

# THE ARMENIAN QUESTION

1945 - 1965

**Christopher GUNN**  
Coastal Carolina University  
May 26, 2014

Christopher Gunn

Coastal Carolina University

May 26, 2014

## THE ARMENIAN QUESTION, 1945-1965

On April 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup>, 1965, Armenians around the world held memorial services to commemorate the 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the massacre and deportations of hundreds of thousands of Armenians living in eastern Anatolia.<sup>1</sup> At the same time, many Armenians also demonstrated against Turks and the Turkish government it held responsible for these events. The largest gatherings were in Yerevan and Beirut, but significant numbers turned out in Paris, New York and in other areas with large Armenian communities. The demonstrations were, and still are, portrayed as spontaneous and uncoordinated outpourings of grief. A condition triggered by the symbolic milestone 1965 represented and the outrage over five decades of Western apathy and cynical self-interest that enabled Turkey and the Turks to escape from justice.<sup>2</sup> In particular, the demonstrations inside the Soviet Union are used to show that the trauma and disappointment of the Armenians were so great that forty-five years of Communism, Soviet oppression, and the police on the ground in April 1965 could not silence them.<sup>3</sup> April 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup>, 1965, was, in other words, a turning point in modern Armenian history: the day Armenians “woke up.”

---

<sup>1</sup> Estimates on the number of Armenians who died during this period can vary greatly (between 200,000 and 2,000,000). The historian Erik J. Zürcher estimates between 600,000 and 800,000. See Erik J. Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History* (New York: I.B. Tauris & Co., 1993), 120.

<sup>2</sup> Michael Bobelian, *Children of Armenia: A Forgotten Genocide and the Century-Long Struggle for Justice* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2009): 121-125; Razmik Panossian, *The Armenians: From Kings and Priests to Merchants and Commissars* (London: Hurst & Company, 2006), 320; Lorne Shiranian, *Quest for Closure: The Armenian Genocide and the Search for Justice in Canada* (Kingston, Ontario: Blue Heron Press, 1999): 108; Ronald Grigor Suny, *Looking Toward Ararat: Armenia in Modern History* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1993), 228; Haig Sarkissian, “50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Turkish Genocide as Observed in Erevan,” *Armenian Review*, Vol. 19, No. 4 (Winter 1966): 23-28.

<sup>3</sup> In addition to Yerevan, there was also, allegedly, a small demonstration by Armenians in Moscow.

Although these physical manifestations of Armenian frustrations were indeed a watershed in the development of modern Armenian nationalism and correctly identified as the catalyst for an Armenian campaign seeking genocide recognition, reparations, land, and punishment from the Turks and Turkey,<sup>4</sup> the gatherings and protests in 1965 appear neither spontaneous nor uncoordinated. In fact, it seems the events of April 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup>, 1965, were the culmination of a deliberate attempt by the Armenian Revolutionary Federation (ARF), elements within the Armenian SSR and, perhaps, the Soviet Union to separate the massacres and deportations of Armenians by the Ottoman Empire from the much more convoluted “Armenian Question,” and World War I, of which it had merely been a part of, in order to implement an aggressive policy of anti-Turkishness throughout the Armenian diaspora and the Armenian SSR.

Between the early 1920s and 1945, the Armenian Question generally referred to the dashed hopes and misfortunes of the Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire, the Caucasus and, more recently, the Soviet Union, beginning in the mid- to late-19<sup>th</sup> century. In the post-World War II era, the Armenian Question came to signify, in particular, the betrayal and misery of the Armenians between the end of World War I and the Sovietization of the short-lived independent Armenian Republic in 1920. While other aspects of the nearly century-old Armenian Question periodically surfaced before 1965, any mention, let alone sustained attention or analysis, of the massacres and forced migrations of 1915 as a distinct event or separate phenomenon, in either Armenian or non-Armenian newspapers, journals, or monographs was relatively rare. A sample review of the accessible sources in English does not suggest that the diaspora, or at least its most powerful political organization, the ARF, was overly concerned with the events of 1915 in eastern Anatolia prior to late 1959. Outrage and awareness of the 1915 massacres and deportations, therefore, were introduced to both the Armenian and non-Armenian publics on April 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup>, 1965.

The successful reduction of the entire Armenian Question into one event (1915) and one enemy (Turkey, Turks and all things Turkish, or, simply, the Turk) enabled Armenian political organizations, in turn, to tap into the inherent, but somewhat latent, anti-Turkishness of the Armenia nation, the foundations of which can be found in the pervasive Turkish stereotypes developed in the West. This shift from multiple potential adversaries to only one, the Turk, came

---

<sup>4</sup> Michael Bobelian’s chapter covering the demonstrations is entitled “Resurrection.” See Bobelian, *Children of Armenia*, and Panossian, *The Armenians*, 320.

at a time when competition for the hearts and minds of the Armenian nation between the right-wing ARF and the Armenian SSR and its leftist allies in the Armenian diaspora, the *Hnchaks* and *Ramgavars*, was particularly violent and brutal. By the early 1960s, anti-Turkishness not only remedied what ailed the Armenian nation, but their joint resentment, hate and opposition to the Turk actually unified the three main diaspora political organizations. Cooperation and interaction between the ARF, *Hnchaks* and *Ramgavars*, virtually unheard of during the previous decades, became the norm, particularly in Beirut, the center of Armenian political, cultural and, for some Armenians, religious power. Even more remarkable was the truce brokered between the seemingly irreconcilable ARF and Soviet Armenia which, to some extent, normalized relations between the two most powerful sources of Armenian nationalism and allowed for some cooperation and coordination in policy, particularly with regards to anti-Turkish propaganda. It is within this context, along with changes in international politics that were both timely and favorable to Armenian efforts against Turkey, that the well-planned and coordinated demonstrations of 1965 should be viewed. There is no doubt that the demonstrations were solemn occasions used to commemorate a great tragedy in the modern history of the Armenian nation, but they were also part of a planned and coordinated effort to instigate tension and encourage animosity between Armenians and the Turk for political gains inside the Armenian diaspora. Neither the ARF, nor the Armenian SSR, and by extension, the Soviet Union, appear to ever had any real intention of following through with the demands being made on the streets of Yerevan, Beirut or New York with anything other than words. The ultimate result of the violent nationalism these political organizations unleashed in the early 1960s, however, would not be fully evident until January 1973.

### **The Armenian Question & the Early Cold War**

After lingering discussions of Armenians and the Armenian Question from World War I died out in the U.S. Congress in early 1923,<sup>5</sup> their mention either in Congress or publications accessible to the general public on the Armenian Question essentially ceased until 1943. In that year, Simon Vratzian, the former Prime Minister of the short-lived independent Armenian Republic, published a book on the Armenian Question through the Hairenik Press in Boston. It is

---

<sup>5</sup> “Mustapha Kemal-- Conditions in the Near East,” *Congressional Record*, Jan. 26, 1923, 2487-2498.

noteworthy that Vratzian, a contemporary of the events of 1915, devoted only six pages (out of his 107) to the massacres of 1915.<sup>6</sup> Additionally, the conditions of Armenians in Turkey were a brief subject of interest in the U.S. Congress, where it criticized the Turkish government's decision to impose a wealth tax on its Armenian and other non-Muslim citizens.<sup>7</sup>

The first sustained discussion of the Armenian Question, however, appeared in April of 1945 and was in the context of the Soviet Union's campaign of pressure on Turkey to submit to Stalin's demands as World War II drew to a close. First, the Soviets wanted Turkey to cede the eastern provinces of Kars and Ardahan to the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic (SSR) and parts of the Black Sea coast to the Georgian SSR. Second, they wanted permission from Turkey to build naval installations along the Turkish Straits and establish a permanent Soviet military presence. Finally, the Soviets wanted Turkey to agree to a revision of the Montreaux Convention, the agreement that had regulated control of the Turkish Straits since 1936. The Soviet campaign ultimately failed, and the crisis it provoked culminated in the Truman Doctrine, which was put before the U.S. Congress by President Truman on March 12, 1947.<sup>8</sup>

Soviet preparations to reopen the Armenian Question and use it to attract attention and western public support to help advance their territorial and other claims against Turkey began at least as early as March or April 1944, when Moscow enlisted the aid of the Diaspora

---

<sup>6</sup> Simon Vratzian, *Armenia and the Armenian Question* (Boston, MA: Hairenik, 1943). The Hairenik Press is owned and operated by the ARF.

<sup>7</sup> "Persecution of the Armenians," *CR*, Nov. 11, 1943, 9665; "Persecution of the Armenians," *CR*, Nov. 29, 1943, 10053.

<sup>8</sup> The Truman Doctrine provided unprecedented guarantees for U.S. support and assistance to Turkey and Greece in the fight against Communism. For a full description of the events as they unfolded see "Soviet Note Lists Demands on Turks," *New York Times*, June 26, 1945; Sam Pope Brewer, "Turks View Allies as Curb on Soviet," *NYT*, Aug. 2, 1945; C.L. Sulzberger, "Russo-Turkish Straits Talk Halted as Ankara Rejects Three Demands," *NYT*, Aug. 4, 1945; Sam Pope Brewer, "Turks Talk War if Russia Presses; Prefer Vain Battle to Surrender," *NYT*, Aug. 7, 1945; "Soviet Oil Aim Tied to Move on Turks," *NYT*, Dec. 21, 1945; "Russians Demand Area of Turkey Along Black Sea," *NYT*, Dec. 21, 1945; C.L. Sulzberger, "Turks' Refusal to Cede Land Affirmed by Foreign Chief," *NYT*, Dec. 22, 1945; Herbert L. Matthews, "Middle East Remains Big Unsolved Problem. Lack of Decision by Foreign Ministers on Iran and Turkey Limits Gains," *NYT*, Dec. 30, 1945; A.C. Sedgwick, "Turkey Sees Security Threatened," *NYT*, Jan. 13, 1946; "Soviet Radio Renews Kars, Ardahan Claims," *NYT*, Feb. 23, 1946; James B. Reston, "U.S., Britain Told by Soviet of Demand for Turkish Area," *NYT*, March 8, 1946; Herbert L. Matthews, "U.S. View on Turkey Awaited in Britain," *NYT*, March 9, 1946; Anne O'Hare McCormick, "In Peace as in War Turkey is at Crossroads," *NYT*, March 9, 1946; A.C. Sedgwick, "Future Status of Straits is Turkey's Chief Concern," *NYT*, April 7, 1946; "'Greater Armenia' Maps Include Sixth of Turkey," *NYT*, Aug. 29, 1946; "Soviet Pressure on Turkey," *CR*, March 26, 1947, 358-359; "Turkish-Armenian Hostility," *CR*, March 26, 1947, 376-377; Rep. Wat Arnold (MO), "Palestine Policy," *CR*, March 15, 1948, A1584-A1585. See also Baskin Oran, ed., *Turkish Foreign Policy, 1919-2006* (Salt Lake City, UT: The University of Utah Press, 2010): 276-281, 298-303; Bobelian, *Children of Armenia*, 86-106; Eduard Mark, "The War Scare of 1946 and Its Consequences," *Diplomatic History*, Vol. 21, No. 3 (Sum. 1997): 383-415; S. Torissian, "Soviet Policy in the Armenian Question," *Armenian Review*, Vol. 11, No. 2 (Sum. 1958): 27-38.

Armenians.<sup>9</sup> This was a full year before the Soviets formally renounced the 1925 Pact of Friendship and Non-aggression between the Soviet Union and Turkey. Initiated, encouraged and supported by the Soviet Union, the corresponding Armenian campaign began in earnest in April 1945 when the Armenian National Committee submitted their *A Memorandum Relating to the Armenia Question* to the United Nations (U.N.) in San Francisco.<sup>10</sup> Aided by various other organizations,<sup>11</sup> individual Armenian-Americans, including such distinguished figures as Leon Surmelian and Aram Saroyan,<sup>12</sup> members of the U.S. House of Representatives, particularly Rep. Bertrand W. Gearhart (CA), and others sympathetic to their endeavors, the diaspora Armenians involved attempted to “do all within our power to enlighten the American public opinion, and yes, also our Government in Washington, on the merits of the Armenian Cause.”<sup>13</sup> Their goal was to elicit support from both the U.S. Government and the American public for the first of the Soviet Union’s three aims: the annexation of the Kars and Ardahan provinces in eastern Turkey to the Armenian SSR; and their efforts lasted through early 1948. The tone of their campaign was, naturally, pro-Soviet, and while certainly anti-Turkish, the initial rhetoric was mild in comparison to what would emerge in after the Truman Doctrine was announced in 1947.

In order to convince Congress and the U.S. public that the Armenians’ claim to regions of eastern Anatolia were justified, the Armenian interest groups had to first reintroduce Americans to the Armenian Question. To do this, the groups largely relied on a narrative of recent

---

<sup>9</sup> The Armenian National Council of America, one of the participants in this campaign, was established in March 1944. See “Statement of the Armenian National Council of America, in Favor of the Ratification of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide, Submitted by Rev. Charles A. Vertanes, Executive Director,” Genocide Convention, Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, Eighty-First Congress, Second Session on Executive O, The International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, January 23, 24, 25, and February 9, 1950, 548; “Soviet-Lebanon Tie Via Armenia is Seen,” *NYT*, April 28, 1944; R. H. Dekmejian, “Soviet-Turkish Relations and Politics in the Armenian SSR,” *Soviet Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 4 (April 1968): 511.

<sup>10</sup> Armenian National Committee, *A Memorandum Relating to the Armenian Question*, April 1945; James G. Mandalian, “The Armenian Case,” *Armenian Review*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Win. 1948): 55.

<sup>11</sup> In addition to the Armenian National Committee, the Armenian National Council of America, the Armenian-American Citizens Club, the American Committee for Justice to the Armenians and the American Committee for Armenian Rights advocated for the awarding of the Turkish provinces of Kars and Ardahan to the Armenian SSR during this period. It is also widely acknowledged that the campaign had the backing and support of the *Hnchak* and *Ramgavar* parties who would remain close allies to the Armenian SSR and the Soviet Union. The ARF made a similar case, but advocated for this enlarged Armenia to be free and independent of the Soviet Union as well. See Mandalian, “The Armenian Case,” 1948.

<sup>12</sup> Leon Surmelian was an Armenian-American writer and author of *I Ask You, Ladies and Gentlemen* (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1945). Aram Saroyan was the uncle of another well-known Armenian-American writer, William Saroyan. Coincidentally, Aram Saroyan also served as the court interpreter for Gourgen Yanikian during the latter’s murder trial in 1973.

<sup>13</sup> Rep. Bertrand W. Gearhart (CA), “A Historic Responsibility of Armenian-Americans— An Address by Mr. Leon Surmelian,” *CR*, July 26, 1946, A4569-A4571.

Armenian history introduced in the Armenian National Committee's memorandum to the U.N. in April 1945. The narrative emphasized the suffering and inexplicable perseverance of the Armenian nation, and put forward five reasons why the Armenians were entitled to Turkey's eastern provinces. First, the Christian Armenians had suffered both persecution and oppression in their "intolerable state of life" within the Islamic Ottoman Empire that denied them the "basic rights of citizenship."<sup>14</sup> These conditions, in turn, led to the slaughter of innocent Armenians during the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries and, ultimately, to the "deportations and massacres" of 1915 that were "well laid plans" for a "program of extermination."<sup>15</sup>

Second, the Armenian nation made tremendous, and grossly disproportionate, contributions and sacrifices for the Allied cause during the First World War.<sup>16</sup> The ANC's memorandum alleged that no one less than General Ludendorff attributed the collapse of the German Army on the Western front to the Armenian remnants of the Russian Army who prevented the oil fields of Baku from falling to the Ottoman army until September 18, 1918, thereby cutting the Germans off from a crucial fuel supply.<sup>17</sup> Third, Armenia was betrayed by the Allied powers at the end of World War I. Despite promises of support from Great Britain, France and the United States, the free and independent Armenia envisioned within the Treaty of Sevres never materialized, and the much smaller and maligned independent Armenia that came into existence on May 28, 1918 was left to its fate. The first independent Armenia state in centuries, the Armenian Republic fell to the resurgent forces of Kemalist Turkey and Bolshevik Russia on December 2, 1920, and the revised peace treaty between the Allied governments and Turkey, the Treaty of Lausanne, signed on July 23, 1924, did not even mention the Armenians.<sup>18</sup>

Fourth, the Armenian contribution during World War II was also significant. According to the Armenian National Committee's statistics, over 300,000 Soviet Armenians fought in the war, close to 25,000 of which were decorated for their service, and 50 generals. Another 10,000 French Armenians fought on the Allied side, along with approximately 10% of Armenian-Americans.<sup>19</sup> Finally, by the end of World War II approximately 1,000,000 Armenian refugees existed around the world who were either eager, or desperate, to return to their historic

---

<sup>14</sup> Armenian National Committee, *A Memorandum*, 3.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 4.

<sup>16</sup> One can assume that the exceptions to this, of course, were the Ottoman Armenians who remained loyal to their own Empire and supported its war efforts.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 6-7.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 7-11.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 11.

homeland, now represented by the dynamic and prosperous Armenian SSR. Unfortunately, the Armenian SSR was simply too small to accommodate all those Armenians who wished to come home, and they need to expand. The Armenians, therefore, by virtue of their sufferings, abandonment, betrayal, and significant contributions to West's war efforts in both of the World Wars, were owed. The simple solution to resolve to historic injustices to the Armenian people, to solve, once and for all, the Armenian Question and the more immediate and pressing Armenian refugee problem and to ensure a just, humane and durable peace settlement was to return the "unproductive and desolate" area of Armenia currently "in the hands of the Turks," to its rightful owner, the Armenian SSR.<sup>20</sup>

The campaign peaked in the spring of 1946,<sup>21</sup> but by the late fall of that year it was clear that the Soviets and Armenians would not succeed in their efforts, either through Western public opinion, the United Nations or through the threat of force.<sup>22</sup> After the announcement of the Truman doctrine in early 1947, any notions of annexing eastern Anatolia by any means other than war disappeared completely. Despite this, however, Armenian organizations continued their efforts throughout 1947,<sup>23</sup> even though the campaign largely digressed into an anti-Turkish smear

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., 12.

<sup>21</sup> Leon Surmelian, "Armenian Claims Territory: Return of Kars-Ardahan Area by the Turks Is Demanded," *NYT*, July 11, 1945; "Armenians in U.S. Appeal. National Council Asks Return of Areas in Turkey to Soviet," *NYT*, Sept. 22, 1945; "Armenians Present Case. Ask Truman to Aid in Solution of Their Country's Problems," *NYT*, Sept. 23, 1945; "Armenians' Return Aided," *NYT*, Dec. 3, 1945; A.C. Sedgwick, "Bid to Armenians Criticized," *NYT*, Dec. 22, 1945; "Seeks to Aid Armenians," *NYT*, Dec. 22, 1945; "Armenian 'National Council' Asks Turks to 'Return' Land to Russia," *NYT*, Dec. 24, 1945; Vahan Kalenderian and James Mitchell, "Claims of Armenia Advanced," *NYT*, Dec. 24, 1945; A.C. Sedgwick, "New Armenia Bid by Soviet is Seen," *NYT*, Jan. 2, 1946; Leo Gananian, "Armenia Has Claims," *NYT*, Jan. 5, 1946; "Armenians to Migrate," *NYT*, Feb. 14, 1946; "U.N. is Urged to Act on Armenian Issue," *NYT*, April 29, 1946; Rep. Bertrand W. Gearhart (CA), "The Case of 1,500,000 Armenians," *CR*, April 30, 1946, A2376-A2377; Rep. Bertrand W. Gearhart (CA), "Justice to Armenia and Greece," *CR*, April 30, 1946, A2391-A2392; Edwin Smith, "Armenian Question Discussed," *NYT*, May 4, 1946; Rep. Charles R. Savage (WA), "Treatment of Armenia," *CR*, May 9, 1946, A2573-A2574; Rep. Thomas J. Lane (MA), "Resolution Adopted by Committee for Armenian Rights and the Armenian National Council of America at Hotel Edison, Lynn, Mass.," *CR*, May 24, 1946, A2964; Rep. Thomas J. Lane (MA), "America's Responsibility Toward Armenia," *CR*, May 24, 1946, A2975; "Closer Soviet Ties Urged Upon Nation," *NYT*, June 17, 1946; "2300 Armenians Leave Syria," *NYT*, July 15, 1946; Rep. Bertrand W. Gearhart (CA), "Justice to Armenia," *CR*, July 29, 1946, A4567-A4568; Rep. Bertrand W. Gearhart (CA), "A Historic Responsibility of Armenian-Americans— An Address by Mr. Leon Surmelian," *CR*, July 29, 1946, A4569-A4571; Rep. Bertrand W. Gearhart (CA), "Armenia's Plea for Justice," July 29, 1946, *CR*, A4575-A4576; Vahan Kalenderian, "Armenian State Urged," *NYT*, July 29, 1946; M.H. Exerjian, "Viewing Turkey's Elections," *NYT*, Aug. 5, 1946; "Armenians Leave Greece," *NYT*, Aug. 15, 1946; "Armenian Migration Reported," *NYT*, Aug. 25, 1946; "Influx to Soviet Armenia from Balkans, Near East," *NYT*, Oct. 19, 1946; "Armenians May Quit Palestine," *NYT*, Oct. 22, 1946; "Armenians Ask Return," *NYT*, Nov. 21, 1946; Leon Surmelian, "An Enlarged Armenia: People Said to Look to Section Under Turkish Rule," *NYT*, Nov. 24, 1946.

<sup>22</sup> Mark, "The War Scare of 1946," 414.

<sup>23</sup> S. Kent Costikyan, "Letters to the Times: Steps for Peace," *NYT*, May 3, 1947; "Survival of Armenian Laid to Christianity," *NYT*, May 3, 1947; "Armenian Claims on Turkey Pushed," *NYT*, May 5, 1947; H.M. Dadourian, "The Armenian Question," *NYT*, May 25, 1947; "U.N. Gets Armenian Plea," *NYT*, June 6, 1947;

campaign aimed at preventing Turkey from receiving the military and economic aid proposed by President Truman.<sup>24</sup> The *New York Times* continued to show an interest in the plight of Armenians returning to the Armenian SSR, in particular the approximately 300 who emigrated from the United States, but by early 1948 even this had run its course.<sup>25</sup> In May 1948, even the Armenians' strongest supporter in the U.S. Congress conceded defeat.<sup>26</sup>

Ironically, it was at this point that the ARF became involved the discussion over the reopening of the Armenian Question. Through articles in the *Armenian Review*, an official journal of the ARF, the organization endorsed the claims being made by other Armenian groups on eastern Anatolia, but also attempted to dispel the notion that all Armenians, including Armenian-Americans, were pro-Soviet.<sup>27</sup> As the post-war honeymoon between the United States and the Soviet Union quickly transitioned into the start of the Cold War, these Armenian special interest groups were left in an awkward position. Their image was also not helped by the national attention surrounding the Armenian-Americans who were willing to renounce their U.S. citizenship and emigrate to the Armenian SSR. The ARF, already trying to repair a reputation

---

<sup>24</sup> "Armenians Fight Aid to Turkey," *NYT*, March 27, 1947; "Armenians Oppose U.S. Aid to Turkey," *NYT*, March 31, 1947; Rep. Bertrand W. Gearhart (CA), "Armenia and the Turkish Loan," *CR*, April 3, 1947, A1486; Rep. Bertrand W. Gearhart (CA), "The Proposed Turkish Loan," *CR*, April 3, 1947, A1495; "Turkish Aid Opposed by Armenian Council," *NYT*, April 7, 1947; Rep. Edwin C. Johnson (CO), "Aid to Greece and Turkey," *CR*, April 22, 1947, A1811; Rep. Daniel A. Reed (NY), "The Foreign Policy of the United States," *CR*, April 28, 1947, A1951; Rep. Bertrand W. Gearhart (CA), "We Believe America can Enhance her Prestige and Win the Admiration and Respect of People Everywhere Only by Championing the Cause of Justice and Decency, Rather than by an Unholy Alliance with the 'Unspeakable' Turk.— Armenian National Council of America," *CR*, May 7, 1947, A2155; Rep. Lawrence H. Smith (WI), "Greek-Turkish Aid," *CR*, May 7, 1947, A2171-A2172; "Turkish Loan," *CR*, May 13, 1947, 5185; "Armenian Group Fights Aid," *NYT*, May 13, 1947; "Armenians Fight Turkish Aid," *NYT*, May 13, 1947; John Roy Carlson (Arthur Derounian), "News Story Protested," *NYT*, May 17, 1947; A. Alichanian, "The Armenian Massacres," *NYT*, Sept. 27, 1947; Henry Tanner, "American-Armenians Who Left U.S. for Soviet Yearn to Return," *NYT*, March 18, 1964.

<sup>25</sup> "Armenians to Quit Greece," *NYT*, June 11, 1947; "Armenian Mistreatment Alleged," *NYT*, September 12, 1947; "Armenians Leaving Palestine," *NYT*, Oct. 20, 1947; "Soviet Inducing Armenians in U.S. to Drop Citizenship, Return to Industrialize Republic," *NYT*, Oct. 21, 1947; "1,000 Armenians Would Leave U.S.," *NYT*, Oct. 31, 1947; "150 Armenians Sail Back to Homeland," *NYT*, Nov. 2, 1947; Armen Alichanian, "Repatriation of Armenians," *NYT*, Nov. 22, 1947; C.L. Sulzberger, "Armenians Find Native Land a Disappointment on Return," *NYT*, March 14, 1948; The *New York Times* would also cover the return of some of these Armenian Americans to the United States in 1964. See Henry Tanner, "American-Armenians Who Left U.S. for Soviet Yearn to Return," *NYT*, March 18, 1964; Martin Gansberg, "American-Armenians Glad to Be Back from Soviet," *NYT*, March 22, 1964; "Russians Dispute Armenia Article," *NYT*, April 1, 1964.

<sup>26</sup> Rep. Bertrand W. Gearhart (CA), "The Armenian General Benevolent Union and the Armenian Refugee Problem," *CR*, May 25, 1948, A3725-A3726.

<sup>27</sup> The ARF would later change its mind and claim that the real goal of the entire Armenian Campaign between 1945 and 1947 was not to take back Armenian territory from Turkey, but simply to discredit the ARF. See Reuben Darbinian, "In Retrospect: A Glance at the Past Thirty Years," *Armenian Review*, Vol. 6, No. 3 (Aut. 1953): 53.

tarnished by the organization's association with the Nazis during World War II, was eager to correct this perception of Armenian-Americans and prove their anti-communist credentials.<sup>28</sup>

Although discussion over the massacres and deportations of 1915 made a brief appearance in Congress during the debates over the Genocide Convention,<sup>29</sup> the Armenian narrative and the interpretation of the Armenian Question changed dramatically by the early 1950s. While Armenians and the Armenian SSR had only recently been hailed as the recipients and beneficiaries of Soviet largesse, they were now the victims of Soviet tyranny oppression. While obviously a product of the deterioration in relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, the change was also due to the dissatisfaction and resentment in Armenian diaspora towards the actions of Kevork VI, the head of the Armenian Church and based in Echmiadzin in the Armenian SSR, the historical center of the Armenian Church. Installed by the Soviets in 1945, Kevork VI gave his support and influence to the repatriation campaign of 1947-1949, which left him exposed when the political winds changed in late 1946. Kevork VI also drew the ire of certain elements in the Armenian-American diaspora, particularly the ARF, by ordering Armenians abroad to annually celebrate the Soviet-friendly "Armenian Liberation Day" on November 29, while forbidding the commemoration of more nationalistic, and pro-ARF, "Armenian Independence Day" on May 28.<sup>30</sup> The chimera of a vibrant, dynamic and advanced Soviet Armenia, which wanted to spread its prosperity to the eastern provinces of Turkey, was now replaced by the nightmare that was the Armenian SSR: "a godless Soviet satellite" suffering from thirty years of "exploitation and oppression."<sup>31</sup>

While the plight of the oppressed and exploited Armenians trapped in the Soviet Union did not receive sustained attention in the national media, it was a topic of intermittent discussion in the U.S. Congress for the next decade, particularly among congressmen representing communities with significant numbers of Armenian-American. Statements of concern and

---

<sup>28</sup> James G. Mandalian, "The Armenian Case," *Armenian Review* Vol. 1, No. 1 (Win. 1948): 49-56; Arkady Stepanian, "The Armenian Case and the Conflicting World Forces," *AR* Vol. 1, No. 2 (Spr. 1948): 75-78; Rep. Frank E. Hook (MI), "John R. Flynn and the Dashnags," *CR*, May 4, 1945, A2074-A2076; Rep. Emanuel Celler (NY), "Document Reveals Dashnag Collaboration with Nazis," *CR*, Nov. 1, 1945, A4840-A4841; Arkady Stepanian, "The Armenian Case and the Conflicting World Forces," *AR* Vol. 1, No. 2 (Spr. 1948): 75-78.

<sup>29</sup> United States Senate, 81st Congress, 2nd Session, Genocide Convention, Legislative History of Committee on Foreign Relations United States Senate, 1950, 26-27; "Statement of the Armenian National Council of America," United States Senate, 81st Congress, 2nd Session, United States Senate, Eighty-First Congress, 1950, 548-550.

<sup>30</sup> Nov. 29, 1920 was the day the Bolsheviks took control of the Armenian Republic, which had declared its independence on May 28, 1918. See "Harry Schwartz, "Many Armenians in U.S. Defy Leader," *NYT*, Nov. 23, 1951; "Justice Douglas Spurs Armenians," *NYT*, Nov. 26, 1951.

<sup>31</sup> "Justice Douglas Spurs Armenians," *NYT*, Nov. 26, 1951; "Soviet Armenia," *NYT*, Dec. 1, 1951.

observations varied in intensity and frequency during the 1950s and early 1960s, but typically centered on May 28<sup>th</sup>, Armenian Independence Day, and February 18<sup>th</sup>, the day the Armenians revolted and temporarily forced the Soviets out of the Armenian SSR.<sup>32</sup> The commemorative holidays provided an opportunity to retell the tragic narrative of the Armenians and, in particular, emphasize, criticize and lament the unlawful Sovietization of the Armenian Republic. The Armenian SSR also enjoyed a prominent place on the list of countries that Rep. Daniel Flood's (PA) proposed *Captive Nations* legislation was designed to assist and were the subject of a House Special Committee.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> Rep. Thomas J. Lane (MA), "Thirty-Fourth Armenian Independence Anniversary," *CR*, May 21, 1952, A3273-A3274; "Armenians Get Praise," *NYT*, May 26, 1952; Rep. John W. McCormack (MA), "Address of Mr. J. Missakian on the Thirty-fourth Anniversary of the Independence of Armenia," *CR*, June 17, 1952, A3784-A3785; Rep. John W. McCormack (MA), "Anniversary of Armenian Independence," *CR*, June 17, 1952, A3793; "Uprising of the Armenian People Against the Soviet Union," *CR*, Feb. 18, 1953, 1157-1158; "Armenian Independence," *CR*, Feb. 18, 1953, 1193; Rep. Everett M. Dirksen (IL), "The Struggle for Armenian Independence," *CR*, February 20, 1953, A783; Rep. Emanuel Celler (NY), "Independence for Armenia," *CR*, April 28, 1953, A2898-A2899; Rep. Thomas J. Dodd (CT), "Armenian Independence Day," *CR*, May 27, 1953, A3010-A3011; Rep. Edward P. Boland (MA), "Armenian Independence Day," *CR*, May 28, 1953, A3035-A3036; "Armenian Independence Day," *CR*, May 28, 1953, 5756; "Armenian Independence Day," *CR*, May 28, 1953, 5787-5788; "Armenian Independence Day—Statement by Senator Humphrey," *CR*, June 1, 1953, 5832-5833; Sen. Theodore F. Green (RI), "Armenian Independence Day Address by Hon. Theodore F. Green, of Rhode Island," *CR*, June 4, 1953, A3184-A3185; Rep. Lawrence H. Smith (WI), "Anniversary of Armenian Revolt Against Soviet Tyranny," *CR*, Feb. 8, 1954, A1172-A1173; Rep. Philip J. Philbin (MA), "Armenia," *CR*, Feb. 16, 1954, 1871; Rep. Philip J. Philbin (MA), "Armenian Independence," *CR*, May 26, 1954, A3879; *Communist Takeover and Occupation of Armenia Special Report No. 5 of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression*, House of Representatives, 83<sup>rd</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, Under Authority of H. Res. 346 and H. Res 438 (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, Dec. 31, 1954); Rep. Edward P. Boland (PA), "Armenian Independence," *CR*, May 28, 1957, 7919-7920; Rep. Edwin H. May, Jr. (CT), "Armenian Independence Day," *CR*, June 4, 1957, 8329; "Armenian Independence Day," *CR*, June 6, 1957, 8460; "Thirty-Seventh Anniversary of Armenia's Successful Revolt Against Soviet Communism," *CR*, February 18, 1958, 2317-2318; "Forty-Third Anniversary of Establishment of Independent Republic of Armenia," *CR*, May 26, 1961, 9093; "Armenian Independence Day," *CR*, May 26, 1961, 9113; "Armenian Independence Day," *CR*, May 28, 1963, 9609-9613; "The 45th Anniversary of Armenian Independence Day," *CR*, May 28, 1963, 9627; Rep. Samuel S. Stratton (NY), "Armenian Independence Day," *CR*, June 6, 1963, A3671-A3672; Rep. Glenard P. Lipscomb (CA), "The 1963 Freedom Award to Congressman Derwinski," *CR*, June 11, 1963, A3790-A3791.

<sup>33</sup> Rep. Daniel J. Flood (PA), "House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations," *CR*, May 21, 1953, A3191; Rep. Daniel J. Flood (PA), "House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations," *CR*, June 6, 1963, A3659; Rep. Daniel J. Flood (PA), "House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations," *CR*, June 12, 1963, A3766; Rep. Daniel J. Flood (PA), "House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations," *CR*, June 18, 1963, A3869; Rep. Daniel J. Flood (PA), "A Special Committee on Captive Nations and the Fifth Captive Nations Week Observance," *CR*, June 20, 1963, A4005-A4007; Rep. Daniel J. Flood (PA), "House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations," *CR*, June 24, 1963, A3988; Rep. Daniel J. Flood (PA), "House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations," *CR*, June 27, 1963, A4590-A4591; Rep. Daniel J. Flood (PA), "House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations," *CR*, July 1, 1963, 12038-12039; Rep. Daniel J. Flood (PA), "House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations," *CR*, July 1, 1963, 12759; Rep. Daniel J. Flood (PA), "House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations," *CR*, July 1, 1963, A4490; "USSR Nationalities in Danger of Extinction," *CR*, July 23, 1963, 13138; Rep. Daniel J. Flood (PA), "House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations," *CR*, July 23, 1963, A4602-A4603; Rep. Daniel J. Flood (PA), "House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations," *CR*, July 30, 1963, A4833-A4834.

## The Massacres and Deportations of 1915

The first instance in which the massacres and deportations of Armenians by the Ottomans in 1915 were the main topic of discussion in a public forum appears to be in a letter written to the *New York Times* from the chairman of the Armenian National Committee in response to comments made by an U.S. Army officer blaming the Armenians for the massacres of 1915.<sup>34</sup> The second was a two-page eyewitness account of the massacres in 1915 published in the third issue of the *Armenian Review* that described atrocities “far more heinous and reprehensible” than those carried out by the Nazis in World War II.<sup>35</sup> The term genocide, since its conception, has been associated with the Armenians and, in some cases, partially defined by the Armenian massacres and deportations of 1915, and a discussion of these events periodically surfaced during the Genocide Convention debates of 1950.<sup>36</sup> Curiously, however, between 1946 and 1959, there was not a single call to hold the contemporary Turkish Republic responsible for the massacres of 1915, and only one instance expressing concern that those responsible for the atrocities had not been brought to justice.<sup>37</sup> In fact, of the four instances described above when

---

<sup>34</sup> A. Alichanian, “Letters to the Times: The Armenian Massacres,” *NYT*, Sept. 27, 1947.

<sup>35</sup> H. Saro, “Terrors from the Crime of 1915,” *Armenian Review*, Vol. 1, No. 3 (Sum. 1948): 105-106. One of the first academic analyses of Armenians and the events leading up to the events of 1915, but not the massacres and deportations themselves, was also published in 1948. See Roderic Davison, “The Armenian Crisis, 1912-1914,” *American Historical Review*, Vol. 53, No. 3 (April 1948): 481-505.

<sup>36</sup> The term “genocide” appears to have been introduced to the public for the first time in late Aug. 1946. See “Genocide,” *NYT*, Aug. 26, 1946. For formal discussions see “Genocide Convention,” 81st Congress, 2nd Session, Legislative History of Committee on Foreign Relations United States Senate, 1950, 26-27; *Genocide Convention*, Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, Eighty-First Congress, Second Session on Executive O, The International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, Jan. 23, 24, 25, and February 9, 1950; “Raphael Lemkin Letters to Senator Brien McMahon (April 3, 1950) and Dr. Kalijarvi,” United States Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations, Subcommittee on Genocide Convention, April 12, 1950. For an early example of a detailed comparison between the Armenian Massacres of 1915 and the definition of genocide, see “Statement of the Armenian National Council of America,” United States Senate, 81st Congress, 2nd Session, United States Senate, Eighty-First Congress, 1950, 548-550. For unsophisticated early associations see “Armenians Oppose U.S. Aid to Turkey,” *NYT*, March 31, 1947; John Roy Carlson (Arthur Derounian), “News Story Protested,” *NYT*, May 17, 1947; H.M. Dadourian, “The Armenian Question,” *New York Times*, May 25, 1947; A. Alichanian, “The Armenian Massacres,” *NYT*, Sept. 27, 1947; H. Saro, “Terrors from the Crime of 1915,” *Armenian Review*, Vol. 1, No. 3 (Sum. 1948): 105-106; “Remnants of the Turkish Genocide,” *AR*, Vol. 2, No. 4 (Win. 1949): 49-53; Rep. Thomas J. Lane (MA), “Thirty-Fourth Armenian Independence Anniversary,” *CR*, May 21, 1952, A3273-A3274; “Independence for Armenia,” Rep. Emanuel Celler (NY), *CR*, April 28, 1953, A2898-A2899; “Armenian Independence Day— Statement by Senator Humphrey,” *CR*, June 1, 1953, 5832-5833.

<sup>37</sup> “Statement of the Armenian National Council of America, in Favor of the Ratification of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide, Submitted by Rev. Charles A. Vertanes, Executive Director,” *Genocide Convention*, Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, Eighty-

the subject of formally recognizing April 24 as Armenian Martyrs' Day came up in the U.S. Congress between 1953 and 1956, the Ottoman Empire was only mentioned once and Turkey not at all.<sup>38</sup>

1959, then, was a watershed in terms of the evolution of the Armenian question and, in particular, the notion that the Turkish Republic and its citizens were collectively responsible for the events of 1915 and owed a debt to the Armenian nation. The *Armenian Review* is a quarterly journal published by the ARF's Hairenik Press and which, by their own editorial board's admission, was the "official organ of an Armenian national-political party."<sup>39</sup> Beginning in its 1959 Spring and Summer issues, the *Armenian Review* published three articles, two of them in serial format: "Under the Shadow Death" by Garabed Aaronian; "An Inquiry into the Turkish Massacres of 1894-1897" by Gregory Arabian; and a reprint of Arnold Toynbee's "A Summary of Armenian History up to and Including the Year 1915."<sup>40</sup> After ten years of publication, this was the first time, since the "eyewitness" account in the third issue, that the massacres and deportations of 1915 warranted their own dedicated and detailed attention in the ARF's journal. Prior to 1959, articles dealing with the Ottoman component of the Armenian Question in the *Review* focused on the 19<sup>th</sup> century, or earlier, pre-World War I, post-World War I negotiations and peace treaties, or the state of Armenian minorities in the contemporary Turkish Republic.<sup>41</sup> The events of 1915, and even World War I, are conspicuously absent.

---

First Congress, Second Session on Executive O, The International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, Jan. 23,24,25, and Feb. 9, 1950, 548-550.

<sup>38</sup> For the reference to "persecution in the Ottoman Empire," see "Memorial Day Commemorating Armenian Martyrs in World War I," *CR*, April 27, 1953, 3923; For the other references see "Armenian Martyrs," *CR*, April 23, 1954, 5416; Rep. F.D. Roosevelt, JR. (NY), "Anniversary of the 1915 Armenian Massacre," *CR*, April 26, 1954, 5538; "Anniversary of Massacre of Armenians," *CR*, April 24, 1956, 6837.

<sup>39</sup> "An Exchange of Letters with the Turkish Ambassador," *Armenian Review* Vol. 13, No. 3 (Aut. 1960): 3.

<sup>40</sup> Garabed H. Aaronian, "Under the Shadow of Death," *AR* Vol. 12, No. 1 (Spr. 1959): 69-76; Gregory Arabian, "An Inquiry into the Turkish Massacres of 1894-1897," *AR* Vol. 12, No. 1 (Spr. 1959): 84-96; Arabian, "An Inquiry into the Turkish Massacres of 1894-1897 II," *AR* Vol. 12, No. 2 (Sum. 1959): 132-140; Arabian, "An Inquiry into the Turkish Massacres of 1894-1897 III," *AR* Vol. 12, No. 3 (Aut. 1959): 127-133; Arnold Toynbee, "A Summary of Armenian History Up to and Including 1915," *AR* Vol. 12, No. 2 (Sum. 1959): 78-97; Toynbee, "A Summary of Armenian History Up to and Including 1915 II," *AR* Vol. 12, No. 3 (Aut. 1959): 59-74; Toynbee, "A Summary of Armenian History Up to and Including the Year 1915 III," *AR* Vol. 13, No. 2 (Win. 1960): 137-150.

<sup>41</sup> Vardges Aharonian, "The Armenian Emancipatory Struggle I," *Armenian Review* Vol. 6, No. 4 (Win. 1953): 3-21; Aharonian, "The Armenian Emancipatory Struggle III," *AR* Vol. 7, No. 2 (Sum. 1954): 64-69; James G. Mandalian, "Figures from the Armenian Revolution," *AR* Vol. 9, No. 4 (Win. 1956): 26-33; Meroojan Ozanian, "Vramian on the Value of Diplomacy and Propaganda," *AR* Vol. 11, No. 3 (Aut. 1958): 61-70; Rita Jerrehian, "Effect of World War I on the Armenian Question," *AR* Vol. 8, No. 4 (Win. 1955): 102-110; Stephen Bonsal, "Armenian Disaster," *AR* Vol. 3, No. 2 (Sum. 1950): 43-52; Jerrehian, "From the Armistice to the Treaty of Sevres I," *AR* Vol. 9, No. 2 (Sum. 1956): 123-142; Jerrehian, "Abandonment of the Armenian Question as an International Issue," *AR* Vol. 9, No. 4 (Win. 1956): 113-122; Dr. Vahe Sarafian, "World War I American Relief for Armenians

In addition to the change content beginning in 1959, there is also an unmistakable change in the tone of the *Armenian Review*. Aaronian addresses a number of themes within the context of the war and massacres, including conversion to Islam, Great Power betrayal, the abduction, the abduction of Armenian women, and the Armenian desire for *revenge*. Arabian's three-part article was technically concerned about the Hamidian Massacres of 1894 - 1897, but it is clear by the article's editorial introduction that the board believed it encompassed much more:

The wonder of the century is that, despite the monumental evidence adduced by the best historians of the world in regard to the heinous enormity of the Turkish crime, to this date, after a lapse of fully sixty-one years, there has not been one Turkish statesmen, not one civic leader, not one soldier, or a poet or a peasant who has had the decency of admitting that, in massacring the Armenians, their nation did a great wrong. It is this absolute absence of any trace of remorse or regret that is appalling in the Turkish character.<sup>42</sup>

In a similar vein, the introduction to the Toynbee reprint stated that while “the Armenian case has been completely forgotten” by the world, Armenians would “bring their case to world attention when the proper time arrives.”<sup>43</sup> Given that the Armenian Question received fairly consistent attention since at least 1945, and given the *Armenian Review*'s own lack of emphasis, coverage or analyses of the events of 1915, it is unclear why the ARF was suddenly concerned with world indifference and acting with a certain sense of urgency to heighten and broaden awareness of the 1915 Armenian massacres. It is also puzzling why, less than a year later, the editors of the *Armenian Review* contradicted themselves by writing: “The whole world knows why the attitude of the Armenians toward the Turks is not, and cannot be friendly, no matter how desirable that may be. Unfortunately, it is only the Turks who do not know, or refuse to realize this fact.”<sup>44</sup>

This change in tone did not go unnoticed. On December 7, 1959, the Turkish Ambassador to the United States, Ali S. H. Ürgüplü, sent a letter to the editor of the *Armenian Review*, Reuben Darbinian, in which Ürgüplü objects to, among other things, “the fact that most articles in the *Armenian Review* reflect a mentality which is both ridiculously and dangerously chauvinistic, and disgracefully prejudiced, which deliberately misrepresents the facts by showing

---

II,” *AR* Vol. 10, No. 3 (Aut. 1957): 133-145; “Remnants of the Turkish Genocide,” *AR* Vol. 2, No. 4 (Win. 1949): 49-53; B. Kushikian, “One Month in Turkey,” *AR* Vol. 6, No. 2 (Sum. 1953):115-125.

<sup>42</sup> Arabian, “An Inquiry, Part I,” *Armenian Review*, Vol. 12, No. 1 (Spr. 1959): 84.

<sup>43</sup> Toynbee, “A Summary,” *Armenian Review*, Vol. 12, No. 2 (Sum. 1959): 78.

<sup>44</sup> “An Exchange of Letters with the Turkish Ambassador,” *Armenian Review*, Vol. 13, No. 3 (Aut. 1960): 3.

one side of the picture, and which has for its sole object the sowing of seeds of hate.”<sup>45</sup> The Ambassador requested that any articles submitted to the journal “containing a hate-Turkey theme” be rejected for publication.<sup>46</sup> It is interesting that while Darbinian replied to Ürgüplü a week later, on December 15, 1959, the journal waited nearly a year before both letters were published.<sup>47</sup> Judging by Darbinian’s response: “if the Armenian people are filled with hatred toward the Turks,” it is because “in 1915 the Turkish Government, through mass deportations and massacre, consummated the Armenian Genocide in its attempt to make an end of the Armenian Question,” and “the authors of the Armenian genocide, neither the Turkish Government, nor any organization nor individual, despite the fact that forty-four years have passed since that tragic episode, have expressed at any time any regret or remorse over the crime they committed, nor have they shown any disposition to make any moral, economic, or political restitution to the surviving Armenians...,” and considering the subsequent articles published in the *Armenian Review*, Darbinian and the rest of the editorial board rejected the Turkish Ambassador’s request.<sup>48</sup>

In the six years between the sudden interest by the ARF and the demonstrations in Beirut and Yerevan to mark the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary in April 1965, publications on the events of 1915 steadily increased in their journal. In addition Arabian and Toynbee installments, the *Armenian Review* published a four-part hagiography of Soghomon Tehlirian (aka, Saro Melikian), the ARF agent who assassinated the alleged architect of the Armenian massacres, and former Prime Minister of the Ottoman Empire, Talaat Pasha.<sup>49</sup> While undoubtedly influenced by Tehlirian’s death in May 1960, the glorification of his life, the assassination and, particularly, his acquittal for the crime, fit the new direction of the *Armenian Review*.<sup>50</sup> While the old, familiar topics of

---

<sup>45</sup> Ibid., 4.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid.

<sup>47</sup> These eleven months were, coincidentally, a particularly troubling period of time for Turkey, that covered President Eisenhower’s state visit to Turkey in Dec. 1959, through the coup of May 1960 and the three years of military rule that followed.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., 5-6.

<sup>49</sup> Sarkis Atamian, “Soghomon Tehlirian I,” *Armenian Review* Vol. 13, No. 3 (Aut. 1960): 40-51; Atamian, “Soghomon Tehlirian II,” *AR* Vol. 14, No. 1 (Win. 1961): 10-21; Atamian, “Soghomon Tehlirian III,” *AR* Vol. 14, No. 2 (Spr. 1961): 16-36; Atamian, “Soghomon Tehlirian IV,” *AR* Vol. 14, No. 3 (Sum. 1961): 44-49. Another homage to Tehlirian was published the following year, see Setrak Pakhtikian, “I knew Soghomon Tehlirian,” *AR* Vol. 15, No. 2 (Sum. 1962): 16-23.

<sup>50</sup> “Saro Melikian, Armenian Hero,” *NYT*, May 26, 1960.

the Armenian Question remained popular;<sup>51</sup> by 1964 they had largely been replaced by stories and articles on the Armenian massacres and deportations of 1915.<sup>52</sup>

Three themes emerged out of this short period of renewed interest in 1915. First, the suffering, anguish and pain of the victims of the Armenian massacres were aggravated further by the Turkish Republic and/or its citizens' refusal to admit, apologize or atone for their crimes, and, in fact, Turkey's denial and counter-accusations regarding the events of 1915 perpetuated the crimes. Second, the Armenians believed that they were denied justice in the immediate post-war period, or, conversely, the Turks escaped from justice,<sup>53</sup> and they wanted this outrage rectified. The final theme was that all Turks, past, present and future, were guilty for the crimes of 1915.

The first of these new themes to emerge in the *Armenian Review* was the anger over the lack of a formal or informal apology from the Turkish government or its citizens. It started with the introduction to the Arabian article in the Spring 1959 issue, was followed by Darbinian's comments to the Turkish Ambassador in December and continued with such statements as: "there was not one soul among the criminal race who would raise his voice to condemn his grandfathers whose ashes are still wet with the torrents of blood which were shed."<sup>54</sup> The attention brought to this issue intensified in 1964 with the publication of an editorial on UNESCO's honoring the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Ataturk's death:

---

<sup>51</sup> Vahan Papazian, "Situation in the Caucasus Between 1910-1920," *Armenian Review* Vol. 12, No. 3 (Aut. 1959): 76-86; Papazian, "Armenian Delegations to the Paris Peace Conference," *AR* Vol. 13, No. 2 (Sum. 1960): 49-60; Papazian, "The Armenian National Congress in Paris," *AR* Vol. 13, No. 2 (Win. 1960): 56-65; Alexander Khatissian, "The Lausanne Conference and the Two Armenian Delegations III," *AR* Vol. 15, No. 1 (Spr. 1962): 55-64; James H. Tashjian, "The Armenian Tragedy," *AR* Vol. 15, No. 2 (Sum. 1962): 30-40; Khatissian, "The Lausanne Conference and the Two Armenian Delegations IV," *AR* Vol. 15, No. 2 (Sum. 1962): 53-62; Avetis Aharonian, "From Sardarapat to Sevres and Lausanne I," *AR* Vol. 15, No. 3 (Aut. 1962): 3-13; K. Guzaljian, "The Origin of the Armenian Question as Appraised by the Armenians," *AR* Vol. 16, No. 2 (Sum. 1963): 69-80; Garo Pasdermajian, "Armenia: A Leading Factor in the Winning of World War I," *AR* Vol. 17, No. 1 (Spr. 1964): 24-45.

<sup>52</sup> Kevork, "To Aram on April 24," *Armenian Review* Vol. 15, No. 3 (Aut. 1962): 60-62; Arsen Yergath, "The Turk," *AR* Vol. 15, No. 4 (Win. 1962): 43-45; William Cowper, "On the Turks," *AR* Vol. 16, No. 1 (Spr. 1963): 8; Haigazn K. Kazarian, "The 'Forty Days of Musa Dagh' and Its English Translation," *AR* Vol. 16, No. 3 (Aut. 1963): 18-22; "The Murderous Tyranny of the Turks by Arnold J. Toynbee," *AR* Vol. 16, No. 4 (Win. 1963): 17-29; "UNESCO and the Kemal Ataturk Anniversary," *AR* Vol. 17, No. 2 (Sum. 1964): 3-4; Hrand Pasdermajian, "A History of Armenia: The First World War," *AR* Vol. 17, No. 4 (Win. 1964): 56-62; Yervand Khatanasian, "Genocide and the Armenian Case," *AR* Vol. 17, No. 4 (Win. 1964): 3-7; Kazarian, "The Turkish Genocide on the Church Front," *AR* Vol. 18, No. 1 (Spr. 1965): 3-9.

<sup>53</sup> There seems to be no explanation as to why the satisfaction of successfully assassinating most of the Ottoman leaders the Armenians held responsible for the events of 1915 in the early 1920s (see next chapter), gave way to this sense of the "Turks" escaping justice.

<sup>54</sup> Arsen Yergath, "The Turk," *Armenian Review* Vol. 15, No. 4 (Winter 1962): 43-45. Sarkis Atamian also briefly notes the lack of an apology in his 1955 research. See Sarkis Atamian, *The Armenian Community: The Historical Development of a Social and Ideological Conflict* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1955), 454.

“there has not been a *single* Turkish leader or common individual who has had the decency to express one iota of regret for their monstrous crime, or even to make a simple admission of it, to say nothing of the fact that neither a single individual nor an organization has felt bound to make any moral or material reparation to the surviving Armenians,” and “a nation which to this day has not shown a single token of compunction for the monstrous crime which it committed against a helpless nation,” in comparison to the Germans “who expressed both sorrow and regret for the enormous crimes of their own Nazis and did their utmost to indemnify the Jewish people both morally and materially...”<sup>55</sup>

This coincided with an editorial by Vahakn Dadrian in the *New York Times* that reproduced, nearly verbatim, the same statement: “Unlike the multitudes of Germans who with feelings of shame and compunction endeavor to atone for Nazi crimes and offer just compensation to Jews, there has yet to emerge a single prominent or humble Turk to publicly admit the massacres.”<sup>56</sup> Another comparison of the Germans and Turks put it even more bluntly: The Turk “is so insolent that not only [sic] he has not uttered a single word of remorse or condemnation to this day.”<sup>57</sup>

The second theme, the argument that justice had been denied to the Armenians in the wake of World War I was not entirely a new concept. Previously, however, and certainly within the context of the late 1940s campaign to annex Kars and Ardahan, the denial of justice referred to the fact that Armenia had not been freed from the Turks. Armenians had not taken possession of the territory awarded to it by the Treaty of Sèvres (Wilson’s Armenia); the land owed to it by the Great Powers for both centuries of endured suffering and for their invaluable contributions to both World Wars.<sup>58</sup> In the word of Leon Surmelian, the entire Armenian Question as a political-cultural issue, prior to 1959 at least, could be summed up in one word: “soil.”<sup>59</sup>

While the subject of Turkey paying for confiscated property during World War I had already been broached,<sup>60</sup> equating justice with the punishment of the contemporary Turkish Republic and its citizens, specifically for the crimes of 1915, was a new development amongst Armenians. They had, of course, expressed anger and resentment over the Allies failure to keep their promise to hold the government of the Ottoman Empire responsible for the events in eastern

---

<sup>55</sup> “UNESCO and the Kemal Ataturk Anniversary,” *Armenian Review* Vol. 17, No. 2 (Sum. 1964): 3-4.

<sup>56</sup> V.N. Dadrian, “Massacre of Armenians,” *NYT*, May 30, 1964.

<sup>57</sup> Yervand Khatanasian, “Genocide and the Armenian Case,” *Armenian Review* Vol. 17, No. 4 (Win. 1964): 3-7.

<sup>58</sup> James G. Mandalian, “The Armenian Case,” *Armenian Review* Vol. 1, No. 1 (Win. 1948): 49-56.

<sup>59</sup> Rep. Bertrand W. Gearhart (CA), “A Historic Responsibility of Armenian-Americans— An Address by Mr. Leon Surmelian,” *CR*, July 29, 1946, A4569-A4571.

<sup>60</sup> “Armenians Present Case,” *NYT*, Sept. 23, 1945.

Anatolia after the war. Armenian discontent, however, was already addressed by the ARF, who hunted down and assassinated the Ottoman officials they believed to be responsible for the Armenian massacres.<sup>61</sup> This new feeling of having been cheated, or that the Ottoman Empire, Turkey and Turkish citizens had escaped from justice, was mentioned during the debates over the Genocide Convention in 1950,<sup>62</sup> briefly resurfaced in the introduction to the Toynbee reprint: “the Armenians...have no intention of letting the murderer of their race go scot free,”<sup>63</sup> and reappeared in the scathing editorial in the *Armenian Review* in 1964.<sup>64</sup> Apparently insulted by the prospect of UNESCO honoring the father of modern Turkey, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, on the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of his death, and influenced by the continued efforts of West Germany to bring Nazi war criminals to justice, the *Armenian Review* lamented the fact that no Turkish leaders were ever tried in court and “not a single Turk has been punished for having organized or participated in the Genocide of the Armenians.”<sup>65</sup>

In his editorials to the *New York Times*, Dadrian carried this further by arguing that the Armenians were “denied the privilege of a Nuremberg trial or even lesser trials where they could have confronted their assassins,” because after the war “the victorious Allies expediently refrained from taking the defeated Turks to task,” and that “above all, the Turks committed and escaped retribution for what has been called ‘deeds surpassing in magnitude and vileness the most imaginative pictures of hell ever conceived.’”<sup>66</sup> An article in the *Armenian Review* in December 1964 was even less kind, laying the blame for the Jewish Holocaust on the Allied governments which had, by failing to bring Turkish war criminals to justice after World War I, “tore justice into a thousand shreds and by their act encouraged the genocide.”<sup>67</sup> It was this author, who perhaps summed up the sentiments of the Armenian diaspora perfectly, as the 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary approached: “The Armenian must recover his ancestral territories” and “The Turk

---

<sup>61</sup> “Allies to Punish Turks Who Murder,” *NYT*, May 24, 1915; “Talaat Pasha Slain in Berlin Suburb,” *NYT*, March 16, 1921; “Talaat Pasha Murdered. Armenia’s Vengeance,” *The Times*, March 16, 1921; “Ex-Grand Vizier Murdered. Prince Said Halim’s Career,” *The Times*, Dec. 7, 1921; “Two Young Turks Murdered in Berlin,” *NYT*, April 19, 1922; “Jemal Pasha Dead. Shot in Tiflis. Tyrant of Syria,” *The Times*, July 26, 1922; “Djemal Pasha, Fugitive, Assassinated in Tiflis; Condemned as Author of Armenian Massacres,” *NYT*, July 26, 1922; “One After Another,” *NYT*, July 27, 1922. See also Simon Vratzian, *Armenia and the Armenian Question* (Boston, MA: Hairenik, 1943), 30-31. See also *Genocide Convention*, 1950, 96.

<sup>62</sup> “Statement of the Armenian National Council of America,” 1950, 548-550.

<sup>63</sup> Toynbee, “A Summary of Armenian History Up to and Including 1915,” *Armenian Review*, Vol. 12, No. 2 (Sum. 1959): 78.

<sup>64</sup> “UNESCO and the Kemal Atatürk Anniversary,” *Armenian Review* Vol. 17, No. 2 (Sum. 1964): 3-4.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>66</sup> V.N. Dadrian, “Letters to the Times: Massacre of Armenians,” *NYT*, May 30, 1964.

<sup>67</sup> Khatanasian, “Genocide and the Armenian Case,” *Armenian Review*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (Win. 1964): 6.

must give an account for his crime,” because “No law, and no resolution can create cooperation and love among the nations as long as the assassin of mankind goes scot free.”<sup>68</sup>

The suggestion that the Turks, collectively, and not the Ottoman central government a handful of others, were responsible for the massacres and deportations of 1915 was also new. Even the oft cited and recycled historian Toynbee went no further than the Central Government, and perhaps some local civil administrators, when allocating guilt: “In one way or another, the Central Government enforced and controlled the execution of the scheme, as it alone had originated the conception of it; and the Young Turkish Ministers and their associates at Constantinople are directly and personally responsible, from beginning to end, for the gigantic crime that devastated the Near East in 1915.”<sup>69</sup> Yet, in the 1959 exchange of letters with the Turkish Ambassador, the ARF makes it clear that there is some ambiguity in the allocation of guilt: “Unfortunately, you, that is the Turkish Government, does nothing to make the Armenians forget the crimes which the *Turks* [emphasis mine] have committed against them.”<sup>70</sup> Likewise, Hrand Pasdermajian writes: “In this work of extermination of a whole people the Turkish leaders found many accomplices among a population which was steeped in ignorance and blind fanaticism.”<sup>71</sup> By 1964, that ambiguity is gone: “The Turkish people, as a nation, supported that crime and was a direct participant in that same crime,”<sup>72</sup> or, “The Turkish people with all classes of society, the religious sects and the fanatical rabble, solidly in unison, dedicated itself to the cowardly task of exterminating the Armenian race,”<sup>73</sup> or, perhaps even more to the point, “It is an insult to the truth to insist that the culprit was the Turkish government and never the Turkish people.”<sup>74</sup> To underscore Turkish collective guilt, this was again contrasted with the Jewish Holocaust which “was not the doing of the German people,” but rather the “malicious act of a few tens of thousands of lunatics,” and it would be the equivalent of “insolently spitting in the face of justice” for the Turkish people to “be exonerated and only the government be called to account before a people rolling in excruciating pain such as the Armenians.”<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup> Ibid., 7.

<sup>69</sup> Arnold Toynbee, “A Summary of Armenian History Up to and Including the Year 1915 III,” *Armenian Review* Vol. 13, No. 2 (Win. 1960): 150.

<sup>70</sup> “An Exchange of Letters with the Turkish Ambassador,” *Armenian Review*, Vol. 13, No. 3 (Aut. 1960): 6.

<sup>71</sup> Hrand Pasdermajian, “A History of Armenia: The First World War,” *Armenian Review* Vol. 17, No. 4 (Win. 1964): 58.

<sup>72</sup> “UNESCO and the Kemal Ataturk Anniversary,” *Armenian Review*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (Sum. 1964): 3.

<sup>73</sup> Khatanasian, “Genocide and the Armenian Case,” *Armenian Review* Vol. 17, No. 4 (Win. 1964): 4.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid., 5.

<sup>75</sup> Ibid.

The task of convincing diaspora Armenians in the early 1960s to move from holding the Ottoman Government accountable for the massacres and deportations carried out in eastern Anatolia in 1915 to holding the *entire* Turkish nation responsible was undoubtedly a Herculean exercise for Armenian leaders. Particularly after the ARF spent the previous 45 years proudly claiming to have avenged the Armenian people for the events of 1915 by assassinating those Ottoman (and Azerbaijani) officials it deemed responsible. Blaming an ethnic Turk in Marmaris, even if one could be found who self-identified as such, for events in Erzincan, Van or Trabzon was as nonsensical as holding a Greek in Edirne, a Palestinian in Konya, or a Jew in Istanbul responsible. Accusing a citizen of the Turkish Republic of being personally responsible for the crimes of 1915, regardless of his ethnic background or the distance of 50 years, is even more unimaginable. That Armenian political leaders, publishers, editorialists, and academics, were able to accomplish such a task, however, speaks to the tremendous power, influence and effectiveness of decades, if not centuries, of brutal anti-Turkish rhetoric and propaganda, in both Europe and the United States.

### **The Dehumanization of the Turk**

The history and perpetuation of anti-Turkishness in the West dates back to the fall of Constantinople in 1453, if not earlier, and has attracted its own scholarship and analyses.<sup>76</sup> The presence of an inherent prejudice against, or a fundamental misunderstanding of, the “Turk” and his empire in the United States was largely a product of the “Missionary establishment” which produced most of the written work on Islam, Turks, and the Ottoman Empire during the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>77</sup> This prejudice was exacerbated by the frequent use of racial and religious slurs coupled with dubious press coverage and reporting in the 19<sup>th</sup> century during the Greek War of Independence, the Serbian and Bulgarian revolts in 1875-1876 and the Russo-Turkish War of 1876-1878. Negative caricatures of the Turk and Islam intensified during the 1890s and hit the high-water mark during World War I and the post-war settlements of the early 1920s primarily due to the covert propaganda efforts of the British government’s Foreign Office and

---

<sup>76</sup> For two recent studies see Justin McCarthy, *The Turk in America: The Creation of an Enduring Prejudice* (Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press, 2010) and Kamil Aydın, *Images of Turkey in Western Literature* (Cambridgeshire, UK: Eothen Press, 1999).

<sup>77</sup> Justin McCarthy, *Turk in America*, 2010.

overt efforts of the *American Committee for Armenian and Syrian Relief* (ACASR) and its successor, the *Near East Relief* organization.<sup>78</sup> The British Foreign Office controlled most of the information on the Ottoman Empire and the Armenians that was disseminated to the American public during the war, and used willing academics, such as Arnold Toynbee, politicians and other figures to get the desired message across.<sup>79</sup> Likewise, the ACASR/Near East Relief spearheaded a fundraising campaign that emphasized the victimization of the *good* Armenian by the *evil* Turk through newspaper articles, advertisements, public meetings, school and church programs, publications, and even film.<sup>80</sup>

One result of this broad endeavor was the widely read memoirs of the former U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, Henry Morgenthau, first published in 1918.<sup>81</sup> While the memoirs' value as a historical document has been challenged elsewhere,<sup>82</sup> it is still useful as an example of the rhetoric used during this period. An alleged authority on the Ottoman Empire and Turks after two and a half years in Constantinople, the text is replete with racist commentary, base generalizations, and historical inaccuracies describing the Ottoman Empire and its Turkish inhabitants.<sup>83</sup> For Morgenthau, the "savage bloodthirsty Turk" was a "psychologically primitive" "bully and coward" with a "traditional aversion to the Christians" and a "natural instinct to maltreat those who are helplessly placed in their power," who, "like most primitive peoples, wear their emotions on the surface..."<sup>84</sup>

To understand the Turks, Morgenthau advised, "we must realize that the basic fact underlying the Turkish mentality is its utter contempt for all other races. A fairly insane pride is the element that largely explains this strange human species," which possesses "a total disregard for human life and an intense delight in inflicting physical human suffering which are not

---

<sup>78</sup> Ibid., 165-248. See also Robert L. Daniel, "The Armenian Question and American-Turkish Relations, 1914-1927," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 46, No. 2 (Sep., 1959): 253-254.

<sup>79</sup> McCarthy, 208-248.

<sup>80</sup> McCarthy, 165-202; Daniel, "The Armenian Question."

<sup>81</sup> Morgenthau was the U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire from November 1913 until February 1916. For one of the more recent editions, see Henry Morgenthau, *Ambassador Morgenthau's Story: A Personal Account of the Armenian Genocide* (New York: Cosmo Classics, 2008). The subtitle of this edition is misleading, however, as only a small portion of the book deals exclusively with the massacre and deportation of Armenians in 1915.

<sup>82</sup> The criticism of Morgenthau's memoirs primarily involves questions of authorship, intentions, and the veracity of its content. See McCarthy, *Turk in America*, 192-197; and Heath W. Lowry, *The Story Behind Ambassador Morgenthau's Story* (Istanbul, Turkey: Isis Press, 1990). For an early acknowledgement of "collaboration" on the memoirs, see Albert Howe Lybyer's review: "Ambassador Morgenthau's Story by Henry Morgenthau," *American Historical Review* Vol. 25, No. 2 (Jan. 1920): 287-288.

<sup>83</sup> Robert Daniel argues that it was Ambassador Morgenthau who "helped to set the pattern in name calling." See Daniel, 254.

<sup>84</sup> Morgenthau, *Ambassador Morgenthau's Story*, 91, 135, 164, 174, 191; See also Daniel, 254.

unusually the qualities of primitive peoples.”<sup>85</sup> To underscore the ‘primitiveness’ of the Turks, and proving either his disregard or ignorance of Ottoman history and culture, Morgenthau endeavored to cast them into a cultureless society devoid of any creativity and without the capacity to create (i.e., Turks could only destroy):

They were lacking in what we may call the fundamentals of a civilized community. They had no alphabet and no art of writing; no books, no poets, no art, and no architecture; they built no cities and they established no lasting state... They knew no law except the rule of might, and they had practically no agriculture and no industrial organization. They were simply wild and marauding horsemen, whose one conception of tribal success was to pounce upon people who were more civilized than themselves and plunder them.<sup>86</sup>

After reading this passage, even one of his contemporaries warned readers “the account given of the early Ottoman history (pp. 276-281) contains some statements which can be characterized only as fantastic.”<sup>87</sup> Perhaps most indicative of the image Morgenthau wanted to spread was his contention that the existence of anything admirable in the context of the Ottoman Empire and its Turks, in their entire five hundred years of existence, “have practically all been taken from the subject peoples whom he so greatly despises,” and that Turks are “parasites upon these overburdened and industrious people.”<sup>88</sup> For proof, he argued, one needed only look at the “wonderful improvements” in the new states of Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria and Rumania since the overthrow of the “Turkish yoke.”<sup>89</sup>

The efforts of the British Foreign Office and the ASACR/Near East Relief organization to project, at best, a negative and incomplete caricature of the Turk, or, at worst, an image of the Turk as a primitive subspecies that subsisted on the intelligence, labor, and industriousness of the superior races, was made easier by a general aversion to Islam and decades of intense anti-Turkish rhetoric and racial stereotyping. The individual American was already predisposed to unquestionably believe what they saw and read about Turks. By enlisting and accepting the aid of respected academics, politicians and civil servants like Arnold Toynbee and Henry Morgenthau, these groups merely ensured the campaign’s resounding success. Irrespective of facts, and despite the presence of Turks in the region for over 800 years, the Turks were marked

---

<sup>85</sup> Ibid., 191, 194.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid., 192.

<sup>87</sup> Lybyer, “Ambassador Morgenthau’s Story.”

<sup>88</sup> Morgenthau, 193-194.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid., 194.

as a terrible tribe of sub-humans who had never made a positive contribution to civilization, illegitimately occupied land in Europe, Anatolia and the Caucasus, were guilty of crimes dating back centuries and were to be shown no mercy. This vilification of ethnic Turks in the United States was so successful that formal diplomatic relations between the U.S. and the new Republic of Turkey did not resume until February 17, 1927. Even then, it was not completely unopposed.<sup>90</sup>

For the next twenty years, however, open and blatant anti-Turkish sentiment and rhetoric largely disappeared from the public sphere. When it resurfaced in 1947, the same familiar racist and dehumanizing clichés: “a race of cruel barbarians,” “the unspeakable Turk,” “the ignorant Turk,” “Turkish diabolism,” and “assassin Turk,” crept back into the *New York Times* and the deliberations of the U.S. Congress.<sup>91</sup> This time, however, it was neither driven by the British Foreign Office, nor the missionary establishment of the United States, but rather by the Armenian advocate groups which had formed in the waning months of World War II. It started with the Armenian National Council of America’s public opposition to any financial assistance for “barbaric” Turkey and the “unspeakable Turk” in April 1947.<sup>92</sup> In a letter to the *New York Times* the following month, Arthur Derounian, writing as John Roy Carlson and claiming to be in a “better position to know the Turkish character than most of my well-intentioned American friends,” opposed sending U.S. aid to the “Nazis of the Near East.”<sup>93</sup> The truly vitriolic attacks, however, took place in the United States Congress.

While Rep. Daniel Reed (NY), who used the “terrible Turks” to question the American public’s tolerance for having “their pockets picked by nations located in an area where blood, pillage, and rape have been their chief contribution to world affairs for thousands of years,”<sup>94</sup> provides at least one example of a non-Armenian resuscitating the hate-speech of the earlier period, the others are embedded in correspondence from Armenian-Americans to Congress. In a letter to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in March 1947, Arshag Mahdesian, allegedly

---

<sup>90</sup> Daniel, “The Armenian Question,” 273-275.

<sup>91</sup> Rep. Bertrand W. Gearhart (CA), “The Proposed Turkish Loan,” *CR*, April 3, 1947, A1495; “Turkish Aid Opposed by Armenian Council,” *NYT*, April 7, 1947; “Aid to Greece and Turkey,” Sen. Edwin C. Johnson (CO), *CR*, April 22, 1947, A1811; Rep. Daniel A. Reed (NY), “The Foreign Policy of the United States,” *CR*, April 28, 1947, A1951; Rep. Bertrand W. Gearhart (CA), “We Believe America can Enhance her Prestige and Win the Admiration and Respect of People Everywhere Only by Championing the Cause of Justice and Decency, Rather than by an Unholy Alliance with the ‘Unspeakable’ Turk.”— Armenian National Council of America,” *CR*, May 7, 1947, A2155; Rep. Lawrence H. Smith (WI), “Greek-Turkish Aid,” *CR*, May 7, 1947, A2171-A2172; H. Saro, “Terrors from the Crime of 1915,” *Armenian Review*, Vol. 1, No. 3 (Summer 1948): 105-106.

<sup>92</sup> “Turkish Aid Opposed by Armenian Council,” *NYT*, April 7, 1947.

<sup>93</sup> John Roy Carlson (Arthur Derounian), “News Story Protested,” *NYT*, May 17, 1947.

<sup>94</sup> Rep. Daniel A. Reed (NY), “The Foreign Policy of the United States,” *CR*, April 28, 1947, A1951.

“one of the greatest living experts on Near East problems ” and the editor of the magazine *New Armenia*, recalled statements made by former U.S. politicians during and after the World War I about the Turks.<sup>95</sup> Woodrow Wilson equated them to nothing less than “Apaches.” Henry Cabot Lodge described the Turks as a “scourge to Europe and Christendom,” the “pest and curse of Europe” which, “wherever they have trodden trade, industry, commerce, the arts and civilization have withered away.” Senator William E. Borah believed Turkey to be “the persecutor of Christians, the foe of civilization, the incarnation of massacres, and the enemy of every principle of humanity,” undeserving of the title ‘nation’, Turks were rather part of a “conglomerate mass of incarnate fiends.” Mahdesian, in an apparent attempt to appear unbiased, also included the opinion of Ibn-Saud, the first monarch of Saudi Arabia, who believed that “the Turks, since time immemorial until the present, have been race of cruel barbarians,” who “have no civilization,” and “create nothing,” because they are “too lazy for work.” They are “like a parasite” living solely of the “production of his subjects.” As far as he was concerned, it was “a disgrace that the Turkish domination was not destroyed at the end of World War” and that “a new lease on life” had been granted to the “Turkish barbarians,” who “under the leadership of a few half-civilized atheists” are “today a worse menace than they were formerly.” After giving his analysis of Turkish foreign policy during World War II, Mahdesian concluded his letter by asking: “How often must the United States Government be deceived by the wily Turk?”

Captain Nishan der Hagopian, introduced as a “reputable and popular lecturer on Near East questions,” tried to explain the “international gangsters” (Turks) to the Senate by asking them to “analyze racial differences between the Turks and Armenians.” In comparison to the thousands of Armenian-Americans thriving in academia, arts, business, and the military, der Hagopian asked, “how many Turks have you in this country that have accomplished anything to compare with this?” “What,” he demanded, “makes the American love for [sic] the Turks?”<sup>96</sup> The Armenian National Council of America argued “she [Turkey] has always been a destructive force, and has not contributed a single iota to the progress of civilization,” and, therefore, “the security of the United States cannot be based upon the protection of a barbaric state like Turkey.” The Council also accused the U.S. government’s policy “to perpetuate a barbaric government like Turkey” was un-American and this “unholy alliance with the unspeakable Turk” would

---

<sup>95</sup> Rep. Bertrand W. Gearhart (CA), “The Proposed Turkish Loan,” *CR*, April 3, 1947, A1495.

<sup>96</sup> Sen. Edwin C. Johnson (CO), April 22, 1947, A1811.

“arouse a righteous indignation in the hearts of all justice-and peace-loving people throughout the world.”<sup>97</sup>

In a letter to Rep. Lawrence H. Smith (WI), John G. Moskoffian of Jackson, Mississippi, an alleged college and university history instructor and author on the history of Turkey,<sup>98</sup> claimed that the “wily,” “dishonest” and “criminal” Turks were natural “international intriguers and bandits,” who possessed “nefarious designs and insidious intrigues” that “aimed to instigate a war between the United States and Russia.” He also believed that the “ignorant Turk does not even know what communism is.” In his professional, and one can only assume objective, opinion as an academic and historian, Moskoffian provided the House of Representatives with his advice on Near East politics: “Turkey is a cancer on the body-politic of the world. Only amputation—that is, division of Turkey in three distinct parts—will remove the cancer of the world.” Moskoffian concluded by applauding the Houses’ crusade against the “intrigues and machinations of the Turks.”<sup>99</sup>

While at least one objection to these attacks was put forward by Senator Tom Stewart (TN) who submitted an editorial from the *Chattanooga News-Free Press* which criticized Armenian-American groups for putting the “bitter hatreds and other prejudices that they and their forebears brought with them from the Old World ahead of the welfare of the United States,”<sup>100</sup> the anti-Turkish rhetoric was largely taken in stride by U.S. Congressmen. While there is no evidence of a backlash, self-censure or any semblance of defense put forward on Turkey’s behalf by any Congressman for such blatantly racist assaults on a new and extremely important ally in the region and the world, U.S. financial assistance to Turkey was still approved.

In the *Armenian Review*, the only instance of grossly anti-Turkish sentiment at this time was in H. Saro’s account of “Turkish diabolism” which the “world forgot” while “millions of American dollars” were being spent courting the friendship of “the assassin Turk.” In describing the fate of an Armenian village priest during World War I, Saro wrote “One was involuntarily forced to ponder that only the Ottoman Turk is capable of such a monstrosity, and only he can

---

<sup>97</sup> Rep. Bertrand W. Gearhart (CA), May 7, 1947, A2155.

<sup>98</sup> While no book on the history of Turkey was located in Worldcat’s database, it does appear that Moskoffian published a 30 –page pamphlet in 1919 entitled *Independence for Armenia: An Appeal to the Congress and the People of the United States*. At that time, he was an instructor in the Modern Language Department at Defiance College in Defiance, OH.

<sup>99</sup> Rep. Lawrence H. Smith (WI), “Greek-Turkish Aid,” *CR*, May 7, 1947, A2171-A2172.

<sup>100</sup> Sen. Tom Stewart (TN), “Divided Loyalties,” *CR*, April 21, 1947, A1797-A1798.

take satanic delight in such barbarism.”<sup>101</sup> Almost as quickly as it appeared, however, the racist and prejudiced anti-Turkish rhetoric disappeared until it returned to the *Review*’s pages in early 1959. The issue of Armenian hate towards Turks, Turkey and all things Turkish, was addressed in a book published in 1955 by Sarkis Atamian, a life-long member of the ARF and a future Central Executive member in California.<sup>102</sup> In an effort to explain their intense hatred for Turks, Atamian wrote that trauma, frustration and anxiety experienced by the survivors of the 1915 massacres had left them with a “hatred for anything to do with the Turk.”<sup>103</sup> More importantly, however, Atamian argued that while “most Armenians probably understand that only a handful of fanatics gave the orders for what happened,” in the end “emotions are bound to hold sway and the Turk and all that is Turkish is repugnant and hateful.”<sup>104</sup> In his comprehensive analysis of modern Armenian history, Razmik Panossian agreed, arguing that after 1915 the Turks “came to embody evil” and this notion was “perpetuated in popular Armenian culture.” In fact, “Turkishness was considered immoral, unclean and violent” and “anti-Turkishness was therefore accepted as a ‘natural’ and inherently good attitude.”<sup>105</sup> As early as the 1920s, Panossian argues, “a strong element of anti-Turkishness” was one of eight key components of an Armenian identity that transcended ideology.<sup>106</sup>

Garabed H. Aaronian’s piece in the Spring issue of the *Armenian Review* in 1959 also explicitly detailed Armenian hate for the Turk, but in the context of a story about an Armenian woman who married into a Turkish family during the course of World War I. According to him Aaronian, Armenian hate for the Turk predated the events of 1915 by centuries, and was used as evidence to prove that a “poor little Armenian girl” would not have entered into a Turkish family willingly:

In normal times, for six hundred years, no Armenian girl had married a Turk of her own free will. Never! Turks were Taboo ofr [sic] Armenian girls. They hated them and ran away from them as a leper or a beast. For any Armenian girl, a Turk was a beast, cruel, inhuman and base, and most of all, he was a Mohammedan. For an

---

<sup>101</sup> H. Saro, “Terrors from the Crime of 1915,” *Armenian Review*, Vol. 1, No. 3 (Summer 1948): 105-106. The *Armenian Review* began publication in 1948.

<sup>102</sup> “Long Time Activist Sarkis Atamian Passes Away,” *Asbarez*, January 6, 2007. Atamian was also the author of the four part hagiography on Soghomon Tehlirian published over the course of 1960 and 1961 in the *Armenian Review*.

<sup>103</sup> Sarkis Atamian, *The Armenian Community: The Historical Development of a Social and Ideological Conflict* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1955): 195.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>105</sup> Panossian, *The Armenians*, 240.

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*, 300-301.

Armenian girl to marry a Turk meant renouncing her Christianity, her Armenian heritage, and to become a Mohammedan, a Turk. In normal times this was impossible. The *hate* in her heart, accumulated during the centuries of Turkish oppression, her deeply-rooted Christian faith would not permit an Armenian girl to ever marry a Turk of her own free will.<sup>107</sup>

In the specific case he described, he was doubly sure, because he had known the girl, Veronica, before the war: “she was a beautiful, modest and pure Armenian girl. She hated the Turks as much as any other Armenian girl.” But as he alluded to in the passage above, these were not ‘normal times,’ and these “helpless, godforsaken, poor little” Armenian girls, Veronica included, had been “taken into a Harem, to live with a beast, God knows how filthy and repulsive.” In a letter to Veronica’s Turkish father-in-law, the author wrote “you, as the ruling nation, mistreated us and we hated you.” It was “now too late to reason, and useless to talk about these things. The harm has been done and the hate is there.”<sup>108</sup>

The next article to address Armenian hate was “The Turk,” a short memoir that appeared in the 1962. The author described the emotions and thoughts experienced by an Armenian whose tranquil stay in a hotel in rural Lebanon in the early 1950s was shattered by the arrival of an elderly Turkish doctor: “from the first moment I was filled with a deep feeling of hatred toward him.” The Armenian was forced to leave the hotel because “it seemed I was breathing now in a poisonous atmosphere. I could not stand the presence of this man.” When he returned to the hotel the following July, the Turkish physician was still there and “he approached me and greeted me with a smile, as if we had been old friends. My hateful eyes met his, suddenly assuming an imploring look.” After the narrator discovers that the Turk had been a military doctor in eastern Anatolia during World War I and, theoretically, could have taken part in the massacres, “the fire of hatred was intensified in my soul.”<sup>109</sup>

The narrator believed that the Turkish physician understood his presence in the company of Armenians “aroused only revulsion and hatred in Armenia hearts,” and may have been “afraid of the haunting of the horrible past which the presence of an Armenian brought to him.” After awhile, however, the hate began to subside inside the narrator and “for the first time I pitied this man in whom I saw a heinous criminal,” and even opened to the idea that “perhaps he is innocent.” This led to a phase in which the narrator’s hate “became extinguished and remorse

---

<sup>107</sup> Garabed H. Aaronian, “Under the Shadow of Death,” *Armenian Review* Vol. 12, No. 1 (Spr. 1959): 74.

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*, 75.

<sup>109</sup> Arsen Yergath, “The Turk,” *Armenian Review* Vol. 15, No. 4 (Win. 1962): 43.

gave way to a brotherly feeling,” and he asked “why? I asked myself, should I have the right to hate this man trying to see in him the revulsive image of his criminal race?”<sup>110</sup> After a period of time, however, the narrator became indifferent to the Turk who had taken up residence in his hotel, and he “sometimes regretted that the fire of hatred no longer inflamed my soul.” When he reflected on the fact that “not one soul among the criminal race” had yet to apologize for the massacres of 1915, however, the hate returned and he blamed himself “for having weakened in my anger of the first days.” In his final analysis the narrator believed that “no matter how unjust to condemn the guilty with the dubious innocents, it is the irrefutable right of the Armenian, at least for our generation, to keep alive the fire of hatred...”<sup>111</sup>

In 1963, Anti-Turkishness in the *Armenian Review* took the form of reproductions or discussions of previously published material rather than any new articles. The first was a reprint of a letter from 1787 sent from British writer William Cowper to his cousin in which he concludes that “there has never been a throne so execrably tyrannical as theirs [the Turks’],” for whom so many innocents have lost their lives to “gratify the humour or caprice of their tyrants.”<sup>112</sup> In the autumn issue an article appeared criticizing the German to English translation of *The Forty Days of Musa Dagh*, a fictionalized account of Armenian resistance during World War I by the Austrian novelist Franz Werfel, first published in 1933. The author of the article, which itself was a reprint and translation of a 1951 Armenian language article in the *Hairenik* monthly, not only questions the translator’s motives, but is particularly upset with his decision to delete certain passages in the original concerned with Armenian cultural and martial achievements, negative descriptions of the Turks and their actions and the premeditated, organized and horrific nature of the deportations, as well as toning down the offensive language in the German original. The author detailed the translator’s omissions and changes line by line, throughout the nearly 900 page novel, which, in his opinion, worked to “diminish or alter its [the original’s] meaning.” The article ended with the revelation that the current president of Turkey’s parliament had organized multiple massacres in 1915-1916 and had apparently escaped detection because of Werfel’s erroneous spelling of his name.<sup>113</sup>

---

<sup>110</sup> Ibid., 44.

<sup>111</sup> Ibid., 45.

<sup>112</sup> William Cowper, “On the Turks,” *Armenian Review* Vol. 16, No. 1 (Spr. 1963): 8.

<sup>113</sup> Kazarian, “The ‘Forty Days of Musa Dagh’,” *Armenian Review* Vol. 16, No. 3 (Aut. 1963): 18-22.

Finally, the *Armenian Review* reprinted one of the British Foreign Office's publications written by Arnold Toynbee and an introduction by Viscount Bryce from 1917 in the last issue of 1963, entitled "The Murderous Tyranny of the Turks." The reproduction introduced a new generation of Armenian Americans to Bryce's opinions on the Turk:

The Turk has never been of any use except for fighting. He cannot administer, though in his earlier days he had the sense to employ intelligent Christian administrators. He cannot secure justice. As a governing power, he has always shown himself incapable, corrupt and cruel. He has always destroyed; he has never created. Those whom we call the Turks are not a nation at all in the proper sense of the word... As a famous English historian wrote, the Turks are nothing but a robber band, encamped in the countries they have desolated. As Edmund Burke wrote, the Turks are savages, with whom no civilized Christian nation ought to form any alliance.<sup>114</sup>

The last example of a publication designed to dehumanize and vilify the Turks, was slightly more sophisticated than the previous instances. The author argued that in order to truly understand a nation, one need only to look at the person that nation worship's as its national hero. In the case of the Turk, that person was none other than Talaat Pasha, "a human monster and the executioner of the Armenian people." Allegedly the subject of poetic eulogies and historical praise within Turkey, the author argued that an entire generation of Turks have been "inoculated with the idea that, only through the path mapped out by Talaat, can the Turkish youth attain to his ideal, to become a hero of his people," and this new generation has been "bending over backwards to justify the [Armenian] genocide."<sup>115</sup> The author then follows with a long list of the cultural and economical contributions the Armenians made to the Ottoman Empire:

to prove that it was the Armenian who spread the light of the east and west upon a Turkish world which was steeped in darkness. And this Turk, this ingrate, instead of appreciating and encouraging this voluntary service and this devotion of the Armenian people to his race, had the temerity of signing the doom of that people. Believe it, the snake which hisses in the desert is more merciful toward a fallen man than this Turk who wear [sic] the purple of civilization.<sup>116</sup>

In other words, according to the author, today's Turks are just as evil as their forefathers. For while not actually carrying out the physical destruction of the Armenians, through

---

<sup>114</sup> The Murderous Tyranny of the Turks by Arnold J. Toynbee, *Armenian Review* Vol. 16, No. 4 (Win. 1963): 17.

<sup>115</sup> Yervand Khatanasian, "Genocide and the Armenian Case," *Armenian Review* Vol. 17, No. 4 (Win. 1964): 4.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, 4-5.

their national adulation of Talaat Pasha, justifying the massacres of 1915, and for still not acknowledging that all that was positive about the Ottoman Empire was the product of Armenian contributions, they were all guilty. The citizens of the Republic of Turkey were guilty for both the deportations and massacres of 1915, and of being inferior, in every way possible, to the Armenians.

While this study did not involve a comprehensive analyses of all the Armenian American periodicals published during this period, it should be clear from the evidence above that from the late 1950s onwards at least one of the main Armenian diaspora political parties, the ARF, was promoting a violently anti-Turkish line for the first time in decades. The sudden appearance of anti-Turkish articles on the pages of the ARF's *Armenian Review*, the vitriolic language used against Turks and Turkey, and the frequency and intensity with which they appeared between 1959 and 1964, however, is puzzling. While circulation numbers for the *Armenian Review* are not available, we can assume that majority of its readers were Armenian-Americans. The target of the ARF's campaign, then, was the English-speaking Armenian diaspora. Why, if Atamian was correct in his analysis that the Armenia diaspora in 1955 already possessed an emotional hatred for Turks and Turkey, and already held the Turkish nation collectively responsible for the events of 1915, did the ARF suddenly get into the anti-Turkish propaganda game and begin preaching to the proverbial choir?

## **The Armenian Revolutionary Federation**

The Armenian Revolutionary Federation, also known as the *Hai Heghapokhakan Dashnaktsutiun*, or *Dashnaks* for short, was founded in 1890 in what is now Tbilisi, Georgia.<sup>117</sup> The Federation was, first and foremost, a nationalist organization aimed at “liberating” the eastern Anatolian provinces of the Ottoman Empire for the Armenians by “sparking mass rebellion and European assistance” through their publications and deeds.<sup>118</sup> At the time, this meant a form of protected autonomy and self-government rather than out right independence.<sup>119</sup> Within a few short years, the ARF was the most powerful political parties among ethnic Armenians in the Russian and Ottoman Empires and the wider diaspora, and its members

---

<sup>117</sup> For their first year, the organization was known as the Federation of Armenian Revolutionaries.

<sup>118</sup> Panossian, 205-206, 217.

<sup>119</sup> The ARF did not equate liberation with independence until 1919. See Panossian, 252.

dominated the government in the first Republic of Armenia (1918-1920).<sup>120</sup> The ARF was very adept at propagating its political line through a variety of in-house publications and benefitted from exceptional leadership and rank and file who were willing to die for the cause.<sup>121</sup> It was these “daring acts of bravery”: the assassination of Ottoman officials, the execution of Armenian informants and collaborators, defense Armenian villages, assaults on Kurdish tribesmen and other “various terrorist acts,” that endeared them to their Armenian constituency.<sup>122</sup>

The two most notorious attacks by the ARF during their first two decades were undoubtedly the Ottoman Bank job and the assassination attempt on Sultan Abdul Hamid II. The former occurred on August 26, 1896, when the Ottoman Empire’s central bank, the European-run *Ottoman Bank*, was taken over by 26 ARF operatives who held the bank, its staff and its wealth hostage. The assailants then threatened to blow up the bank if their demands for political concessions in the eastern provinces were not met in 48 hours.<sup>123</sup> Although the Ottoman government refused to yield, the crisis was resolved when the nine surviving ARF members were allowed safe passage out of the Empire to France in a deal brokered by the European powers.<sup>124</sup> A bomb attack on the Sultan took place nine years later, on July 21, 1905, as Abdul Hamid II’s procession left the mosque after his customary weekly presence at Friday prayer. Abdul Hamid II survived the attack unscathed, but at least 24 individuals were killed, including the royal tutor to the Sultan’s sons and the ARF assassin, 57 wounded and an additional 55 horses slain in the bombing.<sup>125</sup> Although it is unclear when and how the ARF was implicated in the attack, the operation was allegedly planned by Armenian agents working out of Bulgaria, where at least one high-ranking ARF officer was killed while preparing the explosives for the attack.<sup>126</sup>

Through a combination of propaganda, violence, intimidation, protection and kindness the ARF, and other Armenian revolutionary groups were perceived as “freedom fighters or *fedayees* who were to be respected and feared” by the Armenian communities on whose behalf

---

<sup>120</sup> Ibid., 208.

<sup>121</sup> The ARF published over 150 titles between 1890 and 1925 in the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Turkey. See Panossian, 214.

<sup>122</sup> “The Armenian Revolutionary Federation, Popularly Known as Tashnags,” *Military Intelligence Service*, United States Army Forces in the Middle East, March 17, 1943; Panossian, 209-210.

<sup>123</sup> Panossian, *The Armenians*, 216; Suny, *Looking Toward Ararat*, 85.

<sup>124</sup> Ibid., 216-217; “Rioting in Constantinople,” *NYT*, Aug. 28, 1896; “Mobs Killed More than 3,000,” *NYT*, Aug. 29, 1896; “Ottoman Bank Raiders Escape,” *NYT*, Aug. 29, 1896.

<sup>125</sup> “Bomb Misses Sultan; 40 Persons Killed,” *NYT*, July 22, 1905; “The Sultan as a Hero,” *NYT*, July 23, 1905; “Beha Bey Killed,” *NYT*, July 24, 1905.

<sup>126</sup> Panossian, *The Armenians*, 217.

they struggled.<sup>127</sup> Additionally, while the ARF never succeeded in its goal of “liberating” eastern Anatolia, the violent acts of the ARF and others were viewed as “instances of heroic rebellion, moral victory and great national achievement,” some of which are still celebrated today. For the Armenian nation, violence *was* politics.<sup>128</sup> The power, influence and prestige of the ARF peaked during its stewardship of the independent Armenian Republic, and after the Republic’s collapse in December 1920 the ARF remained the most dominant of the three main political parties in the diaspora: the ARF, *Hnchaks*<sup>129</sup> and *Ramgavars*,<sup>130</sup> through at least most of the interwar period.<sup>131</sup> In fact, because the ARF was forcibly removed from power by the Soviets, and returned to power after a momentarily successful counter-revolution between February and April 1921, the ARF saw themselves as the legitimate political representatives of the Armenian Nation (broadly defined) and *the* Armenian party in exile.<sup>132</sup>

One contributing factor for their continued popularity was the success of Operation *Nemesis*, the assassination of former leaders and prominent officials in the Ottoman and Azerbaijani governments deemed guilty of crimes against Armenians. This list included the alleged mastermind of the deportations and massacres, Talat Pasha, and Cemal Pasha, who, along with Talat and Enver, made up the governing triumvirate that led the Ottoman Empire during the First World War. *Nemesis* agents also assassinated Armenians accused of treason and/or collaboration with the ARF’s enemies. Organized and planned by the ARF headquarters in Boston, Massachusetts, and carried out by agents in Europe and the Caucasus, *Nemesis* lasted from March 1921 until April 1922, and murdered at least ten individuals: seven Turks, one Azeri and two Armenians. While the ARF attempted to keep its participation in the assassinations secret while the operation was ongoing, their involvement was at least suspected by Turkey and other western governments at the time,<sup>133</sup> and appeared to be common knowledge within the diaspora.<sup>134</sup>

---

<sup>127</sup> Ibid., 217-223.

<sup>128</sup> Ibid., 226-227.

<sup>129</sup> The *Hnchaks* were a socialist revolutionary party established in Geneva Switzerland in 1887. See Panossian, 202.

<sup>130</sup> The modern *Ramgavar* (*Ramkavar Azatakan Kusaktsutun*, or the Democratic Liberal Party) was founded in 1921 (formed around a former incarnation that had been established in 1908 in Egypt) in Istanbul. See Ibid.

<sup>131</sup> Panossian, *The Armenians*, 206, 251-253, 295; Suny, *Looking Toward Ararat*, 126-127.

<sup>132</sup> Panossian, 258-260; Nikola Schahgaldian, “The Political Integration of an Immigrant Community into a Composite Society: The Armenians in Lebanon, 1920-1974,” PhD Diss., Columbia University, 1979, 94-95.

<sup>133</sup> “Assassin Boasts of Talaat’s Death,” *NYT*, March 17, 1921; “Talaat is Mourned as Germany’s Friend,” *NYT*, March 18, 1921; “Turks Enraged,” *The Times*, November 11, 1921; “Ex-Grand Vizier Murdered,” *The Times*, December 7, 1921; “Two Young Turks Murdered in Berlin,” *NYT*, April 19, 1922; “One After Another,” *NYT*, July

The image of the ARF declined, however, when it ordered the assassination of the Archbishop of the Armenian Church in New York, Ghevond Turian (Tourian), in December 1933 for being too pro-Soviet, anti-ARF, or a combination of both.<sup>135</sup> The assassination was planned over the course of six months and triggered by the Archbishop's refusal to speak at an Armenian event in Chicago until the Armenian Tricolor (the flag of the 1918-1920 Republic and, subsequently, the flag of the ARF) was removed. Archbishop Turian was stabbed to death during Christmas Eve Mass in front of hundreds of parishioners and nine members of the ARF were eventually convicted for the crime.<sup>136</sup> The murder of the Archbishop effectively split the Armenian American diaspora into two opposing camps.<sup>137</sup> The prestige of the ARF declined even further during World War II, when rival Armenian groups capitalized on the ARF's collaboration with Nazi Germany for their own propaganda purposes.<sup>138</sup>

Although the ARF was naturally sympathetic to the cause, they did not actively participate in the Armenian campaign after World War II to annex the Turkish provinces of Kars and Ardahan to the Armenian SSR. While this may have been because the Soviet Ambassador to the United States, Maxim Litvinov, rebuffed the ARF's efforts at cooperation with the Soviets,<sup>139</sup> it proved advantageous in the short-term. Once it became clear that the World War II alliances were breaking down and a Cold War was emerging between the United States and the Soviet Union, the ARF was able to capitalize on the very same staunch anti-Communist, anti-Soviet ideology that had left it on the wrong side of the alliances during the war and marginalized immediately afterwards.

One of the major areas of friction between the ARF and the Soviets was the Armenian Apostolic Church, a powerful political, social and cultural force for many Armenians. The traditional spiritual and administrative center of the Church was situated inside the Armenian SSR at the Mother See of Holy Echmiadzin, and many alleged that the Church had been coopted

---

27, 1922; "Jemal Pasha's Murder. Kemalist Threats," *The Times*, Aug. 29, 1922; Vartkes Yeghiayan, *The Case of Soghomon Tehlirian* (Glendale, CA: Center for Armenian Remembrance, 2006).

<sup>134</sup> Avakian, *Cross*; Arshavir Shiragian, *The Legacy: Memoirs of an Armenian Patriot* (Boston: Hairenik Press, 1976).

<sup>135</sup> *Military Intelligence Service*, "The Armenian Revolutionary Federation, Popularly Known as Tashnags," United States Army Forces in the Middle East, March 17, 1943.

<sup>136</sup> "Slain in 187<sup>th</sup> St. Church," *NYT*, Dec. 25, 1933; "Nine Found Guilty in Church Murder," *NYT*, July 14, 1934; Panossian, 354; Suny, 223.

<sup>137</sup> Panossian, 354; Suny, 223.

<sup>138</sup> Suny, 224; See also *Military Intelligence Service*, "The Armenian Revolutionary Federation," March 17, 1943.

<sup>139</sup> *Military Intelligence Service*, "The Armenian Revolutionary Federation," March 17, 1943.

by the Soviet Union.<sup>140</sup> At the forefront of this criticism was ARF, who challenged the authority, leadership and political messages emanating from Catholicos in Echmiadzin. Also important, but slightly lower in rank, prestige and authority within the Armenian Church was the Holy See of Cilicia which was relocated from Kozan, Turkey to northern Beirut in 1930. In 1956, the ARF was able to outmaneuver Echmiadzin's (read Soviet) candidate for the Catholicos of Cilicia and put their own man in place. This not only limited Soviet influence over the Church and diaspora, but vastly increased their own. The fallout from the tactics and methods used in the effort to rig the election in the ARF's favor, however, was substantial. The Mother See did not recognize the legitimacy of the Cilician election and the rift in the diaspora increased between ARF and the non-ARF factions, which included both the *Hnchak* and *Ramgavar* parties.<sup>141</sup> Each faction had its own Church, cultural foundations, schools, organizations, clubs and media/propaganda outlets, and social exchanges, friendships, marriages, etc. between factions "were rare or non-existent."<sup>142</sup>

There was also a major crisis within the ARF itself. Between 1947 and 1961, a violent intra-party struggle for control of the ARF unfolded between the established leadership and a more conservative, anti-Turkish, anti-communist, youthful and aggressive faction, dubbed the "neo-Dashnaks."<sup>143</sup> In the first year alone, intra-Armenian and intra-ARF violence took the lives of approximately 24 neo-Dashnaks and rival *Hnchaks* in Beirut, Lebanon.<sup>144</sup> Interestingly, this violence occurred at approximately the same time that the Soviets established training centers for Armenian (and Kurdish) "commando armies" to be comprised of both Soviet Armenians and Armenians from the diaspora communities throughout the Middle East.<sup>145</sup> What role these units and training centers played in the intra-Armenian violence in Lebanon in the 1950s, or the later Armenian (and Kurdish) terrorist organizations, however, remains unclear.

By 1955, the neo-Dashnaks emerged victorious.<sup>146</sup> It was during this time that the ARF's center of power shifted to Beirut, where the neo-Dashnaks now reigned supreme. ARF members who disagreed with the party's new line started to defect from the party in 1953, and at least one hundred more either left or were purged from the ARF between 1954 and 1957. By 1957, it is

---

<sup>140</sup> This was the argument used by the Armenians who assassinated Bishop Tourian in 1993.

<sup>141</sup> Panossian, 355;

<sup>142</sup> Panossian, 355; Shahgaldian, "The Political Integration," 221-22.

<sup>143</sup> Shahgaldian, 107-108. For an ideological analysis of the ARF's internal dispute see Atamian, *The Armenian Community*, 454-458.

<sup>144</sup> *Ibid.*, 199-200.

<sup>145</sup> CIA, "Kurdish and Armenian Commando Armies," 5 July 1951, CIA-RDP8200457R007600040006-2.

<sup>146</sup> *Ibid.*, 208-210.

estimated that approximately 30% of ARF veterans, including many former leaders, either abandoned the party or were dismissed.<sup>147</sup> The ARF's tactics in the Catholicos election of 1956 also provoked round of intra-Armenian violence that killed dozens of neo-Dashnaks, *Hnchaks*, *Ramgavars* and others in Beirut.<sup>148</sup> The violence continued throughout 1957 and 1958, as the intra-Armenian merged into Lebanon's first civil war and the three Armenian groups opposite factions. In fact, ARF and *Hnchak/Ramgavar* violence outlasted the civil war, and took an additional 60 Armenian lives *after* the Lebanese conflict ended.<sup>149</sup>

The violent divide between the ARF, *Hnchaks*, *Ramgavars*, the Armenian SSR and the Soviet Union was not the only challenge facing diaspora political organizations. By the early 1950s, the traditional Armenian parties no longer captivated the imagination, interest, or the loyalty of the new generation of diaspora youth.<sup>150</sup> In particular, the ARF had squandered its support, prestige and wealth and stood accused of morphing from the socialist, revolutionary and nationalist party of legends to a "socially conservative, Western oriented, and pro status quo political party."<sup>151</sup> Armenian nationalism had given way to anti-Communism. While this satisfied the United States and other Western host governments, disaffected diaspora Armenians were becoming increasingly apathetic to the Armenian "cause." Taking advantage of this malaise in the diaspora, the Armenian SSR and the Soviet Union initiated a new and aggressive campaign to win the hearts and minds of the Armenian diaspora.

## **The Struggle over the Armenian Diaspora**

At the center of the divide between the two main Armenian diaspora factions in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century were crucial questions of legitimacy, control and influence; who was the rightful representative and leader of the globally dispersed Armenian nation?<sup>152</sup> On one side there was the Armenian SSR, which while certainly not free and independent, was at least a delineated geographical reality. On the other side was the ARF, the party and organization democratically

---

<sup>147</sup> Ibid., 213-214.

<sup>148</sup> Ibid., 215.

<sup>149</sup> Ibid., 220-221.

<sup>150</sup> Panossian, 302-303.

<sup>151</sup> Ibid., 302; Schahgaldian, 222.

<sup>152</sup> Panossian, 367.

elected to govern the first independent Armenia in over 500 years, but overthrown, persecuted, imprisoned and forced into exile by the Bolsheviks and their Armenian sympathizers.

Armenian nationalism resurfaced during the political thaw after Stalin's death in 1953, when previously banned Armenian writers were published for the first time.<sup>153</sup> Anti-Turkishness also seems to have surfaced around the same time. In 1953, the Soviet Foreign Minister, V.M. Molotov, sent a note to the Turkish government declaring that the Soviet Union, or more specifically, the Armenian and Georgian SSRs, had renounced their territorial claims against Turkey, an important point emphasized again in 1954 to the Turkish Ambassador in Moscow, and Khrushchev publicly talked about the importance for more cordial relations with Turkey in 1955.<sup>154</sup> Soviet Armenians were not pleased by these peaceful overtures, and from that point forward anti-Turkishness and demands for territorial redress rose in proportion to the warming of relations between the Soviet Union and Turkey.<sup>155</sup>

After their defeat over the election of the Catholicos of Cilicia, the Central Committee of the Armenian Communist Party recognized that more subtle tactics would be necessary to successfully challenge the ARF for influence in the diaspora.<sup>156</sup> Instead of the more obvious methods of the past, the Armenian SSR increased its emphasis on cultural and educational links with the diaspora.<sup>157</sup> This was made easier by the easing of travel restrictions into Soviet Armenia in 1957, which produced a steady two-way flow of prominent Armenian intellectuals, clergy, politicians, students and tourists.<sup>158</sup> The goal of this effort was to establish the Armenian SSR as the true representative of the Armenian nation, or “*the* homeland, . . . where the nation was being conserved and advanced,” and plant the notion that Armenia(n SSR) had much more to offer the diaspora than the diaspora could ever offer to it.<sup>159</sup> This was dramatically different from the conception of the Armenian SSR in the late 1940s, which needed help, support and Armenians from the diaspora to help it rebuild after World War II. Now, the Armenian Soviet Republic was there to help the diaspora by providing “cultural nourishment” to the Armenians losing their ‘Armenianess’ in the diaspora.<sup>160</sup> These efforts by the Soviet Armenians culminated

---

<sup>153</sup> Dekmejian, “Soviet-Turkish Relations,” 512.

<sup>154</sup> Oran, 304-306; Hale, 88-89; Dekmejian, 512.

<sup>155</sup> Dekmejian, 513, 514, 517, 520.

<sup>156</sup> Panossian, 368-369.

<sup>157</sup> For an examples of the Armenian SSR's more overt methods in the past, see Schahgaldian, 201-202.

<sup>158</sup> Panossian, 368-369, 376; Schahgaldian, 109-110.

<sup>159</sup> Panossian, 369-370; Dekmejian, “Soviet-Turkish Relations,” 521.

<sup>160</sup> Panossian, 370-371.

in the establishment of the Committee for Cultural Ties with Diaspora Armenians, or the SMKK (*Spiurkahayutian Het Mshakutayin Kapi Komite*), the organization that effectively governed all contact with the diaspora groups.<sup>161</sup> The increase in contact also had the unintended effect of further nationalizing the Armenians within the SSR.<sup>162</sup>

The *Hnchaks* and the *Ramgavars* supported Soviet Armenia in the struggle, and had at least two reasons for doing so.<sup>163</sup> First, the organizations had developed a good working relationship with the leadership of the Armenian SSR and the Soviet Union during the joint effort of the late 1940s to annex Kars and Ardahan and promote repatriation. Second, while the popularity and influence of these two political organizations had always been less the ARF's, the disparities became even more pronounced after the start of the Cold War. Tainted, in the United States at least, by their association with the Soviet Union and communism, the *Hnchaks* and *Ramgavars* had little choice but to hope that the Armenian SSR emerged as a viable counterweight to the power and influence of the ARF. By the mid-1950s, this strategy proved successful. Capitalizing on deteriorating support for the ARF, the *Hnchaks* and *Ramgavars* organized and transformed their respective political organizations into attractive alternatives for the Armenian diaspora. The *Hnchaks* represented the "socialist and liberal Armenian elements in Lebanon," while the *Ramgavars* were no longer viewed as simply an "unorganized coalition of apolitical and cosmopolitan merchants."<sup>164</sup> The changes allowed them to mount a challenge, albeit unsuccessfully, to the ARF's apparent monopoly on representing diaspora Armenians.

For a while, the *Hnchaks and Ramgavars* were assisted by the ARF's continued instability caused by the unpopular policies of the neo-Dashnaks. The neo-Dashnaks, however, had backed wrong side during the Lebanese civil war in 1958, however, and soon after its conclusion the ARF moderates returned to power.<sup>165</sup> After their removal, the violence that had plagued Lebanon's Armenian community subsided, and joint cultural and education activity between the three Armenian political organizations resumed. Paying more attention to sentiments within its core constituency, the moderates toned down the neo-Dashnaks fierce anti-communist rhetoric and focused more attention on local concerns. By 1960, the new leadership was reaping the benefits of the new policies. The ARF was again in control of Armenian political power in

---

<sup>161</sup> Panossian, 368-369.

<sup>162</sup> Dekmejian, 513.

<sup>163</sup> Schahgaldian, 95-6.

<sup>164</sup> *Ibid.*, 223.

<sup>165</sup> *Ibid.*, 238.

Lebanon, and enjoyed a majority of support among Lebanon's Apostolic, Catholic and Protestant communities.<sup>166</sup>

The ARF, understandably, had a grudge against the Soviet Union and the Armenian SSR. The wounds of 1920 and 1921 were still fresh in the minds of the political leadership and the party faithful, and the ARF had gained considerable political capital and support, particularly in the U.S., during the early years of the Cold War for its fierce anti-Communist position.<sup>167</sup> For the ARF to change this position now made very little political sense, especially since Soviet Armenia was its only real political competitor for the allegiance of the diaspora Armenians. The benefits of keeping the ARF's anti-Communist allies in the U.S. Congress satisfied far outweighed any potential concessions an official rapprochement with the Soviets would bring, even if it had diluted some of the rhetoric inside the Armenian communities in Lebanon and the rest of the Middle East for local reasons.

After Cilicia, the ARF also went on the offensive, but its campaign lacked the subtlety employed by the Soviet Armenians. As mentioned above, in addition to the challenge being mounted by the Armenian SSR and its *Hnchak* and *Ramgavar* allies, the ARF first had to overcome its own disaffected rank and file and the apathy to the Armenian cause prevalent in the generation of diaspora Armenians coming of age.<sup>168</sup> Coincidentally, the ARF addressed these issues at a time when its leadership "equated patriotism with anti-Turkishness."<sup>169</sup> This put the ARF in a rather awkward position both in the context of Cold War and in terms of their conception of the Armenian Cause. Turkey, their historic enemy, not only had the backing of the United States, arguably the ARF's greatest patron and a source of considerable income for the organization, but was a member in the alliance of Western nations opposing the ARF's greater and more immediate threat, the Soviet Union. While opinion on how to deal with this issue appears to have been split within the ARF, until 1959 it was accepted that the struggle against the Soviet Union was the higher priority.<sup>170</sup> In accordance with this, the ARF stayed away from "vilifying the Turk" during the first decade of the Cold War, ostensibly to avoid upsetting the

---

<sup>166</sup> Ibid., 243, 245-246; "The Political Structure of the Armenian Community in Lebanon," Department of State Telegram A-628, January 20, 1967, NARA, RG59 Box 3081.

<sup>167</sup> Panossian, 366-367. "The Political Structure of the Armenian Community," DOS, Jan. 20, 1967; See "Captive Nations" campaign above.

<sup>168</sup> Schahgaldian, "The Political Integration," 1979, 228.

<sup>169</sup> Panossian, 302.

<sup>170</sup> Atamian, 455-457.

United States, and refrained from any “political or diplomatic agitation” in regards to eastern Anatolia.<sup>171</sup>

This changed, however, with the ousting of the anti-Communist neo-Dashnaks in the late 1950s and early 1960s. In order to distance themselves from the previous, and largely discredited, leadership, and to address the challenges facing the ARF, the moderates turned to the one thing guaranteed to transcend all internal problems within the Armenian diaspora: anti-Turkishness. Its sudden emergence on the pages of the *Armenian Review* beginning in the late 1950s, was a means for the ARF to stir up some excitement within the diaspora, particularly among the youth, and, most importantly reassert its “revolutionary” credentials by reigniting the conflict with the Turk, the traditional, and reviled, other. In addition to tapping into the nation’s hatred of the Turks, however, the ARF had to maintain some of their anti-Communist and anti-Soviet rhetoric, or risk conceding at least some measure of legitimacy to the Armenian SSR.

The ARF, at least in the United States, however, was in a dilemma. Having positioned themselves as staunch anti-communists,<sup>172</sup> it was difficult to criticize any NATO ally of the United States, let alone one as strategically important as Turkey. In order to get around this conundrum, the ARF developed a position of the Soviets first, and then Turkey:

No matter how great is the Armenian people’s score with the Turk, no matter how important it is to settle that score, no matter how important it is to keep that score alive both in their minds and in the minds of the outsider nations, to be able to settle that score some day, the Armenians must concentrate their effort today on the struggle which is being waged against the Soviet tyranny, the enemy which threatens the existence of the free world.<sup>173</sup>

But while the *Armenian Review* continued to attack the Soviet Union and its Armenian allies, the Armenian SSR continued to gain ground and a truce was being brokered between the ARF and Armenian SSR in their struggle for control of the Armenian diaspora.<sup>174</sup>

---

<sup>171</sup> Atamian, 457.

<sup>172</sup> Rep. Harold D. Donohue (MA), “Resolution Adopted at the 62nd Annual Convention Banquet of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation,” *CR*, July 19, 1955, A5447; Rep. Michael A. Feighan (OH), “Armenian Revolutionary Federation Holds 62nd Annual Convention,” *CR*, July 27, 1955, A5587-A5589; Rep. Patrick J. Hillings (CA), “Resolution Adopted by the Los Angeles Interexecutive Committee of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation,” *CR*, Jan. 8, 1958, A1691; Rep. Barratt O’Hara (IL), “Armenian Revolutionary Federation Credo,” *CR*, Feb. 7, 1964, A655-A656.

<sup>173</sup> Reuben Darbinian, “The Armenian Case,” *Armenian Review*, Vol. 16, No. 2 (Sum. 1963): 9.

<sup>174</sup> Reuben Darbinian, “The Immediate Past in Light of the Present,” *Armenian Review* Vol. 11, No. 2 (Sum. 1958): 3-14; Artaches Tchillingarian (Reuben Darbinian), “On Whose Side are the Armenian People,” *AR* Vol. 11, No. 2 (Sum. 1958): 59-68; S. Torissian, “Soviet Policy in the Armenian Question,” *AR* Vol. 11, No. 2 (Sum. 1958): 27-38;

Soviet Armenia's initiative to increase its relevancy in the Armenian diaspora proved to be a success on a cultural, if not political level.<sup>175</sup> While support for the Soviet Republic ranged from "benign acknowledgement to active support," the diaspora proved willing to at least view the Armenian SSR as the "bastion of Armenianness," which could support its "culturally 'poor' brothers in exile" since they did not have a nation-state of their own.<sup>176</sup> To a certain extent, Soviet Armenia even won over the ARF, which "accepted that the Armenian SSR was *a*—if not *the*—homeland, albeit imperfect and territorially incomplete."<sup>177</sup> Anti-Soviet rhetoric and clamoring for freedom and independence for the 'captive nation' were toned down starting in 1963.<sup>178</sup> After allegations that this change in policy was caused by the KGB's penetration of the ARF,<sup>179</sup> Hrayr Maroukhian, the leader of the ARF, claimed that while this allegation was untrue, the ARF had maintained contact with officials of the Armenian SSR since 1963.<sup>180</sup> Among the important topics discussed between the ARF and Armenian Soviets were "attitudes toward Turkey" and the ARF's desire for the Armenian SSR "to be more national."<sup>181</sup> An attempt was made in 1963 to reconcile the divisions in the Armenian Church, but while the Catholicos of Echmiadzin and the Catholicos of Antelias met in Jerusalem to mediate the dispute, no agreement was reached.<sup>182</sup>

The increased activity, exchange and contact with the diaspora, including both tourists and the ARF leadership, had a visible effect on nationalism in the Armenian SSR. At the same time ARF and Soviet Armenian representatives were beginning to cooperate, nationalism within the Armenian SSR also began to rise.<sup>183</sup> At some point in 1962-1963, a group of Armenian

---

James G. Mandalian, "Ten Big Lies," *AR* Vol. 11, No. 3 (Aut. 1958): 23-31; Yervand Khatanasian, "The Mission of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation," *AR* Vol. 13, No. 3 (Aut. 1960): 7-17; James H. Tashjian, "The Armenian Tragedy," *AR* Vol. 15, No. 2 (Sum. 1962): 30-40; Darbinian, "The Armenian Case," *AR* Vol. 16, No. 2 (Sum. 1963): 3-15; Darbinian, "The Extremists and the Armenian Extremists," *AR* Vol. 17, No. 1 (Spr. 1964): 17-21.

<sup>175</sup> "The Political Structure of the Armenian Community," DOS, Jan. 20, 1967.

<sup>176</sup> Panossian, 371-372. See also Schahgaldian, 111-112.

<sup>177</sup> Panossian, 371-372.

<sup>178</sup> *Ibid.*, 372.

<sup>179</sup> When President Levon Ter Petrosian expelled the ARF leader, Hrayr Maroukhian, from Armenia in July 1992, among the various accusations he leveled against the Dashnak leader was the 'fact' that the latter had collaborated with the KGB in the past." See Panossian 373-4 and "The A.R.F. vs The Armenian Republic," *Armenian Reporter*, July 18, 1992.

<sup>180</sup> The Bureau's headquarters were in Beirut and the Maroukhian Foundation's website claims he moved to Beirut shortly after he was elected to the Bureau in 1964. See <http://www.maroukhianfoundation.org/english/about-us/hrayr-maroukhian-a-visionary-leader>; The State Department's analysis of the Armenian community in Lebanon in 1967, however, failed to mention Maroukhian as one of the seven members of the ARF's Bureau. See "The Political Structure of the Armenian Community," DOS, Jan. 20, 1967.

<sup>181</sup> Panossian, 374.

<sup>182</sup> "The Political Structure of the Armenian Community," DOS, Jan. 20, 1967.

<sup>183</sup> Dekmejian, 513.

intellectuals discussed a number of Armenian nationalist issues, including the ‘reunification’ of the Armenian SSR with the lost provinces of ‘historical’ Armenia, spread out over Turkey, the Azerbaijani SSR (Nagorno-Karabakh and Nakhchivan), and the Georgian SSR (Javakheti); the recognition of the massacres and deportations in eastern Anatolia during World War I as genocide; the threat of Russification within the Armenian SSR; and, finally, the need to revive Armenian nationalism. Before they proceeded very far into their program, however, seven members of the group were arrested but, allegedly due to the intervention of a high-ranking Armenian Communist official, the individuals involved received relatively light sentences.<sup>184</sup>

Recognizing that the rising nationalism and renewed interest in Armenian culture and history could not be stopped, the leadership of Soviet Armenia tried control and direct it as much as they could. While anti-Soviet or anti-Russian writings, slogans or sentiment was off limits, anti-Turkishness was not only acceptable, but in fact encouraged, by the Soviet leadership.<sup>185</sup> Much like their diaspora counterparts, it is unclear to what extent this latent anti-Turkishness existed among the Armenians residing inside the Armenian SSR prior to the early 1960s, but clearly by this time they too were introduced to the western diaspora’s increasingly hostile and racist descriptions of Turks and Turkey. It was therefore relatively easy for Soviet Armenia to follow the diaspora’s lead in this regard. Not only was pressure directed at one of NATO’s most important partners, but also any aggression arising from Armenian nationalism could easily be deflected away from the Soviet Union and the Armenian SSR.<sup>186</sup>

Despite the apparent confluence of interests between the ARF and the Armenian SSR to downplay their mutual hostilities and encourage and promote anti-Turkishness throughout the diaspora and within the Armenian SSR, there still remained one significant problem for the ARF. While the leadership and center of the ARF was located in Beirut, Lebanon, much of the power, prestige, income and influence of the ARF came from the efforts of Armenians living in the United States and in other western Countries allied against the Soviet Union and international communism. To suddenly change its rhetoric and become, an even neutral, supporter of the Soviet Union, while at the same time being fiercely critical and hostile to a NATO ally of the United States, especially one as important as Turkey was no simple task. Fortuitous for the ARF,

---

<sup>184</sup> Panossian, 324.

<sup>185</sup> Panossian, 321, 371.

<sup>186</sup> Armenian analysts have also contended that anti-Turkishness was introduced into the Armenian SSR by Moscow for strategic purposes. See footnote 5, Panossian, 322.

the Armenian SSR and the Soviet Union, however, the time of their truce and the rise of anti-Turkishness occurred at the most opportune time in over a decade.

### **U.S. – Turkish – Soviet Relations in the Early 1960s**

After a decade of strong bilateral ties under the leadership of Adnan Menderes and the Democratic Party, relations between the United States and Turkey started to suffer slightly in the late 1950s. First, public demonstrations and increasing unrest inside Turkey triggered by Menderes regime's poor economic, social and political policies caused grave concern among the U.S. and other western countries. Menderes' wasteful use of western aid and financial assistance also further alienated his former supporters abroad. On May 27, 1960, the Turkish military carried out a successful coup d'état against the Menderes regime and while this alleviated some of the political problems inside Turkey, it did not help the country's deteriorating fiscal condition. To make matters worse, in the fall of 1962, only a year after the government had returned to civilian control, Turkey was unwittingly drawn into the Cuban Missile Crisis.

Although kept from the public at the time, Turkey's recently installed, but largely outdated and obsolete, Jupiter missiles from Turkey proved to be the key element in negotiating a peaceful outcome to this confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union. In return for the removing the Jupiter missiles from Turkey, a major concern for Khrushchev since 1959, the Soviet leader agreed to remove the missiles from Cuba. The possession of Jupiters was a source of pride for the Turkish military and political elite and while their removal did not cause an open dispute between Turkey and the United States, it did cause Turkey's leaders to reevaluate and reflect on their relationship with the U.S. and their position in the Cold War. In the opinion of the Turkish elite, the United States had bargained away Turkey's security to protect their own interests, and had undermined, if only slightly, Turkey's faith in the U.S. commitment to its alliance partners.<sup>187</sup> Two years later, Turkish confidence in the United States faced an even greater challenge.

In late 1963, the President of Cyprus, Archbishop Makarios III disrupted the precarious ethnic balance between Greeks and Turks on the island by advancing constitutional amendments

---

<sup>187</sup> William Hale, *Turkish Foreign Policy Since 1774*, Third Edition (New York: Routledge, 2013), 98-101; Oran, *Turkish Foreign Policy*, 410-412.

that would have significantly reduced the rights of the Turkish minority. Concerned by the outbreak of violence between the two groups, the Turkish government sought to exercise its rights provided for by Article 4 of the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee signed between the United Kingdom, Greece, Turkey and Cyprus to come to the aid of the Turkish minority. The threat of Turkish military intervention on the island, however, prompted a stern message from U.S. President Lyndon Johnson to İsmet İnönü, the Turkish Prime Minister. Fearful that Turkish military intervention in Cyprus might provoke retaliation from the Soviet Union, which enjoyed close relations with President Makarios, the now infamous “Johnson Letter” warned İnönü that Turkey’s NATO allies were not sure whether or not they were obligated to come to Turkey’s aid, and Turkey was not to use any U.S. supplied weaponry for military operations on the Cyprus. Turkey backed down, and, with the exception of airstrikes, did not intervene on the island, but Johnson’s letter was interpreted by most Turks as evidence that the President and the United States sided with the Greeks on the dispute and for the first time anti-U.S. protests surfaced in Turkey.<sup>188</sup>

This weakening in U.S.-Turkish relations was mirrored by the first thaw between Turkey and the Soviet Union in over three decades. Since the death of Stalin in 1953, the Soviets had made overtures to bury any ill-will left over from the confrontation of the late 1940s. While the planned visit of Menderes to the Soviet Union in July 1960 did not take place because of the coup d’état, the Turkish Foreign Minister, Selim Sarper, met with Khrushchev in New York in October 1960, the first high-level between Turkey and the Soviet Union since the late 1930s.<sup>189</sup> While not much came of these talks, the ice was broken and by 1963 Turkey was receptive to rapprochement with the Soviets. In late spring of that year, a parliamentary delegation from Turkey visited to the Soviet Union, followed by the Turkish Foreign Minister in the fall of 1964 and reciprocated in January 1965 by a delegation from the Supreme Soviet. By March 1967, Turkey was on its way to being the largest recipient of Soviet financial assistance in the developing world by the end of the 1970s.<sup>190</sup>

Given these developments in Turkish-Soviet relations, it is curious that the Soviet Union would have engaged, encouraged or, even tacitly supported the emergence of an Armenian

---

<sup>188</sup> Hale, *Turkish Foreign Policy*, 106-109; Oran, *Turkish Foreign Policy*, 412-416.

<sup>189</sup> Oran, 466. The first ministerial visit to the Soviet Union, undertaken by the Turkish Minister of Health, Lütfi Kırdar, had taken place ten months prior, in December 1959. See Oran, 309.

<sup>190</sup> Hale, 108; Oran, 466-468.

nationalism grounded in anti-Turkishness at a time when relations between the Soviet Union and Turkey were finally improving. Anti-Turkish Armenian nationalism, however, served two purposes for the Soviet Union. First, nationalism needs an “other” and, as mentioned above, it was much safer, and prudent, to channel Armenian nationalist activity at Turkey and the Turks, rather than risk it turning against the Soviet Union or Russians. The Soviets were well aware of the fact the warming of relations between the USSR and Turkey had provoked hostility among Soviet Armenians, and was one of the main reasons Moscow allowed the commemoration in Yerevan to take place on April 24, 1965.<sup>191</sup> Furthermore, the Soviets could easily deny any involvement or role in the promotion of anti-Turkishness among its Armenians. As far as they were concerned, Armenians and Turks had been enemies for nearly a thousand years. Second, anti-Turkish Armenian nationalism was a useful means for the Soviet Union to put pressure on or extract concessions from Turkey. The Soviet Union could either offer to contain or threaten to unleash Armenian nationalism, depending on its aims. It should be noted, however, that the threats were perceived as being territorial in nature, i.e. eastern Anatolia, and not, as they are today, of foreign legislatures labeling the events of 1915 in one manner or another.

As the 50<sup>th</sup> Commemoration of the events of 1915 approached in April 1965, therefore, the promotion of anti-Turkishness benefitted both of the main formulators of Armenian nationalist policy, the Armenian SSR and the ARF, was acceptable to, if not encouraged, by the Soviet Union, and was initiated at a time when U.S.-Turkish relations were at their lowest point in decades. The Armenian SSR and the ARF had recognized the energizing and unifying effects anti-Turkish propaganda had on diaspora Armenians, and sought to use it to achieve their political goals within the diaspora. The Soviet Union, for its part, saw only an upside to the cultivation and encouragement of an anti-Turkish Armenian nationalism, assuming that it never turned on its patron (a mistake it would realize in 1988). The large and boisterous demonstrations in Beirut and Yerevan on April 24, 1965, were launched under these conditions.

---

<sup>191</sup> Dekmejian, 517.

## April 24, 1965

On April 24 & 25, 1965, Armenians around the world commemorated the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the tragedy of the Armenian deportations and massacres of 1915.<sup>192</sup> In some locations Armenians demonstrated against Turks and the Turkish government. It was no accident that the two largest demonstrations, by hundreds of thousands of participants, were in Yerevan and Beirut. These cities represented the two opposing poles, the two most powerful forces, and the two religious centers of the Armenian nation, and were already in competition for the loyalty and support of Armenians everywhere. Yerevan represented the Armenian SSR and the Holy See of Echmiadzin, while Beirut symbolized the ARF and the Holy See of Cilicia. The demonstrations Yerevan and Beirut were well-planned and organized, and, given the Armenian SSR and ARF's recent cooperation, it is unlikely that these events were not coordinated.

Of the two major demonstrations, the events in Yerevan have received considerably more attention in the literature. The preparations, or instigation, for the demonstrations in Yerevan date to at least before March 16, 1965, the date when Soviet Armenian leaders announced a monument would be built to honor the martyrs of 1915.<sup>193</sup> The leaders of the Armenian SSR also wanted to commemorate the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary in a "grand manner," and had asked Moscow for permission. When Moscow gave its consent, the Central Committee of the Armenian Communist Party proceeded with its plans.<sup>194</sup> As described by a witness, tens of thousands of workers, students and professors began to spontaneously gather on the streets of Yerevan on April 24<sup>th</sup>, shouting for the return of "Our lands, our lands" in anticipation of an official commemoration ceremony to be held at the Armenian State Academy Theater. The senior leadership of the Armenian SSR and the Catholicos of Echmiadzin attended the official ceremony, but halfway through, the throng of demonstrators surged past the police and barricades into the Theater, disrupted the gathering and began to admonish the Catholicos for not standing with the demonstrators on the question of Armenian nationalist territorial demands.<sup>195</sup> Final estimates

---

<sup>192</sup> Bobelian, 125.

<sup>193</sup> "The History of the Memorial Dedicated to the Victims of the Armenian Genocide," *Armenian Reporter*, April 26, 2008.

<sup>194</sup> Dekmejian, 513, 516.

<sup>195</sup> Haig Sarkissian, "50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Turkish Genocide as Observed in Erevan," *Armenian Review* Vol. 19, No. 4 (Win. 1966): 23-28. See also James H. Tashjian, "Turkey Returns to the East II," *AR* Vol. 20, No. 2 (Sum. 1967): 56; Panossian, 320-323; Dekmejian, 513-514.

placed the size of the crowd at approximately 100,000 demonstrators.<sup>196</sup> It is noteworthy that this account, published in an ARF journal in the United States, attributed this “explosion” to “grievances and discontent against the Soviet regime.” While it was doubtful that evening unfolded entirely according to script, the publication of a newspaper article in the Soviet press accusing Turkey of genocide and Moscow’s lack of interest in arrests and retaliation for an event that brought over 100,000 on to the streets of Yerevan, tends to undermine the contention that the Soviet Union was taken by complete surprise.<sup>197</sup> In fact, while there were some purging and punishment of some Soviet Armenian leaders, this was carried out only *after* Turkey had put pressure on the Soviet Union.<sup>198</sup>

Vahakn Dadrian conducted a much more detailed analysis of the strength of Armenian nationalism in the context of April 1965 in the Soviet Union. In his account of the minor Armenian demonstration in Moscow,<sup>199</sup> Dadrian experienced “pure admiration” for the “few hundred bold and patriotic young men,” from the “new generation... imbued with the dogmas of communism” no less, who “had succeed in imposing their will” on the Soviets.<sup>200</sup> According to Dadrian, an Armenian graduate student conceived of the Moscow demonstrations after witnessing anti-American demonstrations by North Vietnamese and Chinese students in the Soviet capital. His plan was to gather like-minded Armenians and march on the Turkish embassy after a scheduled church service to commemorate 1915. When the church service was postponed for four hours a crowd of about 250, proceeded to the Turkish embassy to express “the anger and deep sorrow of our [the Armenian] nation.” While the Soviet police blocked the demonstrators from reaching the Turkish Embassy, the authorities did assist the demonstrators in their demand that the Turkish Embassy lower its flag in deference to April 24<sup>th</sup>. The demonstrators even returned later in the evening to verify that the flag was still lowered and through their actions “Armenia and Diaspora were intertwined and spiritually fused.”<sup>201</sup>

The demonstrations in Beirut, while barely mentioned in the contemporary ARF press or in the historiography, were comparable in size and magnitude to demonstrations in Yerevan.

---

<sup>196</sup> Dekmejian, 514; Hedrick Smith, “Moscow Deftly Allows Armenia Its Nationalism,” *NYT*, Dec. 20, 1971.

Panossian claims as many as 200,00 may have participated. See Panossian, 320.

<sup>197</sup> “Soviet Article Accuses Turks,” *NYT*, April 25, 1965.

<sup>198</sup> Dekmejian, 516.

<sup>199</sup> “Soviet Article Accuses Turks,” *NYT*, April 25, 1965.

<sup>200</sup> Vahakn Dadrian, “The Events of April 24 in Moscow—How They Happened and Under What Circumstances,” *Armenian Review* Vol. 20, No. 2 (Sum. 1967): 10. See also Tashjian, “Turkey Returns to the East II,” 55-56.

<sup>201</sup> *Ibid.*, 26; “Soviet Article Accuses Turks,” *NYT*, April 25, 1965.

The Turkish government was aware of preparations for demonstrations as early as December 1964, and the press began reporting the Armenian community in Beirut was planning a large demonstration against the Turkish government for the events of 1915 and to seek compensation for the losses in life and property by late March 1965.<sup>202</sup> By April 2, the U.S. Embassy in Beirut was also aware of plans for a major demonstration in the city scheduled for April 25.<sup>203</sup> While the Lebanese government approved the gathering and ceremony, they did not approve the Armenians request to hold a march through the city.<sup>204</sup> Anywhere between 20,000 and 85,000 thousand people attended the four-hour service at the City's Cite Sportive Stadium.<sup>205</sup>

The most detailed example of the degree to which the commemorations, demonstrations and public statements events of April 1965 were planned and organized well in advance are the events and actions in the U.S. The ARF Bureau submitted a memorandum detailing their claims against Turkey to a number of U.N. Delegations in New York.<sup>206</sup> The ARF, assisted by both private and public sources, sent out form letters to state Governors, mayors and other local politicians to read into the public record and formally commemorate and recognize Armenian Martyrs' Day. U.S. Congressmen were sent different letters, asking them to recognize the Armenian massacres and Armenian Martyrs' Day on the floors of the Senate and the House. To assist them, the ARF provided the congressmen with five different prepared statements to choose from, some even including "personal" anecdotes through which to introduce the topic of the

---

<sup>202</sup> "Bazı Yabancı Memleketlerde Müfrit Ermeni Teşekkülleri Tarafından Tertiplenen Kampanya [Campaign Organized by Extremist Armenian Organizations in Some Foreign Countries]," 28 April 1965, Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü Cumhuriyet Arşivi, 03001643959; "Ermeni Olayı," *Dışişleri Belleteni*, No. 6, March 1965, 38; "Yunanistan, Ermenileri siyasi emellerine alet etmek istiyor," *Dışişleri Belleteni*, No. 6, March 1965, 64; "Ermeniler, Türkiye aleyhinde büyük bir gösteri hazırlıyor," *Milliyet*, March 30, 1965; "Ermeniler asıllı Türkler ve ötesi," *Haber*, April 1, 1965; "Lübnanlı Ermeniler dünya çapında bir gösteri yapacaklar," *Yeni Gazete*, April 1, 1965.

<sup>203</sup> "Joint Weeka No. 13," BEIRUT A819, April 2, 1965, NARA, RG59, CFPF, 1964-1966, POL & DEF, Box 2432, POL 2-1 LEB. See also "Religious Minorities: Armenians and the Armenian Community at Kayseri," ANKARA A921, April 20, 1965, NARA, RG59, CFPF, 1964-66, Box 2755, POL 13-3 TUR.

<sup>204</sup> "Joint Weeka No. 16," BEIRUT A882, April 23, 1965, NARA, RG59, NARA, RG 59, CFPF, 1964-1966, POL & DEF, Box 2432, POL 2-1 LEB. Vahakn Dadrian alleges that the Lebanese government's refusal to allow the march to take place was due to joint pressure from the Turkish and Soviet Ambassadors in Beirut. See Dadrian, "The Events of April 24 in Moscow," 9-26.

<sup>205</sup> "Joint Weeka No. 17," BEIRUT A899, April 30, 1965, NARA, RG59, Box 2432, POL 2-1 LEB; Cahit Güçbilmez, "Beyrutta yapılan Ermeni Mitingi fiyasko ile sonuçlandı," *Cumhuriyet*, April 26, 1965; "Ermeni mitingine 20 bin kişi katıldı," *Akşam*, April 26, 1965; "Doğusunda Ermenistan Kuracaklarmış," *Hurriyet*, April 26, 1965; "Ermeniler, Beyrut ve Pariste gösteri yaptı," *Milliyet*, April 26, 1965; "Beyrut Ermeni toplantısına 20 bin kişi katıldı," *Ulus*, April 26, 1965; "Massacre of Armenians by Turks Commemorated," *NYT*, April 25, 1965. The U.S. State Department estimate was 85,000, the Turkish press reported 20,000, and the *NYT* estimated 50,000.

<sup>206</sup> Ara Caprielian, "Some Aspects of the Armenian Question and the Armenian Revolutionary Federation," *Armenian Review* Vol. 29, No. 4 (Win. 1976): 386.

Armenian massacres.<sup>207</sup> The tactic proved extremely successful. Between April 4 and May 6, over 40 U.S. Congressmen brought attention to the events of 1915 in the Senate and House.<sup>208</sup> Pamphlets and booklets were written and documentaries filmed to educate the both the Armenian diaspora and the public at large, and a Memorandum detailing Armenian grievances and demands was distributed to United Nations missions in New York City.<sup>209</sup> Finally, various cities throughout the United States held commemoration church ceremonies and anti-Turkish demonstrations.<sup>210</sup> The largest appears to have been in New York City, where the ARF's youth organization, the Armenian Youth Federation (AYF), organized anywhere between 2,000 and 3,000 Armenians organized to demonstrate in front of the Turkish Consulate, the Turkish Mission to the United Nations and the Turkish Information Office, holding signs such as: "Turkey: Author of Genocide;" "1915 Turkish Genocide of Armenians Still Unpunished;" and "A Nuremberg for the Turks;" and Justice for Armenia."<sup>211</sup>

While there is no doubt that the worldwide commemorations in April 1965 to mark the massacres and deportations of Armenians in 1915 were solemn and sincere occasions used to honor the victims of a great tragedy in the modern history of the Armenian nation, the handful of aggressive anti-Turkish demonstrations were something else entirely. Given the detailed evidence of the ARF's coordination and planning for the events in the United States, the anti-

---

<sup>207</sup> Ibid., 385-387; Ara Caprielian, "The Armenian Revolutionary Federation: The Politics of a Party in Exile," PhD. Diss., New York University, 1975, 311-314.

<sup>208</sup> Rep. William L. St. Onge (CT), "Armenian Martyrs Day," *CR*, April 5, 1965, 7043; Rep. Edward J. Derwinski (IL), "Polish American Newspaperman John Switalski Recalls Turkish Atrocities," *CR*, April 6, 1965, A1690; "The 50th Anniversary of the Armenian Massacre," *CR*, April 22, 1965, 8224; "The 50th Anniversary of Massacre of Armenians by Turks," *CR*, April 22, 1965, 8261; "Armenian Memorial Day," *CR*, April 23, 1965, 8347; "Fiftieth Anniversary of Turkish Genocide of Armenians," *CR*, April 23, 1965, 8348; "Armenian Memorial Day," *CR*, April 23, 1965, 8353-8354; "The 50th Anniversary of the Armenian Massacre," *CR*, April 26, 1965, 8386-8389; "Armenian Massacres in 1915," *CR*, April 26, 1965, 8390-8391; "The 50th Anniversary of the Armenian Massacre," *CR*, April 26, 1965, 8420; "The Armenian Massacres in Turkey in 1915," *CR*, April 26, 1965, 8503; "Armenian Memorial Day," *CR*, April 26, 1965, 8503-8504; "Anniversary of Armenian Massacre," *CR*, April 29, 1965, 8885; "Observance of 50th Anniversary of Massacre of Armenians by the Turks," *CR*, April 29, 1965, 8888-8898; Rep. William G. Bray (IN), "Anniversary of Armenian Massacre," *CR*, April 29, 1965, A2077; "Armenian Massacre," *CR*, May 3, 1965, 9180; "Armenia Must Be Free," *CR*, May 3, 1965, 9195-9196; "The 50th Anniversary of the Armenian Massacre," *CR*, May 3, 1965, 9232; "The Armenian Tragedy in Turkey in 1915," *CR*, May 4, 1965, 9427-9428; Rep. Richard L. Roudebush (IN), "Observance of the 50th Anniversary of Massacre of Armenians," *CR*, May 6, 1965 (April 29), A2229-A2230; Rep. Edward R. Roybal (CA), "In Commemoration of the 50th Anniversary of the Armenian Massacre," *CR*, May 6, 1965, A2233-A2235.

<sup>209</sup> Caprielian, "Some Aspects of the Armenian Question Caprielian," 385-386; "The Armenian Revolutionary Federation," 240-242.

<sup>210</sup> "Rites Will Memorialize Massacre of Armenians," *LA Times*, April 24, 1965; "Armenians Mark a Tragic 1915 Day," *NYT*, April 25, 1965; "Miting, Türkiye için çok kötü bir propaganda oldu," *Hurriyet*, April 26, 1965.

<sup>211</sup> "New York'taki Ermeni Mitingi," *Hurriyet*, April 26, 1965; Ara Caprielian, "Some Aspects of the Armenian Question and the Armenian Revolutionary Federation," *Armenian Review* Vol. 29, No. 4 (Win. 1976): 385.

Turkish rhetoric in its publications since 1959 and the recent cooperation between the ARF and the leadership of the Armenian SSR, it is clear that the demonstrations in Yerevan, Moscow, Beirut, New York and elsewhere were part of a planned and coordinated effort to instigate tension and encourage animosity between Armenians, Turkey and Turks for political gains inside the Armenian diaspora and the Armenian SSR.

## Conclusion

Between 1945 and 1959, the massacres and deportations of the Armenians in eastern Anatolia by the Ottoman Turks in 1915 were neither a singular topic of discussion or analysis, nor even what the Armenians specifically sought justice for.<sup>212</sup> Instead, the tragedy was part of a larger, and longer, narrative filled with numerous instances of violence and perceived injustice by Muslims, Ottomans, Russians, Kurds, Turks and others. In terms of the 1945-1948 campaign described above, the justification for seeking the Turkish provinces of Kars and Ardahan was not based on the events of 1915, but rather on a list of subjective reasons meant to explain why Armenia deserved it more than Turkey, or, to prove, like Rep. Charles Savage (WI) believed: the Turks “did not originally belong there.”<sup>213</sup> For reasons of their unbroken tenure of habitation, racial and religious superiority, sufferings and persecutions, dedication to the Allied cause, promises from the Allied governments during and immediately after World War I, betrayal by those same Allied powers, contributions to the Allied cause in World War II, and, finally, in order to accommodate over one million Armenian refugees who wished to repatriate to the Armenian SSR, the Armenians deserved to be awarded eastern Anatolia and in fact were owed eastern Anatolia. When that failed, the discussion turned to reasons why Turkey was unworthy of Western assistance at the beginning of the Cold War. Even then, however, the massacres and

---

<sup>212</sup> There are two minor exceptions: a letter in the *New York Times* and two pages in the *Armenian Review*. See A. Alichanian, “The Armenian Massacres,” *NYT*, September 27, 1947; H. Saro, “Terrors from the Crime of 1915,” *Armenian Review*, Vol. 1, No. 3 (Sum. 1948): 105-106. For what appears to be one of the first truly academic analyses of the events leading up to the massacres and deportations of 1915, see: Roderic Davison, “The Armenian Crisis, 1912-1914,” *American Historical Review*, Vol. 53, No. 3 (April 1948): 481-505.

<sup>213</sup> Rep. Charles R. Savage (WA), “Treatment of Armenia,” *CR*, May 9, 1946, A2573-A2574. That Turks had inhabited the area for nearly a thousand years, or the fact that by the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century Armenians were neither a majority in any province of eastern Anatolia, nor had had any political control over the territory in over 500 years, appears to have escaped many of the U.S. Congressmen, and others, who participated in this campaign.

deportations of Armenians/Christians in 1915, was not the only, or even primary, reason being cited.

Once the realities of the Cold War settled in, however, the emphasis during the 1950s was on the illegal, undemocratic, and brutal Sovietization of the Armenian Republic, the tyranny and oppression suffered by the Armenian people, and on freeing the Armenia SSR from the Soviet Union. The main proponent and beneficiary of this change in focus was the ARF. While still quixotic, after the unrest in Berlin, Poland and Hungary caused by de-Stalinization, the decoupling of the Armenian SSR from the Soviet Union seemed more probable than Turkey, the United States and their NATO allies willingly handing over eastern Anatolia. If 1915 was mentioned in this period, it was to engender concern for the plight of the contemporary Armenians of the Armenian SSR, not to elicit sympathy for the former inhabitants of eastern Anatolia, and certainly not to create ill-will towards Turkey, one of NATO's newest and strategically significant members.

In 1959, for a number of reasons discussed above, the ARF changed course and promoted anti-Turkishness over anti-communism. Anti-Turkishness had a long history in both Western and Armenian culture, and this change served to reduce tension within both within the diaspora and between the ARF and the Armenian SSR, the two main sources of political, cultural and spiritual power in the Armenian nation. It is within this context, along with changes in international politics that were both timely and favorable to Armenian efforts against Turkey, that the well-planned and coordinated demonstrations of 1965 should be viewed. There is no doubt that the demonstrations were solemn occasions used to commemorate a great tragedy in the modern history of the Armenian nation, but there were also part of a planned and coordinated effort to instigate tension and encourage animosity between Armenians and the Turk for political gains inside the Armenian diaspora. The decision to draw attention to the massacres and deportations of 1915 was not to achieve international recognition, to have the events redefined, extract an apology and reparations from Turkey, or to achieve any other form of 'justice.' The demonstrations were instead used excite and energize the Armenian diaspora with the one emotion known to work: anti-Turkishness. For the Soviet Union and the Armenian SSR, the demonstrations also provided a necessary distraction from potential anti-Soviet and anti-Russian sentiment. Unfortunately, the violent nationalism unleashed by the April 1965 demonstrations would have ramifications far beyond the limited confines of the Armenian diaspora.