will call it pseudogenocide) is the responsibility for each citizen.

#### 1. Estimation of events 1915-1923

For objective, unbiased explanation of events actually occurring in Ottoman Turkey in 1915-1923 and the reason why the Armenian falsification of history has reached so global character, it is expedient to use opinions not of the confronting sides, but American historical science, which is impartial and adequate enough. Most American scientists and diplomatists were actual witnesses of events occurring at the dawn of 20th century and have left their evidences.

It is not an accident that true estimation of "Armenian genocide" myth was first given in the USA. On 19 May 1985, 69 Turkish historians from leading universities of the USA have published (in reply to the attempts to legislatively condemn the so-called "Armenian genocide") their letter to the USA Congress in "Washington post" and "New York Times" newspapers.

The authors had proved it was not genocide, but the "serious internal strikes between Muslims and Christians within the World War I, became complicated because of disease, starvation and slaughter in Anatolia and close regions in 1915-1923".

In this connection the Armenian sufferings "cannot be considered separate from those of Muslim inhabitants of the region". The 'document' used in favor of the pseudo-genocide lobbied in the USA Congress during that peri-

od, were called "the resolution based on historically doubtful assumptions distorting historical estimation and undermining the adequateness of the American legislation".

As a result, authors have called to provide access to archives of all countries concerning given events (republics of the former USSR, Turkey, Bulgaria, Syria): "Until the given archives become accessible, the history of Ottoman empire for the period 1915-1923 cannot be adequately reflected".

#### 2. The reason of events

Most authors of the letter give precise and clear estimations of 1915 events. Describing them as civil war within the World War I and Russian-Turkish war, they pointed on the reasons of the conflict. So, one of the famous specialist on this issue, J. McCarthy ("Armenian terrorism: history as poison and antidote"), says "in April 1915, Armenian revolutionary groups intensified their anti-Turkish activity", and "However erroneous the deportation would be considered from the point of view of today's morals, nobody can seriously deny the fact that exactly owing to the help rendered to Armenians by interfering Russian troops in 1828, 1854 and 1877, Turks had discovered they could not trust Armenians".

#### 3. The role of Anatolian Armenians in the 1915-1923 events

It is important to emphasize that the unanimous estimation existing in the western scientific circles concerning 1915-1923 events and actual purposes of the Armenian leaders as well as their methods of achievement has been proved by the Armenian leaders themselves. Poqos Nubar, the leader of the Armenian delegation at the Paris peace conference in 1919 clearly wrote in the letter to the London Times on January 27, 1919 (published on January, 30th): "Inexpressible sufferings and awful losses which have fallen upon Armenians as a result of their fidelity to allies are known for all... Since the

beginning of the war Armenians struggled on the party of allies on all fronts... Armenians de facto took part in war since that moment when they have refused with indignation to stand with Ottoman Empire". The political aim of armed rebellion against Ottoman Empire is unambiguously discussed in the same letter: "With all this is mind, the Armenian national delegation would ask for the Armenian nation to be recognized as the participant of war... I try to convince, that with the victory of allies Armenians... dream to get independence". This purpose proves to be true by the service report from Istanbul to London the British diplomatist A.Leyard made 40 years before (March 18, 1878). Informing about the conversation with the Armenian archbishop of Constantinopolis Narciss, it testifies about an active support by the Armenian church of an idea of the independent Armenian state, as well as the activity in Armenians in propagation of rebellion against the Ottoman state.

"These intrigues are held very actively and intensively, and cause movement among Armenians... The autonomy should end with the annexation from Russia which obviously enters into intentions of the Patriarch", the British diplomatist warns. The authoritative American historian, the contemporary of these events John Joel in November, 1928 wrote in this connection: "Few Americans who mourn over misfortunes of Armenians, know, that before rise of nationalist ambitions since the seventieth, Armenians were an exclusive part of the population of Turkey, or that during the World War they betrayable have given the Turkish cities to Russian aggressors; that they bragged, that have lifted army from 150000 person to begin civil war, and that they have burnt at least one hundred Turkish villages and have destroyed their population". Arthur Chester, the businessman, the representative of the Shipping Union of USA in Istanbul describes the role which Armenians in have played in Turkey army (February, 1923): "In the front Armenians shot blank cartridges and deserted. It was already bad enough, but they were not content only with this form of treachery. A plenty of the Armenian population lived in the provinces, situated in the battle-field, and these people, feeling, that it is a good chance for Russians to crush the Turks, have decided to help them by rising revolt in the battle-field and cutting it off from the supply base". Chester also marks, that "Armenians in Turkey not only have full representation in authorities, but also the special privileges which are not given them by any other country".

Later William Langer, the professor of history of diplomacy of the Harward University, in his book "Diplomacy of imperialism", published in New York in 1968, specified that during the events of 1915-1923 and long before "the direct purpose of the Armenian propagandists was instigation to disorders, provocation of inhuman reciprocal measures and causing intervention of great powers. This is why they acted preferably in those areas where Armenians concluded minority for making repressions evident. One of the revolutionaries told in 1890... gangs of "Hnchaq" (Armenian terrorist party) would search for an opportunity to kill Kurds and

the Turks, set their villages on fire, and hide in mountains, causing Muslims' reciprocal actions against Armenian villagers. As a result, Russia will intrude and will grasp these territories under the banner of humanity and Christian civilization". Letters of Mark Bristol, USA Supreme Commissioner in Istanbul deserve consideration in this context.

As he marks, Armenian leaders "did their utmost to provide their attacks on Kurds, Turks and Azerbaijanis, thus slaughtering Muslims, destroying their villages, plundering and destroying their houses, and at last, attacking Turks. This caused reciprocal actions and then Armenians have left without stopping to protect the wives and children. Actions of the Armenian troops in Kars caused hatred against Americans", - Bristol concludes. Numerous documents from archives the France Ministry of Foreign Affairs published by Armenian historian Arthur Bejlerjan in the collection "Great powers. Ottoman empire and Armenians in the French archives (1914-1918)" testify a treacherous role of Armenians.

American researcher Bruce Feyn has showed recently in newspaper Washington Times (16.10.2007) endurances from messages of Emory Hails and Arthur Sutherland, the members of official mission of USA in East Anatolia in 1919: "In all region - from Bitlis up to Van and Bayasit - we was informed that destructions and ruins have been accomplished by Armenians who controlled the region after Russia's leaving. When Turkish forces came, Armenians destroyed everything that belonged to Muslims. Moreover, Armenians are accused of making murders, rapes, arsons and every possible awful atrocity on Muslim population. First we skeptically concerned these messages, but as a result we had to believe it, because statements of witnesses were absolutely unanimous and proved to be true actual proofs". Charles Farlong, the officer of military investigation and member of USA delegation at the Paris Peace Conference, wrote in the letter to the USA president Woodrow Wilson on March, 23rd: "We heard histories, both truthful and strongly exaggerated, about Armenians slaughtered by Turks, but almost nothing Armenian's actions against Turks... Actually, in opinion of those familiar with the given situation, there is a big question whether the Turks are mostly the affected party because of actions of Armenians and French military contingent".

#### 4. Numbers

Armenian scholars and politicians have dome their utmost to deform world about the number of Armenian victims claiming the number was 1.5 million. Justin McCarthy writes, "First I found out studying the population of Ottoman Anatolia is that that something is wrong with honored Armenian science when I established that Muslims in Anatolia had more casualties than Armenians. The events cannot be considered as genocide". The author makes a conclusion that Muslims were more affected as a result of war, slaughter and deportations including 400 thousand Muslims, mainly Azerbaijanis

moved from Caucasus by authorities of imperialist Russia during the First World War. There were 870 thousand Armenians living in eastern districts of Turkey and total number of Armenians in Turkey for that period was 1.3 million.

"In total, - McCarthy, - the number of Armenians who lost their lives was about 600 thousand and Muslims' casualties encountered 2.5 million... If it was genocide, it seems to be very strange genocide in which more murderers died more than victims". And it is difficult to disagree with final conclusion of the American historian: "Those who want to see the Muslims as instigators of genocide, in a strange way do not wish to recognize Muslims as victims of massacres..."

This is a story about human sufferings, but this story has been told wrong. Instead of truth about a human trouble there was a great myth, a myth about the Malicious Turk and the Kind Armenian... The false picture of Armenian genocide became unique". It is a paradox that Armenian falsification of history long has time been used the status of an axiom simply due to its continuous recurrence. Stanford Show, the professor of California University says in his multivolume "History of Ottoman Empire and modern Turkey", published in 1979: "...Actually the number of the Armenians living within the Ottoman empire before war hardly totalled 1.3 million. Half of them lived in war zones, but number of actually deported Armenians... did not exceed 400 thousand". Then S.Show makes a conclusion: "there were about 200 thousand persons who died - not only as a result of resettlement, but also famine, diseases and the warfare which carried away the lives of about two million of Muslims as well".

Perhaps it is possible to consider the most weighty the memories of the alive eyewitness of those events - admiral Mark Bristol, the Supreme Commissioner and the ambassador of the USA (1919 - 1927) in Istanbul, who wrote in his letter to Washington in occasion of consideration of the Armenian question on board of the Senate of the USA, 28 March, 1921: "I see that messages about Turks killing thousands of Armenians in Caucasus is widespread in the USA. These messages are repeated so much that my blood boils when I hear it... Spreading of such false messages in USA without refutations is the violent infringement of the legislation and certainly makes more harm to Armenians than advantage".

### 5. Demography and Politycy.

Did Armenians have the ground to claim for autonomy within the territories on which they minority? We will use mentioned book by J.McCarthy recognized as the most authoritative expert in the sphere of the population of Turkey: "Despite of the presence of the term "Armenia" on maps of XIX century and the statement of the European politicians which do not have opportunity to learn the truth, there was no Armenia in Ottoman empire". In McCarthy's opinion, "the territory named now "Turkish Armenia", was one of 6 districts - Van, Bitlis, Mamuretualaziz, Diyarbakir, Sivas and Erzurum, where in only 870000 Armenians lived in 1912, and they were less

than 1/5 from total population". In other book "Armenians in Ottoman empire and modern Turkey (1912-1926)", published in 1984, McCarthy emphasizes that "in the end of XIX and beginning of XX in all provinces of Ottoman empire Armenians made obvious minority", and "in 6 districts the population ratio of Muslims and Armenians were 4.5 to 1". He comes to conclusion that "proceeding from the self-determination right of the nations, it is impossible to approve about existence of Armenia... If even Armenians from all world have gathered within the "6 districts" Muslims would still be the majority".

Paul Hentze, the advisor of the Congress of the USA on foreign affairs, in his book "Sources of the Armenian Violence" (1984) also marks that in territories, on which Armenians applied" they conceded by quantity to Muslims in each of six east provinces, traditionally called "Armenian". In Erzurum which many Armenian nationalists considered as their capital, Armenians definitely were minority... In independent Armenia they inevitably would have been minority if they have not expelled Muslims". Last thesis specifies the essence of the Armenian terror against Muslims, not only at the dawn of 20 century in Turkey, but also in an extent of whole 20 century in Azerbaijan. Correction of demographic situation by ethnic cleansings and deportations of Muslims from their territories by means of Russian bayonets with in order to create Armenian state - is the original reason of the Armenian-Azerbaijan conflict. In 1918-1922 this policy had been "successfully" tested in Armenia where Azerbaijani population who was the majority before, and then in Azerbaijan from which Armenians annexed territories in the period of 1920-1994.

As a whole in 1820-1920 more than two million Azerbaijanis were violently deported to Turkey, and their areas were settled by Turkish and Persian Armenians. "The historical fact is that expansion of Russian empire had broken traditional balance of population in Caucasus and East Anatolia. All people suffered but to speak in the language of numbers Crimea and Caucasus Muslims had suffered most. It is proven possible by "The Note about resettlement of Armenians from Persia in our areas", prepared in 1828 by the Russian writer and the ambassador of Russia in Persia Alexander Griboyedov, where he describes the negative consequences of the Persian Armenians' resettlement to Erivan and Nakhchivan Khanate territories annexed by Russia as a result of the Russian-Persian war in 1826-1828: "Armenians are settled mostly in the Muslim landlord territories. In is possible in summer. Muslims, the owners, depastured their cattle in summer pastures and had little chance to meet with heterodox newcomers". Then the author speaks about "suggestions, which should make Muslims to reconcile themselves to their present burdening which will not be long-lasting, and to eradicate their fear that Armenians could capture their lands".

### 6. The goals of mythical work

One of the purposes of the so-called "Armenian genocide" myth is clearly stated in the program docu-

ments of one of the leading parties of Armenian diaspora and Dashnaksutun, ruling party in Armenia. To say more concrete – in the interview of Leo Sarkisyan, chairman of the Armenian national committee of the USA published in the American newspaper "Armenian weekly", March 21, 1987: "There are about 70 % of our historical territories grasped by the Turkish government so far and the struggle for satisfaction of the Armenian territorial claims have still been the initial stage". There is a requirement to the great powers "to recognise the fact of genocide and the Armenian territorial claims officially" and to support the realization of these claims. The fact that Armenia hasn't still recognised Turkish-USSR agreements in 1921 year, and therefore - the territorial integrity of Turkey, is indicative.

Secondly, the recognition of pseudo-genocide is called by aspiration to justify historically the regional expansionism of Armenia not only in Turkey, but also Azerbaijan, and probably, Georgia in the long term, to provide more favorable propaganda and political conditions for Armenian diplomacy to legalize the annexation of the Upper Garabagh ("Nagorno-Karabakh"). In the political manifest of Dashnaksutun (December, 11, 1985) it was signed, that "the borders of Armenia should include the Armenian territories with areas of Nakhchivan, Akhalkaly (in Georgia) and Karabakh". Creation of independent Armenian formations in Russia (in Krasnodar, Rostov and Stavropol districts) where the Armenian minority already more actively demands more rights, more property and more territories – is also in agenda.

Third, the given myth should distract attention of world community from the fact of more than 70 Turkish diplomats' murdered by the Armenian terrorists in 1973-1985, a phenomenon of the Armenian terrorism, and also massacre and deportations of Azerbaijani population of present Armenia and Azerbaijan during 20 century. "During two last years, - Mark Bristol says, - achievements of independent Armenian Republic in 1919-1920 has shown an absolute inability to operate themselves, and especially - inability to operate or manage with the national minorities under their authority". "I cannot believe, - he adds, - in idea of creation of independent Armenia in the country where Armenians' population is less than 25%. I do not believe that Armenians can operate themselves, and especially it is impossible to agree that they operated other people. And certainly, if any other people in this part of the country stay under Armenians' power it will suffer from discrimination and violence". It is difficult to find estimation where the historical forecast would coincide with realities of Armenian-Azerbaijani relationship so exactly and so tragically.

Fourthly, the myth of pseudo-genocide is promoting to prove the thesis about "pan Turkic treatment" to Russia and other countries of the region. The head of the Armenian Union in Russia in the Armenian newspaper "Azq", published in April 25, shows the connection between pseudo-genocide and "pan Turkic treatment" such way: "The crime has been accomplished with a

political goal of liquidation of the Armenian ethnic wedge stirred to realize pan-Turkic program of territorial expansion - unification under power of the Turkic state of East, Northern and Southern Caucasus, Central Asia, Southern Azerbaijan and other territories down to Xinjiang. Realization of these plans was a component of destruction of the Russian state". It is useful to notice, that during this so-called "pan-Turkic programs of territorial expansion" the Azerbaijani population of Armenia was exposed to deportation and terror, and reduced from 575 thousand in 1918 up to 72 thousand in the beginning of 20s. As for Turkey, it struggled for a survival in 1915-1923, against attempts of a separation of the country on Sevres Agreement of 1920 and simultaneously against aggression of the Allies and Dashnak Armenia. Estimating that period of Armenian-Turkish relations, Chicherin the national commissar of foreign affairs of Russia noted in his letter, wrote in December 1920: "Soviet government agrees with dashaks' violence, which couldn't leave indifferent the command of Turkish army on the borders of Armenia".

And, fifthly, the myth of "genocide" became practically unique measure of consolidation and mobilization of Armenian nation on feelings of unreasonable animosities to Turks and Azerbaijanis.

The pseudo-genocide became the tool which probably, at absence of other positive motives of consolidation unites ideologically and directs political will of the world Armenians against Turkey and especially against Azerbaijan which because of great vulnerability became the main target of Armenian expansionism. "The people writing history, - Paul Hentze notices, - tends to glorify their past and to avoid the objective consideration of inconsistent features. Armenians tends to it more, than the majority of other people, and in second half of 20 century this tendency has especially amplified. As a result, there is an emotional dramatization of Armenians' position which is considered as the nation of martyrs having unique virtues from immemorial times and unique in the sufferings. Armenians projected the most part of their modern history in the past, having transformed it in mythology".

The historical lie is repeated until it is accepted as an axiom. The reason of the Armenian national chauvinism and regional expansionism is false history, therefore finally only true history will cure this disease. J. McCarthy wrote in 1984 before the Upper Garabagh ("Nagorno-Karabakh") conflict:

"Considering a question of Armenian violence, it is impossible to ignore history because history is the reason of Armenian terrorism, and at the same time, the only treatment. Armenian terrorism has taken roots from false interpretation of history, and only having reconsidered this point of view, Armenian terrorism can be defeated. Therefore, I would like to offer a method which usually is not used in struggle against terrorism. The method is consideration of history". ●