

# THE ARMENIAN REPORT OF BRITISH WAR OFFICE, GENERAL STAFF: "HISTORICAL AND ETHNOLOGICAL NOTES ON THE ARMENIANS" (5TH APRIL 1918)

((THE ARMENIAN REPORT OF BRITISH WAR OFFICE, GENERAL STAFF:  
"HISTORICAL AND ETHNOLOGICAL NOTES ON THE ARMENIANS"  
(5TH APRIL 1918))

**Assist. Prof. Dr. Tolga BAŞAK**  
Atatürk University  
Institute of Atatürk's Principles and History  
tbasak@atauni.edu.tr

**Abstract:** *This study presents the report of the British War Office, General Staff on "Historical and Ethnological Notes on the Armenians." In the light of cyclical international developments of the era in which this report was written up, some evaluations are made. The report written in the last year of I. World War includes some information on Armenian history. Aside from assessments related to Turkish-Armenian, Armenian-Kurdish, Armenian-Georgian, Armenian-Russian and Armenian-Iranian relationships some statistical information on Armenian population are submitted in this report. This study also mentions the policy of British War Office on Armenians and lastly some statistical information revealed in this report are surveyed and compared with some other information given in different sources.*

**Keywords:** *First World War, Armenian Question, Armenians, Armenia, British War Office.*

**Öz:** *Bu çalışmada İngiliz Savaş Bakanlığı Genelkurmay Başkanlığının "Tarihsel ve Etnolojik Açından Ermeniler" başlıklı raporuna yer verilerek raporun kaleme alındığı dönemin uluslararası konjonktürel gelişmeleri ışığında bazı değerlendirmeler yapılmıştır. Ermeni tarihiyle ilgili bilgiler içeren rapor I. Dünya Savaşı'nın son yılı içinde hazırlanmıştır. Raporda Türk-Ermeni, Ermeni-Kürt, Ermeni-Gürcüü, Ermeni-Rus, Ermeni-İran ve Ermeni-Azeri ilişkilerine ait değerlendirmeler yanında Rus ve Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'ndaki Ermeni nüfusuna ilişkin istatistiksel veriler sunulmaktadır. Adı geçen veriler kaynaklarıyla beraber incelenmiş ve diğer kaynaklardaki bazı verilerle karşılaştırılarak genel bir değerlendirme yapılmıştır.*

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** *I. Dünya Savaşı, Ermeni Sorunu, Ermeniler, Ermenistan, İngiliz Savaş Bakanlığı.*

## Introduction

Political initiative and concerns as a result of military evaluations constituted an important aspect of the Armenian question that began to appear in international politics towards the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Ottoman Armenians began to take part in international discussions after Russia's military victories against the Ottoman State. The military and political potential that the Armenians could utilize within a crumbling empire began to be noticeable by the imperialist powers at that time. Russia's attempt to unilaterally use this potential triggered Britain's worries about the eastern dominions,<sup>1</sup> which caused a rivalry problem<sup>2</sup> to gain an international character.

The 1877-78 Turkish-Russian War and gains Russia made with the Treaty of San Stefano were milestones in this process. The British ambassador in Istanbul Layard considered the conquest of a part of Eastern Anatolia by Russia to be a great blow to British interests. While in his letter sent to London, Layard stressed the dire nature of the situation;<sup>3</sup> the British Foreign Minister of the time Lord Salisbury stated that His Majesty's Government too could not stand idly by the unfolding events Asia Minor.<sup>4</sup> In the end Russian gains were curtailed in the Berlin Congress and the arrangements of San Stefano that would have caused the Armenians to be subject to Russian influence were revised.<sup>5</sup> From this point onward, Britain attempted to remove the potential of the unilateral use of the Ottoman Armenians from Russian hegemony. With such British attempts, the Armenian question began to be discussed in the international platform in different guises and justifications, the foremost being the issue of reform. This British political stance borne out of rivalry and military justifications carried the Armenian question to Europe's congresses and conferences, and eventually carried it all the way onto the Treaty of Sevres in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

The change in Britain's policy regarding the territorial integrity of the Ottoman State also affected the Armenian question. Just before the outbreak of World

---

1 James Long, *The Position of Turkey in Relation to British Interests in India*, East India Association, London, 1876, pp. 9-13.

2 Münir Süreyya Bey, *Ermeni Meselesinin Siyasî Tarihçesi, (1877-1914)*, T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, Osmanlı Arşivi Daire Başkanlığı, Yayın No: 53, Ankara, 2001, p. VII.

3 Arman J. Kirakossian, *British Diplomacy and the Armenian Question, from the 1830's to 1914*, London, 2003, pp. 64-65.

4 House of Commons Parliamentary Papers, 1878, Volume: LXXXII, Turkey No: 36 (1878), *Correspondence Respecting the Convention Between Great Britain and Turkey* of June 4, 1878, No. 1, The Marquis of Salisbury to Mr. Layard, Foreign Office, May 30, 1878.

5 House of Commons Parliamentary Papers, 1878, Volume: LXXXIII, Turkey, No: 22, (1878), *Annex to Article XIX of the Treaty of San Stefano*, pp. 14-15; House of Commons Parliamentary Papers, 1878, Volume: LXXXIII, Turkey, No:37, (1878), *Map Showing the Territory Restored to Turkey by the Congress of Berlin*, London, 1878, p.1; House of Commons Parliamentary Papers, 1878, Volume: LXXXIII, Turkey, No: 44, (1878), *Treaty Between Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, Russia and Turkey for the Settlement of Affairs in the East*, Signed at Berlin, July 13, 1878, Article; LVIII, pp. 27-28.

War I, Russia had gotten Britain’s permission to use Armenians for political and military purposes. At the same time, the 1878 arrangements that prevented Russia from unilaterally exploiting the Armenian question were cancelled. Upon Russia’s initiative in 1914, an international conference was convened in Istanbul and the Armenian question was updated in the light of other political agendas.<sup>6</sup>

World War I carried the use of the Armenian reforms problem for the projects of establishing influence on the Ottoman Empire and disintegrating the state onto a different platform. In conjunction with the changes brought forth by the international conjecture, the Armenian question’s potential began to be used by Britain and Russia.

The great powers’ stances on the Armenian question during the World War were shaped by the same interest-based impulses. The war had to be finished in favor of the Allies as soon as possible. The first step toward this goal was taken in the form of a Russian-Armenian cooperation<sup>7</sup> in conjunction with Armenian insurrection. The second concrete step was the “*massacre of the Armenians in Turkey*” propaganda propagated by Britain. A propaganda campaign was begun that contained stories of Armenians in Turkey being deported, of Armenians being subjected to massacres, and even of attempts at exterminating them as a group of people. The result of this campaign was a work produced by the British War Propaganda Bureau (Wellington House) and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office called “The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, 1915-1916, Miscellaneous, No: 31.”<sup>8</sup>

The last step in this process was taken after Russia was knocked out of the war in 1917 by the Bolshevik Revolution. During this period the Russian area of conquest in Eastern Anatolia and Caucasus was attempted to be protected by Armenian gangs and soldiers. During 1917-1918, a British-Armenian military alliance occurred in the east. Britain resorted to the policy Russia employed at the outbreak of the war in order to fill in the void in the Eastern front left by the retreating Russian army, to protect the petroleum region in the Caucasus and to prevent the Turkish union project that posed a threat to Britain’s colonial

---

6 *British Documents on Foreign Affairs: Report and Papers from the Foreign Office Confidential Print*, Part: I, Series: B, The Near and Middle East, 1856-1914, Volume: 20, Editor: David Gillard, Her Britannic Majesty’s Stationary Office, 1985. p.433; *British Documents on the Origins of the War, 1898-1914*, Edited by G. P. Gooch and Harold Temperley, Volume: X, Part: I, *The Near and Middle East on the Eve of the War*, London, 1936, pp. 531-532; 545-546; 548; Stefanos Yerasimos, *Milliyetler ve Sınırlar, Balkanlar, Kafkasya ve Orta Doğu*, İstanbul, 2000, p.132.

7 The National Archives of United Kingdom, Public Record Office, Foreign Office, 371/2147/74733, P. Stevens to Foreign Office, 29.10.1914; TNA. PRO. FO. 371/2147/74733, *Consul Stevens (Batoum)*, to *Foreign Office*, October 29, 1914; TNA. PRO. FO. 371/2146/68443, *Francis Kinby (Ruster on Don)* to *Foreign Office*, November 7, 1914.

8 *The Treatment of the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, 1915-1916, Documents Presented to Viscount Grey of Fallodon with a Preface by Viscount Bryce*, Misc No: 31, Cmd 8325, H. M. Stationery Office, London, New York and Toronto, 1916. For information relating to the effects of British propaganda during the World War I on the Armenian question, please see: (Tolga Başak, *İngiltere’nin Ermeni Politikası*, İstanbul, 2008, pp. 196-228).

empire. Armenian troops and gangs were given military assistance, and they were used in line with British war policies.<sup>9</sup>

The British-Armenian alliance project put into place in Eastern Anatolia and Caucasus with military plans and justifications, in short time, resulted also in political initiatives. In an effort to bolster the Armenians' will to fight, the British government attempted to motivate the Armenians by using the "Independent Armenia" discourse and promises expressed by Russia in the beginning of the war. In this way, Britain added political content to military cooperation. Lacking any alternatives, the Armenians, meanwhile, wanted to use the British for their political future.<sup>10</sup> The British Foreign and Commonwealth Office, with the sympathetic plans and projects it devised, made serious references to an independent Armenia that would be established after the war.<sup>11</sup>

*The British-Armenian alliance project put into place in Eastern Anatolia and Caucasus with military plans and justifications, in short time, resulted also in political initiatives. In an effort to bolster the Armenians' will to fight, the British government attempted to motivate the Armenians by using the "Independent Armenia" discourse and promises expressed by Russia in the beginning of the war.*

The British War Office, under conditions of war, handled the Armenian question as a propaganda tool, and the propaganda bureau, Wellington House,<sup>12</sup> carried out what it was tasked. At the same time, however, according to the War Office, Britain was not to commit

to any obligations regarding the political future of the Armenians in Eastern Anatolia and Caucasus.<sup>13</sup> In relation to this, the British War Cabinet that convened in London in 1917 proposed protection by the USA for Armenia.<sup>14</sup> This stance of the British Government was to be the backbone of its post-war Armenian policy. The War Office's realistic perspective on the Armenian question and especially on "Independent Armenia" resulted from time to time in disputes in the Foreign and Commonwealth Office.

9 TNA. PRO. FO. 371/3284/75611, "Memorandum Regarding the Support Afforded to the Armenians", *Department of Military Intelligence to Foreign Office*, April 29th 1918.

10 TNA. PRO. FO. 371/3062/234125, Mr. Stevens (Tiflis) to Foreign Office, December 10, 1917; TNA. PRO. FO. 371/3062/219773, War Office to Mr. Balfour, Secret, No: 0149/4786 (M.0.2), 29th October, 1917; *Lord Bryce to Lord Robert Cecil*, November 5, 1917; TNA. PRO. FO. 371/3016/208687, *General Barter to C. I. G. S.*, No: 1332, 24 October 1917; *Foreign Office to Sir C. Spring Rice (Washington)*, No: 4687, 2 November 1917.

11 TNA. PRO. FO. 371/3018/237859, *Foreign Office to Mr. Stevens (Tiflis)*, No: 5, December 13th, 1917; TNA. PRO. FO. 371/3062/234125, *Foreign Office to Mr. Stevens (Tiflis)*, December 13th, 1917; TNA. PRO. FO. 371/6561/E 14000, *The Case for Armenia, The British Armenia Committee*, London, 1921, s.6-8; Artin H. Arslanian, "British Wartime Pledges, 1917-1918", *Journal of Contemporary History*, Volume: 13, Number: 3, (July, 1978), pp. 517-529.

12 TNA. PRO. CAB. 24/3, G.102, s.2.

13 TNA. PRO. FO. 371/3018/237859, *C.I.G.S to General Shore*, December 17th, 1917; *Foreign Office to Sir C. Marling (Teheran)*, No: 353, December 16th, 1917.

14 PRO. CAB. 23/13, *War Cabinet 308a Secret, Draft Minutes of a Meeting held at 10 Downing Street, S.W.*, on Monday, December 31, 1917 at 4 P.M., pp. 2-4.

After World War I, the War Office and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office began to view the Armenian question from different angles. Military evaluations developed a context that was suitable for the conditions of the region. Meanwhile, the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, in line with its previous promises and its role as the Champion of the Christian world, exploited to the limit the Armenian question and its potential for use. During the arrangements that were to be made in Paris, the warnings made by the War Office<sup>15</sup> with regards to Turkey in general, and Eastern Anatolia and the Armenian question in specific were not heeded. As a result of this, it was decided that an important part of Anatolia would be established as Armenia under the Treaty of Sèvres.<sup>16</sup> Politicians, who had disregarded the warnings of British War Office, were forced to completely change their stance on the Armenian question at the signing of the Treaty of Lausanne.

Since, generally speaking, the Armenian question kept being updated in periods throughout and after the war, British war circles would prepare reports about the Armenians and the Armenian question, and send such reports to political platforms for evaluation. One such report was made up of notes sent by the British General Staff to the Foreign and Commonwealth Office six months prior to the end of World War I. These notes primarily contained some information and evaluations regarding Armenians and Turkish-Armenian relations, and contained a historical narrative of the Armenian question. Alongside these, the report also provided population statistics for pre-war Eastern Anatolia and Caucasus. Dated April 5, 1918, the report was titled "*Historical And Ethnological Notes On The Armenians*".<sup>17</sup>

---

15 TNA. PRO. CAB. 24/89, G.T. 8292, *War Cabinet*, "Military Policy in Asia Minor" Memorandum by the Secretary of State for War, 9th October 1919; HLRO. LG/F/206/4/14, "Erzurum and the Western Boundary of Armenia" *General Staff War Office*, 11.2.1920, B. B. Cubitt, (WO) to Secretary of the Cabinet, 12 February 1920; TNA. PRO. WO. 106/64, "The Situation in Turkey, 15th March, 1920", s.8-9; TNA. PRO. CAB. 24/103, C. P. 1035, "Treaty of Peace with Turkey", *Copy of letter from Marshal Foch to Mr. Lloyd George*, March 30, 1920; TNA. PRO. CAB. 24/103, C. P. 1014, "General Staff Memorandum on the Turkish Peace Treaty", *The War Office*, 1st April, 1920.

16 *Traité Entre Les Puissances Alliés et Associées et la Turquie Signé Le 10 Aout 1920, A Sevres*, Texte Français, Anglais et Italien, pp.190-191.

17 TNA. PRO. FO. 371/34105/204335, "Historical and Ethnological Notes on the Armenians", General Staff, War Office, 5th April, 1918, pp. 1-10.

1918.		204335 DEC 12 1918 Received by 155708.
Dec. 9 11	No. 204335	
D.M.I. (Secret & Confidential) Last Paper. 203339	(Subject.) <u>Armenians</u> P.L. his. memo. containing historical and ethnological notes on:	
(Print.)	(Minutes.) P.L.D. (P. Tognbee). a.d.P. 13/12	
(How disposed of.)	Good historical summary and valuable statistics; satisfactory absence of political partisanship. A.S.T. 16.12.18.	
(Action completed.) [Signature]	(Index.) [Signature]	
Next Paper.		

264357-NY. 29726/177-25,000-10-15-W. & S. Ltd.-(90).

60152

SECRET AND CONFIDENTIAL

Q. 9.

## HISTORICAL AND ETHNOLOGICAL NOTES ON THE ARMENIANS.

### TABLE OF CONTENTS.

#### PARA.

1. Independent Armenia.
2. Geographical Distribution.
3. Armenians and Turks.
4. Armenians and Kurds.
5. Armenians and Georgians.
6. Armenians and Russia.
8. Armenians and Persia.
7. Armenians and Tartars.

#### APPENDICES.

APPENDIX I.—Statistics as to Armenians.

APPENDIX II.—Armenians as affected by the Brest-Litovsk Treaty.

Without attempting any chronological survey or detailed statistical consideration, it may be useful to summarise briefly the historical and ethnological background of some of the more salient Armenian problems. A note as to numerical distribution is given in an appendix.

1. *Independent Armenia.*—The most important fact in this connection is that the Ottoman Turks have been in possession of Armenia since Selim I.'s conquests of 1514. An independent Armenia, with varying boundaries, existed at various times before that date, but it would be fair to say that its final extinction took place in the first quarter of the 11th Century (1021); the subsequent Kingdom of Lesser Armenia, mainly in Cilicia, was admittedly a transplantation. It does not, therefore, seem profitable here to do more than pick out a few special points in pre-Ottoman Armenian history.

- (a.) Throughout the first 1,000 years of our era, the Armenians were a buffer between the Roman and Byzantine Empires and the various Eastern Empires, which included Persia, Mesopotamia and, under the Caliphs, Syria. During this period their fullest independence was attained when the power controlling Asia Minor was in active rivalry with that controlling Mesopotamia and Persia, and, as against the Parthians, when the Armenians held the lower Araxes Valley (roughly, first three centuries A.D.).
- (b.) Owing to geographical difficulties and owing to the fact that Armenia never became more than a nominally vassal state of Rome, the Armenians never experienced Roman influence to any very great extent; the same causes, *plus* the religious difference, affected relations with Byzantium.
- (c.) The Armenians were converted to Christianity by St. Gregory, the Illuminator, about a hundred years before the partition of Armenia between Rome and the Persian (Sassanian) Empire in 387 A.D. This, together with the standardisation of the Armenian alphabet and the translation of the Bible, helped to fuse the people together, but the final break off from the Roman Church at the end of the 5th Century rendered them additionally isolated from European influences. The most striking feature of Armenian nationality has been the centring of its aspirations and traditions round the Gregorian Church, but it was this narrow intensity that ruined Armenian relations with Byzantium (later represented by Moscow) and with Rome, and left the Armenians to struggle unaided against the early successes of Mahomet. Only when they moved out of their true home, the Armenian Plateau, to the plains of Sivas or to Cilicia, do they seem to have shown themselves capable of collaboration with other Christians.

(B18/473) 100 12/18 H&S 6583-1600

(d.) In spite of the bond of religion, the Armenians seldom displayed much cohesiveness; the high plains, running roughly east and west, were, as a rule, separated by difficult parallel ranges, and neither of the Empires, to the west or the east, could spare the energy fully to absorb them. Consequently the prevailing *régime* seems to have been one of numerous native nobles and foreign adventurers, at times coalescing under a particularly strong leader or succession of leaders. "Some were vassals of the Greek Emperor, some of the Caliph; some were Moslems, some were Christians, some were Armenians, and some were Kurds; some were descendants of Arabian Emirs and their servants." This more or less feudal *régime* was modified to an important degree by the pressure of the Seljuks and the resulting tendency of many Armenians to move further westwards towards Sivas and south-westwards towards Aleppo. The seal was set on this process by the Emperor Basil II transplanting the "dynasty" of Van to Sivas (1021), and by Michael IV. transplanting the Bagratid dynasty (centred in the middle Araxes and Arpa Chai valleys) to Cilicia. The result was a great diminution in the Armenian nobility left in the old "Armenia." Three centuries of struggle amongst themselves, the Kurds and the Seljuks sufficed almost entirely to eradicate them, leaving the Armenians constituted as a peasant population with a marked proportion of persons engaged in commerce and rudimentary industries, and with the clergy as the leaders in their country.

(e.) The Bagratid Kings (886–1041), mentioned above, are important as marking a period of national power and heroism and of a considerable consolidation of rule over the chief districts of present-day Armenian population in Russian Trans-Caucasia. The historical tradition of this kingdom, though exaggerated, is still of influence, especially in conjunction with the position of Échmiadzin, now the religious capital, which is also in Russian Trans-Caucasia, near the town of Erivan.

2. *Geographical Distribution.*—(For number and percentages, see Appendix I.) The true home of the Armenians may be considered to be the high plateau,\* intersected by mountain ranges running roughly east and west, and bounded on the north by the Pontic Mountains; on the south by the Eastern Taurus and the Alps of Kurdistan, on the west by the Euphrates from its passage through the Taurus to Erzingan, and thence north across very difficult country to the Pontic Mountains; on the east by the Hakkiari, the heights east of Lake Van along the Turco-Persian frontier, the Agri Dagh (the Ararat Range), and the tumbled mass of inward curving offshoots of the Pontic Alps. The word Armenia will be used throughout these notes as signifying the above-mentioned stretch of country. Both the northern and the southern frontiers are far more definite than the western or eastern; the Pontic and Taurus Mountains each present a wall pierced by only two important lines of egress or ingress, in the former case the Erzerum—Baiburt—Gumishkahé—Trebizond route and the passage of the Chorokh to the sea, in the latter case the Bitlis Gorge and the Haini and Arghana Passes. Consequently the Arabs never got a hold on Armenia, and it was from the east, and later the west, that Moslem invasions took place; so too, except for the Trebizond—Tabriz caravan route, the Black Sea has never played any part in the development of the Armenians, who have always been, and still are, despite their dispersion, an inland people with no maritime abilities or traditions. West of the Euphrates the country gradually develops into the plains of Sivas and the steppes of Anatolia, the centre of the Osmanli Turks, where the Armenians and the Kurds have never been more than scattered immigrants. To the east of Lake Van and Erzerum the closing in of the offshoots of the Eastern Taurus and the Pontic Mountains has resulted in the knot of mountains of which Ararat is the culminating point; their general course is south-easterly from the Chorokh to Ararat, then almost due south. But they do not present an insuperable barrier, in spite of the great altitude of the whole country. In particular, the Araxes, rising in the Bingeul Dagh, south of Erzerum, flowing east, forces a way through the gap between the Aghri Dagh and the Soghanlu Mountains, and thence forward in Russian Trans-Caucasia forms a rich and attractive valley. Having comparatively easy communication both with the Eastern and Western Euphrates, the three valleys have been at all times main lines of movement. So too the mountains south of Ararat, before they become entangled in the Hakkiari, have always proved

\* Its average height is about 5,000 feet, but many of the plains are much higher, e.g. 7,000 feet.



passable for Oriental peoples or armies, moving from the rich lands round Lake Urmia or the valleys of the Kizil Uzen Su and its tributaries to the plains of Van, Melashkert and Mush, which lead on to the Eastern Euphrates. Armenia, as described above, was not entirely the true home of the Armenians, for from very early times they appear as inhabiting the middle Araxes and Arpa Chai basins, centreing round Erivan and Alexandropol, but on the whole their increase and diffusion in Russian Trans-Caucasia took place later than in Armenia. Van preceded Ani as a national centre.

Though the chief feature of the distribution of the Armenians is that they usually form minorities, an important compensating factor is to be found in their occupation of the richest lands of Armenia, and of Erivan, Kars and the Upper Kura; the plains, e.g. of Van, Mush, Bulanik, Palu, Alashkert, were in 1914 still thickly studded with Armenian villages, and were original centres of Armenian life. Their agricultural ability was combined with commercial aptitude and skill in handicrafts, which favoured their collection in small towns, and eventually led to their colonies being found in most of the towns of Turkey and Trans-Caucasia. The development of these "town" Armenians has been so great that as a people they can be sharply differentiated between "progressive" money-makers engaged in commercial, financial or industrial pursuits\* and hardy peasants of considerable education, but not naturally inclined to the doctrinaire westernism of the "town" leaders. Inter-marriage between the two is stated to be very rare. Parallel with this distinction, according to some authorities amounting to a physical distinction, there is also the natural difference due to their dispersion. The Armenians around Tiflis are naturally marked by wide divergencies from those of Mush, or the Turkish-speaking Armenians south-west of the Euphrates, or the great Constantinople colony. Finally a third line of cleavage may be noticed in the strong hostility shown between Gregorians, Roman Catholics and Protestants,† though the last two are in very small numbers.

3. *Armenians and Turks.*—Following on the passage of the Seljuks through Armenia to Anatolia (11th Century onwards) and the chaotic and desolating succession of Seljuk, Kurdish and Armenian chieftains, the Ottomans finally conquered Armenia in the beginning of the 16th Century. Their policy towards the Armenians was largely bound up with their attitude towards the Kurds, and will be summarized in paragraph 4. As Christians, the Armenians throughout the Ottoman Empire were organized in *millets* under ecclesiastical chiefs, with absolute authority in civil and religious affairs, and as regards certain criminal offences. The result of this system, which gave them religious freedom, and the right to manage their educational and municipal affairs, was to foster strong communal feeling and enterprise, which eventually developed into a definite national consciousness. The influence of the Armenian Church was thus increased by the Turkish policy, but the prominence of the ecclesiastics as civil leaders affected adversely their spiritual leadership, and also stimulated their conservatism. From 1839 onwards the tendency to break away from this rigid ecclesiastical organization received assistance from the Sultan, and a lay Armenian *intelligenza* grew up, originally as the rival of clericalism. Later transformed by the example of the Balkan States and European revolutionary ideas, they stood out more and more as the upholders of violent action to attain autonomy or even independence. Their increasing power and the desperation caused by the failure of their hopes in 1878 was in part responsible for Abd-ul-Hamid's reversal of the previous Turkish policy towards the Armenians. The subsequent relations between the Turkish Government and the Armenians, except for an interval after 1908, were as bad as could be; it does not seem necessary to trace them here (see also paragraph 6), but it may be pointed out that the Armenian Church consistently opposed the schemes of the extremists and their committees, that the oscillations and jealousy of the European Powers enormously weakened the position of the Armenians, and that, though Armenian revolutionary propaganda was undoubtedly very active, it seems doubtful whether it made much progress except among the Armenians in the towns.

Apart from the Kurds, the Armenians are also, in the north and east of Armenia much intermixed with Turks (and Turkomans). In many districts (e.g. in the Erzerum and Erzingan districts) there are villages composed of Armenians and Turks, while west of the Euphrates, in full Turkish land, the Armenians are scattered broadcast among the Turks, mainly in the towns. Prior to the last fifty years they seem to have lived

\* The clergy also were recruited mainly from the town class.

† But recently this hostility has much decreased, the Protestants even having been admitted to the Gregorian National Assembly.

side by side without much hostility, but the renaissance of Armenian nationalism and the cruelty and extortions of the centralised administration and police created an atmosphere of suspicion and mistrust, before the massacres made their mutual relations almost intolerable.

4. *Armenians and Kurds*.—Whether the bulk of the remaining Armenians in Turkey remain under Turkish rule or not, this is the centre of the Turkish Armenian problem. The two races, before the war, were much intermixed in their distribution and throughout history they have been closely connected; this was accentuated by the gradual extension north-westwards and northwards of the Kurds, following on the Seljuk desolation of Armenia and Ottoman encouragement. Although some Kurdish tribes have become sedentary and shown aptitude for agriculture, particularly in Northern Mesopotamia, the two races may fairly be contrasted, the one as agricultural cultivators of the plains, the other as pastoral nomads or semi-nomads of the mountains. The necessity of coming down to less bitter and inhospitable lands in winter, the movements in search of pasture, and the mutual economic requirements of the two peoples have always perpetuated difficulties, but prior to the 19th Century their relations do not seem to have been particularly bad. The Ottoman policy favoured the Kurds as a semi-independent bulwark against Persia and as capable of maintaining a feudal authority over the Armenians in addition to their own tribal authority. The Armenian peasantry thus became *rayahs* and enjoyed the protection of their overlords as against the attacks of any other Kurdish chieftain against them. Religious toleration was extended to the Armenians, as to the other Christians in Turkey; ever since the strong hostility between Armenians and Kurds religious differences have played a minor, or artificial, rôle. The Kurds are sub-divided between Sunnis and Shiah, with a considerable element of Animism and eclectic Paganism. They are of Iranian, not Turanian, race, and speak a variety of Kurdish dialects some of them akin to Persian. Their connection with the Turks is mainly Governmental, and their attitude to them chiefly influenced by the policy of Constantinople towards them. This policy as outlined above was changed in the beginning of the 19th Century when Sultan Mahmud initiated an era of centralization and of official Ottoman administration among the Kurds and the Armenians. Somewhat later the interest of the European Powers in the Armenians, beginning about 1830 and increasing during the course of the century, had a bad effect on the Kurds. This was fatally aggravated by Abd-ul-Hamid's policy after the Russo-Turkish war of setting the Kurds against the Armenians. Arms were distributed to the former, the *Hamidieh* were raised and the massacres organized. At the same time the Kurds were further encouraged, and as far as possible compelled, to take to agriculture and cultivate barren hills or the richer lands of the Armenians. After 1908, the C.U.P. attempted to mend matters and had some success, particularly in the reduction of Ibrahim Pasha's Milli Confederacy, but they could not undo the fatal mistake of assisting to arm the Kurds. Since the war they have reverted to Abd-ul-Hamid's ideas and have far surpassed him in the success of their efforts to exterminate the Armenians. But it should be noted that not all the Kurds have joined in the massacres of the Armenians; little more than tribal consciousness exists among them, and they are scarcely as yet capable of applying any methodical, "nationalistic," policy. During the 1915 massacres, in particular, some of the Kurds of the Aleppo *vilayet* and those of the Dersim (the wild tract of country roughly between Kharput and Erzincan), have shown themselves friendly to the Armenians. There is strong reason to believe that the recent terrible accentuation of the Armeno-Kurdish problem is in part artificial and that, given a strong Government to repress and overawe the more wild and bellicose tribes, and a wise Government to keep tolerably adjusted the friction between a pastoral and an agricultural people, Armenians and Kurds might live together, as they have in the past, without exceptional strife, especially if the Kurdish settlement of Northern Mesopotamia were to prove practicable.

5. *Armenians and Georgians*.—These two peoples represent the only two important Christian groups of Trans-Caucasia and North-East Asia Minor. The Georgians are, however, Orthodox, and are of the Caucasian group of races; the temperaments and characteristics of the two races do not appear to have much in common. Nor is their literary or cultural development closely connected. During certain periods of mediaeval history, there were, however, numerous historical links between the leaders, if not between the peoples. The position of Georgia and Armenia naturally inclined the Byzantine Emperors to utilize them as barriers against the succession of Turco-Tartar peoples that

swept in from the east and north-east, and against the Arab encroachments of the Caliphs. The persistent attempt to combine this with a pan-Greek policy combined with other factors to render the attempt usually a failure. But during the time of the Bagratid dynasty in modern Russian Armenia (846-1045), and of an offshoot of the same dynasty in Georgia, a near approach to a Christian bloc was at moments achieved. The principal reasons for its failure seem to have been the quarrels and intrigues of the Orthodox and Armenian ecclesiastics, the intestine feuds of the Armenian feudal chiefs, especially in the case of the Kings of Van, and the selfish exclusiveness encouraged among the Georgians by their remoteness. It should be noted that at this period the Armenians possessed a powerful and able feudal nobility, which has now entirely disappeared. During the subsequent centuries of Moslem (Seljuk, Ottoman, Mongol, Persian) invasion and conquest, no attempt was made at an Armeno-Georgian combination. The Armenian nobles either migrated to lesser Armenia, or were killed off, or remained in the service of their conquerors. The Georgians retained their independence with varying boundaries until their annexation by Russia in 1801. Latterly the great growth of Armenians, largely composed of emigrants from Turkey, especially at and around Tiflis, has created a race problem at a particularly delicate spot for the Georgians. The common link of Russian denationalizing policy was probably in the main only negative.

6. *Armenians and Russia.*—As a result of the Russo-Persian wars of the first quarter of the 19th Century, most of the Armenians in Trans-Caucasia were under Russian rule by 1830; the Armenian population in the districts of Kars, Ardahan and Batum were gained from Turkey in 1878. Previous to the 19th Century Russia had no important connections with the Armenians. For the greater part of the century they were treated well, *i.e.*, left very much to themselves with the advantage of being able to rely on the support of the Russian frontier forces. They were valuable to the Government as a barrier against the Turks, and their relatively prosperous and stable condition induced considerable emigration from the Turkish provinces. But in the early eighties there was a change in Russian policy, due to the removal, or abatement, of fears from the side of Turkey consequent on the war of 1877-1878, and to the "reaction" that followed the murder of Alexander II. in 1881. The schemes of Loris Melikov (himself of Armenian origin) for an Armenian State to include the Armenians of Trans-Caucasia and Armenia under the supremacy of Russia fell to the ground, and the Armenians felt the full weight of governmental and bureaucratic pressure. The attempts to Russianise them, particularly by inducing them to enter the Orthodox Church, have quite failed; the number of Russians living amongst the Armenians is almost entirely confined to officials and soldiers and the two peoples have never really come into contact. The result of Russian policy towards the Armenians, both in the Russian and Turkish Empires, was to cause a gravitation of hopes and political energies to Constantinople; immediately before the war, despite the Turkish massacres and the ruin of the hopes aroused by the Young Turk revolution, many of the Armenian leaders (the Dashnakist Party) still considered that more could be done from the side of Turkey than from contact with the Russian Government. The fatal bar of different Churches and the fact that the Armenians have never had an opportunity of learning or appreciating the qualities of the Russian peasantry have resulted in little influence being exercised by either side. Russia stood for a "strong government," but the advantages of this, curtailed by the corollary of moral and spiritual bondage, appear to have inclined the Armenians, with perpetual oscillations, to prefer the laxness of the Turkish State even at the price of bodily danger. The revolution, in so far as it has replaced a bureaucratic autocracy by a system of Socialist Soviets, does not seem likely to find a real echo among the Armenian peasantry, the driving force of whose political consciousness is controlled by the ecclesiastical hierarchy and to a less extent by the leaders of the Dispersion; the activities of the Heutchakist (Social Democratic) Party, before the war confined to Turkish Armenia, seem to have been influential chiefly in Armenian colonies rather than in the nucleus of the race.

During the war the Russian treatment of Turkish Armenians was not of a character to inspire friendly feelings; the main features were excessively strict military control, importation of Russian labour battalions, support of the Kurds, schemes for settling Cossacks on Armenian lands, and the demand that Armenians must produce written evidence as to the ownership of their land.

7. *Armenians and Persia.*—Throughout history Armenia has figured as the passage-way for peoples moving or raiding from the East, and as the combat-ground between the various Empires of Persia and the Roman, Byzantine, Seljuk and Ottoman

(6583-16)

Empires. In consequence, Armenia has frequently been under the rule of Persia. The two races are considered by some ethnologists to belong to the same Iranian group, and the language, and to a lesser extent some of the customs, of the Armenians show Persian influence. But there is no evidence that the Armenians in any numbers were ever settled in Persia or *vice versa*, and connection between them seems never to have been really close. The conversion of the Persians to Mohammedanism served to weaken such slender links as existed between the two nations; the settlement of Azerbaijan by Tartars, mainly due to Selim I. in the 16th century, created a wedge between them; finally the more and more persistent Turkish control under the later Ottomans over the Van—Ararat region and the Russian conquest of Trans-Caucasia, removed even Persian rule over any considerable number of Armenians.

8. *Armenians and Tartars.*—The position of the Tartars in Azerbaijan, South-East Trans-Caucasia and the Baku district is important as cutting off the Armenians from the Caspian Sea. Prior to the Tartar settlements, various other Turkish-speaking races seem to have occupied these districts, and the Armenians have at no time attempted to control the Caspian as an outlet to Russia and Central Asia. The rise of the oil industry around Baku in the last century has caused the immigration of a considerable number of Armenians to the town and district, but they are only the usual Armenian urban colonies of commercial, financial and industrial interests; they in no sense represent any real north-westward extension of the Armenians of Erivan. At Baku economic and social difficulties, inflamed by the nascent Tartar *intelligenzia*,\* gave rise to serious massacres in 1905; these may have been fortuitous and exceptional, but relations are certainly bad. This is all the more important as any movement of Tartar nationalism or of strong hostility to the Armenians is more likely to be started in Baku than in those districts where the two races are intermingled in greater numbers, e.g., around Elizabetopol and Shusha. In Persian Azerbaijan, the Armenians are so few that no real Armeno-Tartar problem arises.

## APPENDIX I.

### STATISTICS AS TO ARMENIANS.

#### (i.) IN THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE.

The Russian Official Census for 1897 is admitted by authorities to be as impartial and correct as can be possible in so large an Empire with such great difficulties of topography, migration and ignorance. There seems to have been no intentional misrepresentation in the figures for the different nationalities, either in the Caucasus or elsewhere. The 1897 Census is therefore taken by all subsequent experts as the basis for their investigations. But for the Armenians there are also available the statistics collected by the highly perfected organization of the Gregorian Church and those of various missions; these figures probably represent an over-estimate.

The numbers of the three chief races in Trans-Caucasia immediately prior to the war were approximately as follows:—

Armenians	.. .. .	about 1,500,000
Georgians	.. .. .	„ 2,000,000
Tartars and Turkish-speaking peoples	„	2,000,000

A very considerable migration of Armenians from Turkey into Russian Caucasus took place in the last 75 years, notably in 1830, in 1839, at the time of the Russo-Turkish war of 1877–1878, and after the massacres of the nineties. A certain proportion of the emigrants, especially since 1880, were, however, only temporary. The Armenians are now chiefly concentrated in the provinces of Tiflis, Elizabetopol, Erivan and Kars. Tiflis city itself has an enormous colony (over 150,000 out of a total population of about 300,000), though it is historically and sentimentally the Georgian capital. The region of Baku and Shemakha also has a considerable number, the town of Baku itself having about 60,000 out of a total population of about 250,000. The following is their distribution according to the census of 1897:—

Province of Tiflis	.. .. .	196,286	19 per cent.	..	Georgians, 43 per cent. ; Tartars, 10 per cent.
„ Elizabetopol	.. .. .	292,188	38	„	Tartars, 61
„ Erivan	.. .. .	441,000	53	„	„ 38
„ Kars	.. .. .	73,466	25	„	„ Kurds, 14
„ Baku	.. .. .	52,233	6	„	„ Tartars, 59
„ Kutais	.. .. .	5,385	5	„	„ Georgians, 69

\* It should be noted, however, that this *intelligenzia* is very small and that the Tartars are extremely illiterate, (probably over 80 per cent.).

**The Armenian Report of British War Office, General Staff:  
"Historical and Ethnological Notes on the Armenians" (5th April 1918)**

Armenians are to be found in trade and business in all the towns of Trans-Caucasia, and they have increased to over 250,000 in the province of Tiflis, chiefly in the city of that name and in the upper Kur valley, but their real centre is in the country watered by the Arpa Chai ("the grain river") and the left bank tributaries of the Araxes as far south-east as Ordubad. From the headquarters of the Arpa Chai they have spread over into the upper valley of the Kur and are numerous round Akhalkalaki: all down the Arpa Chai they form a compact mass, with the ruins of their ancient cities dotted along its course; as also in the Araxes Valley from Kagyzman to Erivan, and in the town and district of Novo-Bayazet on the west shores of Lake Sevan. They also outnumber the Tartars in the districts of Shusha and Zangezur (*i.e.*, between the Araxes and Lake Sevan). The vast majority of the Armenians in Trans-Caucasia are Gregorians; the Roman Catholics are estimated at about 30,000 and the Protestants at 1,500.\*

The number of Armenians in the rest of Russia is small and scattered (about 200,000); their chief colonies are in Astrakhan, Moscow, Petrograd, Bessarabia, near Rostov-on-Don and in the Black Sea Province. Though most of them are newly established in commerce, &c., some, *e.g.*, at Astrakhan, emigrated before the Russian conquest of the Caucasus. They are almost entirely engaged in commerce or industry and are wealthy.

(ii.) IN THE TURKISH EMPIRE.

Turkish official figures are based on taxation registers and recruiting rolls; consequently they usually tend to underestimate the population, as females are not directly included and the desire to escape taxation and military service is universal. There is the additional difficulty of attempting to estimate nomad or migratory tribes. In the case of the Armenians there has also been flagrant misrepresentation. Armenian ecclesiastical figures, though usually exaggerated, supply a useful maximum figure. The most reliable statistics, those of Guinet and Lynch, date from the middle nineties; figures drawn up by the Armenian Patriarch at Constantinople in 1912 differ by as much as 500,000, an increase impossible even for the prolific Armenians. The 1915 massacres are said officially to account for about 600,000 persons. In the light of previous massacres it is difficult to believe that this figure is correct. Further, about 600,000 are said to have been deported, of whom a considerable number have died; this figure again will probably prove erroneous, unless are included the refugees into Trans-Caucasia. At the close of 1915 there were estimated to be about 200,000 of these.† Whatever the truth may be, there can be no doubt that enormous alterations and reductions among the Armenians in Turkey have taken place.

The following is a rough estimate, which may be regarded as a minimum, of the number of Armenians in the Turkish Empire in 1914, together with the percentages in the six Armenian *vilayets* of Erzerum, Van, Bitlis, Mamuret-ul-Aziz (Kharput), Diarbekr and Sivas:—‡

In the city of Constantinople .. .. .	200,000
In the six "Armenian vilayets" .. .. .	900,000
In Zeitun .. .. .	200,000
In rest of Turkish Empire .. .. .	300,000
Total .. .. .	1,600,000

*Vilayet of Erzerum.*—Here the Armenian percentage was about 25 per cent., the remainder being mainly Turkish, with about 20 per cent. Kurds. In the town of Erzerum the Turks were preponderant, with a strong Armenian element of perhaps 30 per cent.

*Vilayet of Van.*—The town had an Armenian majority over Turks and Kurds taken separately, but perhaps not over the two combined; the *sanjak* of rather over 50 per cent. The Kurds came next with 20 per cent. The rest of the *vilayet*, comprising the wild and inaccessible Hakkhari, was almost exclusively peopled by Kurds and Nestorians: the great majority of these latter have either been massacred during the war or have fled across the Persian border and into Trans-Caucasia, where a large number are reported to have died from disease.

*Vilayet of Bitlis.*—Here the Armenians formed about 40 per cent. of the population, with the remainder Moslems, mainly Kurds; the Turks formed a feeble minority. In the town and *kaza* of Mush the Armenians were preponderant, over 60 per cent.; in no other district of any size were they more numerous than the Moslems combined.

*Vilayet of Mamuret-ul-Aziz (Kharput).*—In the whole *vilayet* the Armenians (about 15 per cent.) were heavily outnumbered by the Moslems (about 80 per cent.); but they formed a strong minority (40 per cent.) in the *sanjak* of Kharput, and they were in a majority over the Kurds, who took second place, and over the Turks, chiefly in the town itself, taken separately. In the *sanjak* of Dersim, a westerly counterpart to the Hakkhari, Kurds of various kinds largely predominated, as also in that of Malatia, the south of which, even by Armenian ecclesiastical figures, was excluded from the true Armenian area.

*Vilayet of Diarbekr.*—Here there is great division of opinion, but the south of the *vilayet* was admittedly Kurd, though there was an important Armenian colony at Mardin. For the whole *vilayet* they probably represented about 25 per cent., and the Kurds about 35 per cent. The Turks were again in a great minority. The Armenians were most numerous in the extreme northward *Paşa*, and round *Farkin*.

*Vilayet of Sivas.*—The great majority of the population was Turkish and Turkoman; the Kurds were numerous chiefly in the eastern and south-eastern districts, the Circassians in the south in the *Uzun Jailu*. There were a number of Greeks in the north and north-west towns. The Armenians were scattered everywhere, chiefly in the towns round Sivas and in the eastern districts; they probably constituted about 16 per cent. of the total population: they were most numerous in the north-east in the *kaza* of Kurahissar (about 25 per cent.).

*In rest of Turkish Empire.*—The Armenians were to be found in commerce and finance in most of the towns. Their principal colonies were, apart from Constantinople, at Brusa, Ismid, Trebizond, Samsun, Smyrna, Baghdad, Mosul, Jerusalem, Adana, Killis, Urfa, Aintab and Marash. Including Constantinople, these urban

\* 1913 figures from German Orient Mission.

† The total population of Armenians allowed for by the editor of the Blue Book on the 1915 massacres in Turkey is about 1,800,000.

‡ In the following percentages by *vilayets* considerable use has been made of a memorandum of January, 1918, on the population of Turkish Armenia, prepared by the Naval Staff, Intelligence Division.

colonies probably totalled about 450,000. There was also a large and sturdy peasant community on the southern slopes of the Taurus, in the *sanjak* of Kosan (Sis) and in the neighbouring corner of the *vilayet* of Aleppo, around Zeitun and Andarin, comprising probably about 200,000 persons. These were the remnants of the ancient Kingdom of Lesser Armenia, and originally emigrated from the Armenian plateau in the 11th Century, owing to the pressure of the Seljuks and the offers of the Byzantine Emperors: their survival was chiefly due to their natural bravery and to the inaccessibility of the district.

(iii.) IN OTHER PARTS OF THE WORLD.

Besides their many colonies throughout the Turkish Empire, there are important communities of Armenians at Cairo, Alexandria, Singapore, Calcutta, Bucharest, in Switzerland, at London, Manchester, Paris and in the United States. Their wealth, education and ability renders them particularly important, as in the event of the reconstitution of some form of an independent Armenia, their ranks might be utilized for recruiting administrators and leaders. Their number may be put at 250,000.

In addition, there were in Persia between 50,000 and 100,000 Armenians, mostly in Azerbaijan, though there was a small colony at Ispahan (as at Julfa) established by Shah Abbas the Great in 1604.

(iv.) GRAND TOTAL.

The following approximate figures may be given for the total number of Armenians in 1914:—

In the Russian Empire .. .. .	1,700,000
In the Turkish Empire .. .. .	1,600,000
In the rest of the world .. .. .	350,000
Grand total .. .. .	<u>3,650,000</u>

*Note.*—Official figures of the *Katholikos of Echmiadzin* just prior to the war—

Armenians in the Caucasus .. .. .	1,636,486
Armenians in rest of Russia .. .. .	about 400,000

Official figures of *Patriarch at Constantinople*, 1912—

Armenians in Turkey .. .. .	about 2,100,000
-----------------------------	-----------------

*Turkish* official figures just prior to the war—

Armenians in Turkey .. .. .	about 1,100,000
-----------------------------	-----------------

STATISTICS OF ARMENIANS IN THE SIX *Vilayets*.

(From Russian Orange Book, 1915.)

<i>Vilayets.</i>	<i>Sanjaks.</i>	Armenian Patriarch, 1881.		Lynch.		Turkish Ministry of Justice, 1890.		Cuinet, 1892.	
		Armenians.	Mohamme- dans.	Armenians.	Mohamme- dans.	Armenians.	Mohamme- dans.	Armenians.	Mohamme- dans.
Erzerum .. .. .	.. .. .	136,147	195,067	*106,768	*428,495	109,819	441,671	134,967	500,782
Sivas .. .. .	.. .. .	243,515	605,610	.. .. .	.. .. .	118,085	735,489	170,433	839,514
Diarbekr .. .. .	.. .. .	.. .. .	.. .. .	.. .. .	.. .. .	55,614	240,374	79,129	328,644
Mamuret-ul-Aziz.	.. .. .	107,059	169,364	(1890)	(1890)	80,511	300,194	69,718	504,946
	Kharput	.. .. .	.. .. .	85,000	120,000	.. .. .	.. .. .	.. .. .	.. .. .
	Dersim	.. .. .	.. .. .	8,000	62,000	.. .. .	.. .. .	.. .. .	.. .. .
Bitlis .. .. .	.. .. .	130,460	21,121	†97,184	†145,454	107,804	167,054	131,390	254,000
Van .. .. .	.. .. .	133,559	113,586	.. .. .	.. .. .	71,582	282,582	79,998	241,000
	Van .. .. .	.. .. .	.. .. .	75,644	52,229	.. .. .	.. .. .	.. .. .	.. .. .
Total .. .. .	.. .. .	751,041	1,104,748	372,596	808,178	543,515	2,167,564	665,625	2,668,886
		(Excluding <i>vilayet</i> of Diarbekr).		(Only <i>vilayets</i> of Erzerum and Bitlis and <i>sanjaks</i> of Kharput, Dersim and Van).					

\* From Turkish official figures, 1887.

† From Turkish official figures, 1893.

**The Armenian Report of British War Office, General Staff:  
"Historical and Ethnological Notes on the Armenians" (5th April 1918)**

9

Vilayets.	Sanjaks.	Ormanian, 1910.		Russian Consul-General at Erzerum, 1912.		Armenian Patri-arch, 1913.		Maevsky, 1899. (By houses: counts 8 for a house.)		Russian Vice-Consul Olpherev, 1912.	
		Armenians.	Mohammedans.	Armenians.	Mohammedans.	Armenians.	Mohammedans.	Armenians.	Mohammedans.	Armenians.	Mohammedans.
Erzerum	..	203,400	..	200,000	550,000	215,000	370,000	..	..	..	..
	Erzerum	152,500	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Erzingan	35,700	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Bayazid	15,200	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sivas ..	..	163,200	..	..	..	1165,000	1287,000	..	..	..	..
	Sivas ..	86,000	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Tokat ..	23,500	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Amasia ..	28,500	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Karahis-sar.	25,200	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Diarbekr	..	81,700	..	..	..	§ 105,000	§ 127,000	..	..	..	..
	Diarbekr and Mardin.	*47,000	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Arga	*6,700	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Severek	*50,700	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Mamuret-ul-Aziz.	..	131,200	..	..	..	168,000	277,000	..	..	..	..
	Kharput	80,700	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Dersim ..	27,500	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Malatia ..	23,000	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Bitlis ..	..	196,000	..	† 150,000	† 497,000	180,000	162,000	186,608	277,320	180,000	280,000
	Bitlis ..	76,500	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Mush and Gendj.	94,000	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Sairt ..	25,500	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Van ..	..	192,200	..	..	..	..	..	109,880	234,864	120,000	240,000
	Van ..	182,200	..	..	..	185,000	147,000	..	..	..	..
	Hakkiari	10,000	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Total ..	..	967,700	..	350,000	1,047,000	1,018,000	1,178,000	296,488	522,134	300,000	520,000
				(Vilayets of Erzerum and Van only).		(Excluding south of Malatia, north-west of Sivas vilayet, Bisherek and Hakkiari).		(Vilayets of Bitlis and Van only).		(Vilayets of Bitlis and Van only).	

\* Adds up to 104,000.

† Figures supplied by Russian Consul at Bitlis.

‡ Excluding north-west part of vilayet.

§ Excluding Bisherek.

|| Excluding southern part of Malatia.

APPENDIX II.

ARMENIANS AS AFFECTED BY THE BREST-LITOVSK TREATY.

By the Brest-Litovsk Treaty of the 3rd March, 1918, ratified subsequently by the Moscow Congress and by Petrov at Berlin, Turkey was given back the territory acquired by Russia after the war of 1877-78. Article IV. runs:—"The districts of Ardahan, Kars and Batum shall . . . without delay be evacuated by Russian troops. Russia shall not interfere with the reorganization of the constitutional and international conditions of these districts, but shall leave it to the population of these districts to carry out the reorganization in agreement with the neighbouring States, particularly Turkey." (German version, as published in the *Times* of the 6th March.) The district of Batum belongs to the old Russian Government of Kutais, the districts of Kars and Ardahan to that of Kars. The Armenians are probably slightly outnumbered by Turkish-speaking peoples in the whole of this ceded area, but in the east and south-east of the Government of Kars they form a compact and strong majority, principally in the rich lands near the Araxes and the Arpa Chal; they also extend to the upper valleys of the Kura, but there is only a sprinkling of them in the district of Batum.

DISTRICT OF BATUM.

Total population. 1914, approximate, from Russian Year-book . . . 172,000  
 (Town of Batum.. .. . . . 30,000)  
 Turks. 1897. Based on Russian Official Census approximately . . . 40,000

Majority of population in 1914 was Georgian (mainly Mohammedan). A considerable number of Greeks are found in the towns; the Armenians probably did not number not more than 5,000 or 6,000 in 1914.

GOVERNMENT OF KARS.

1897. Russian Official Census:—

Total population	.. .. .	292,498	
Armenians	.. .. .	78,406.	25 per cent.
*Turks	.. .. .	68,547.	21 "
Kurds	.. .. .	42,968.	15 "
Greeks	.. .. .	32,593.	11 "
Russians	.. .. .	27,856.	9 "

1914. Approximate, from Russian Year-book—

Total population .. .. . 389,000

The increase of Armenians would be proportionately greater than that of other nationalities, except perhaps than that of the Greeks.

DISTRICT OF BATUM AND GOVERNMENT OF KARS.

1914. Approximate estimate—

Armenians	.. .. .	120,000
Georgians	.. .. .	110,000
Turkish-speaking peoples	.. .. .	140,000
Kurds	.. .. .	50,000

*Note.*—The term "Turks" probably implies only ethnological, linguistic and religious kinship with the Osmanli Turks of Anatolia.

\* The census in addition gave 8,442 Turkomans and 2,347 Tartars.

GENERAL STAFF,  
 WAR OFFICE,  
 5th April, 1918.



## EVALUATION AND CONCLUSION

As far as it can be understood from the note written down on the file cover, the report was described by British historian Arnold J. Toynbee<sup>18</sup> as being "a useful historical summary and valuable statistics about Armenians penned in a non-partisan manner", and that it had been prepared in the last year of World War I. In comparison to other British politically motivated reports gathered about Armenians and Turkish-Armenian relations, especially the letterheads and propaganda related works of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, the report prepared by the General Staff was noticeably more neutral in its character. This was especially apparent in the comparative statistic data on population and the historical narrative given about the Armenians. Despite this, the report contained the "Christian victimhood" theme in Turkish-Armenian relations and the statements of "massacres" carried out in Turkey. In this respect, the report contained no data that would change perception of the Christian world in general, and that of Britain in specific.<sup>19</sup>

Containing population statistics about pre-war Caucasus and Eastern Anatolia, the report was written in period of British-Armenian military alliance and intensified rhetoric about independent Armenia. It was organized under eight main headings and concluded with an appendix at the last section.

The purpose of the report was to put forth a set of data that could be evaluated by providing a summary of the historical and ethnological foundation of the Armenian question.<sup>20</sup> The first two sections were elaborated under "Independent Armenia" and "Geographic Distribution" headings, and highlighted certain passages about pre-Ottoman Armenian history. The fact that Ottoman Turks had possessed Eastern Anatolia since 1514 and that the last independent Armenian formation had ceased to exist by the last quarter of the 11<sup>th</sup> century were the parts underlined in these sections. Having been a

---

18 Not only was Arnold Toynbee a famous historian, but he was also an important member of the propaganda bureau Wellington House of the British War Office and Political Intelligence Service during World War I. In his work "Armenian Atrocities, The Murder of a Nation" - based on American Committee Reports, Armenian émigrés and publishers - he described the precautions taken by the Ottoman State against the Armenian insurrections in 1915 as the "annihilation of all of the Christian population. (Arnold J., Toynbee, *Armenian Atrocities, The Murder of a Nation*, London, New York, Toronto, 1915, p. 27). In addition to this he, along with Lord Bryce, prepared the propaganda book known as the Blue Book, and with his work during World War I he used Turkish-Armenian relations as a tool for war propaganda. (*Treatment of Armenians of Ottoman Empire*, pp. XVI-XVII). Later on he would make evaluations that resembled a confession of his propaganda work (Arnold J. Toynbee, *The Western Question in Greece and Turkey, A Study in the Contact of Civilisations*, London, Bombay, Sydney, 1922, p. 50).

19 In memorandum submitted by Toynbee to British Foreign and Commonwealth Office on October 3, 1918 after the Armistice of Montrose, some information regarding the history of the Six Provinces was given in conjunction with a mentioning of four great Armenian massacres carried out in Turkey. According to Toynbee the first massacre was carried out in the 1893-96 years, the second in 1909, the third in 1912 and the last one in 1915. Such statements in general actually demonstrated the perspective of the Christian world that was equipped with one-sided sources of information. (TNA. PRO. FO. 371/3448/166382, "War Office Draft Conditions of Armistice With Turkey", memorandum by A. Toynbee, 3.10.1918).

20 "Historical and Ethnological Notes on the Armenians", General Staff, War Office, 5th April, 1918, p. 1.

buffer between Eastern and Western empires, the Armenians were not subject to much Roman influence due to the region's geographic structure and due to their superficial ties to the Roman Empire. Furthermore, due geographic difficulties no empire was able to fully bring the Armenians under its control.

The report indicated that the Armenians converted to Christianity in 300 A.D., and that their final separation from the Roman Church in the 5<sup>th</sup> century isolated them from European influence. According to the report, the most noticeable attribute of Armenian nationalism was that its aspirations and traditions were rooted in the Gregorian Church.<sup>21</sup> This situation had a negative impact on Armenians' relations with Byzantium and Rome, and thus left the Armenians by themselves in their struggle against Islamic forces.<sup>22</sup> Another point mentioned in the report was the treatment of the Armenians by the Byzantine emperors. According to the report, Emperor Basil II had in 1021 transferred the Van "dynasty" to Sivas, and Michael IV had transferred Bagratid Dynasty<sup>23</sup> in the middle of the Aras and Arpa Creeks valley to Cilicia. The importance of the Bagratid Kingdom was that it represented for the Armenians a period of national power and heroism. With the entrance of the Seljuks into the region, the region's system with a feudal like regime experienced important changes, which caused an Armenian movement to begin towards the West and the Southwest.<sup>24</sup>

The "Geographic Distribution" heading of the report in general defined the borders of the high plateau (Eastern Anatolia) that was considered to be the true homeland of the Armenians. The report, just like all the other British

21 Since they lacked a political organization (the state) through which they could express, preserve and develop their national identity, the Armenians protected their national existence by devoting themselves to Christianity. It was for this reason that religion and its representative the Armenian Church became the vanguard of Armenian political identity. The "Catholicos" title of the Armenian religious leaders meant "the representative of the people" (Erol Kürkçüoğlu, *Roma'dan Selçuklu İdaresine Ermeniler*, Erzurum, 2005, p. 34. For information about the Armenian's conversion to Christianity and Christianity's effect on the Armenians, please see pages 28 and 37 of the same work).

22 During this period the Armenians had become targets of Eastern Romans just as much as that of the Persians. Until the period of Turkish incursions into Anatolia, the Armenians were stuck between Persian, Eastern Roman-Byzantine and Islamic-Arabic forces. By the time Turks were beginning to dominate Anatolia in 11th century, the Armenians were on the brink of being destroyed as a result of the orthodoxation and greekification policies of Byzantine (Davut Kılıç, *Osmanlı Ermenileri Arasında Dini ve Siyasi Mücadeleler*, Ankara, 2006, pp. IX,X).

23 There is both error and inconsistency in the dates given for the establishment and the collapse of the Bagratid Dynasty. The Bagratid Dynasty which ruled between 885-1045 (Esat Uras, age, pp. 74, 76.) was cited as having ruled between (886-1041) in one instance, and (846-1045) in another instance.

24 Prior to the entry of the Seljuks to Anatolia, there were two Armenian principalities in Eastern Anatolia that were tied to the Byzantine Empire. One of them was the Bagrat Dynasty (Ani Principality), the other was the Vaspuragan Principality east of the Lake Van. Having previously been a part of the Abbasids, these two principalities came under Byzantine domination in the 10th century. After the incursions by the Turks began, the Vaspuragan Prince came to an agreement with the Byzantine Emperor, abandoned Van to Byzantine and took a large part of his people from Van to the Sivas region in 1021. In this way the Armenian principality in Van came to an end. Having invaded Van, the Byzantine Empire settled some of the Armenians in the region to Inner Anatolia, and some to Urfa. The Ani Kingdom, having still been subject to the Byzantine Empire during this time, was put an end to by Byzantine again in 1045. Meanwhile the cities of Kars and Ani would come under Turkish dominance in 1064 (Ali Güler, Suat Akgül, *Sorum Olan Ermeniler*, Ankara, 2003, pp. 7-8). For reference to Seljuk-Armenian relations, please see; Mehmet Ersan, *Selçuklular Zamanında Anadolu'da Ermeniler*, Ankara, 2007; Ali Sevim, *Genel Çizgileriyle Selçuklu-Ermeni İlişkileri*, Ankara, 1983; M. Altay Köymen, *Selçuklu Devri Türk Tarihi*, Ankara, 1989; Erol Kürkçüoğlu, *Roma'dan Selçuklu İdaresine Ermeniler*, Erzurum, 2005.

**The Armenian Report of British War Office, General Staff:  
"Historical and Ethnological Notes on the Armenians" (5th April 1918)**

documents, used Armenia as a geographic term that defined Eastern Anatolia, and, this understanding was underlined in the report. On a related note, another point emphasized was that the region mentioned as Armenia was not in its entirety the true homeland of the Armenians.<sup>25</sup> At the same time, the report indicated that Van was more prominent as the national center than Ani, and that the main feature of the distribution of Armenians in the region was their position as a minority. The geographic distribution of Armenians resulted in significant social, physical but also denominational differentiation. In other words, Armenians of Tbilisi, Muş and Istanbul were different from one another; and there were certain divergences between Protestant, Catholic and Gregorian Armenians due to disagreements and infighting.<sup>26</sup>

The report's "*Armenians and Turks*" heading in general presents a summary of primarily the Ottoman period, with the main theme being the "Millet System"<sup>27</sup> and repercussions of this system for the Armenians. Accordingly,

25 "Historical and Ethnological Notes on the Armenians", *General Staff, War Office*, 5th April, 1918, p. 2. In British documents and also in western literature "Armenia" is used to describe a geographic region. A region in the south of Caucasus is mentioned as "Armenia of Russia," while Eastern Anatolia is mentioned as "Armenia of Turkey" or "Western Armenia.". "United" or "Great Armenia" meanwhile is term that encompasses the regions of Eastern Anatolia and Cilicia (Başak, *ibid.*, p. 266). Prof. Jean Laurent's words regarding Armenia emphasize that it is primarily a geographic term: "In reality, since the beginning of written history this country that is being defined has not been a state but a geographic term. There is no doubt that Armenians have lived in this region... But just because this region carries the name Armenia in no way means that it can be associated to Armenian destiny or to a state that carries the name Armenia." (Erdal İltter, "Ermenistan Adı, Ermenilerin Menşei ve Türk-Ermeni İlişkileri Konusunda Tespitler", *Dünden Bugüne Türk-Ermeni İlişkileri*, ed. İdris Bal, Mustafa Çufalı, Ankara, 2003, pp. 3-4). For some studies on the prehistoric period of the region referred to as Armenia, please see; Yıldız Deveci Bozkuş, *Sultan Deniz Küçükler, Armenia, Ermeniler ve Armenia Bölgesinin Eskiçağ Tarihi*, Ankara, 2011; Esat Uras, *Tarihte Ermeniler ve Ermeni Meselesi*, İstanbul, 1987; Sadı Kocaş, *Tarih Boyunca Ermeniler ve Türk-Ermeni İlişkileri*, Ankara, 1967; Şemseddin Günlaltay, *Yakın Şark IV. Romalılar Zamanında Kapadokya, Pont ve Artaksiad Krallıkları*, Ankara, 1951; René Grousset, *Başlangıcından 1071'e Ermenilerin Tarihi*, İstanbul, 2005; George A. Bournoutian, *A Concise History of the Armenian People*, USA, 2002; A. E. Redgate, *The Peoples of Europe The Armenians*, USA, 1998; Kevork Aslan, *Armenia and the Armenians*, New York, 2005; Razmik Panossian, *The Armenians: From Kings and Priests to Merchants and Commissars*, New York, 2006; Robert W. Thomson, Mouses, *Khorenatzi's History of Armenia*, England, 1980; İnyetullah Cemal Özkaya, *Le Peuple Arménien et les Tentatives de Reduire le Peuple Turc en Servitude*, İstanbul, 1971; V. De Saint Martin, *Mémoires Historique et Géographiques sur l'Arménie*, Paris, 1818; Frédéric Macler, *La Nation, Arménienne, Son Passé, ses Malheurs*, Paris, 1923; David Marshall Lang, *Armenia, Cradle of Civilisation*, London, 1980; N. Adontz, *Histoire des Arménie: Les Origines (du X au VI s. av. J.C.)*, Paris, 1946; C. A. Burney, David Marshall Lang, *The Peoples of the Hills: Ancient Ararat and Caucasus*, London, 1971.

26 "Historical and Ethnological Notes on the Armenians", *General Staff, War Office*, 5th April, 1918, p.3. For this subject, please see; Davut Kılıç, *Osmanlı Ermenileri Arasında Dini ve Siyasi Mücadeleler*, Ankara, 2006.

27 The Ottoman State was being governed by Islamic law called "şariat" (sharia), rulers' biddings called "kanun" (law), and customs called "örf". In accordance with these rules non-Muslims were protected and were able continue their community lives on the condition that they accepted Islamic laws. The manner in which communities administered themselves under the Millet System gave the Ottoman State a multi-ethnic and multi-cultural character. Until recently this opportunity was not given to Muslims living in lands captured by Christians (Andrew Mango, *Atatürk, Modern Türkiye'nin Kurucusu*, Turkish translation: Füsün Doruker, İstanbul, 2006, pp. 22-23). The following studies can be referred to for Ottoman-Armenian relations and the Millet System: Salahi Sonyel, "Hristiyan Azınlıklar ve Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Son Dönemi", *Yeni Türkiye, Ermeni Sorunu Özel Sayısı*, II (Mart-Nisan 2001), Ankara, pp. 687-692; Cevdet Küçük, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Millet Sistemi", *Ermeni Sorunu Özel Sayısı*, II (Mart-Nisan 2001), Ankara, pp. 692-702; Benjamin Braude, "Millet Sistemi'nin İlginc Tarihi", *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Ermeni Sorunu*, Ankara, 2000, pp. 131-145; Yuluğ Tekin Kurat, "Çok Milletli Bir Ulus Olarak Osmanlı İmparatorluğu", *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Ermeni Sorunu*, Ankara, 2000, pp. 163-171; Salahi Sonyel, *The Ottoman Armenians, Victims of Great Power Diplomacy*, London, 1987; Yavuz Ercan, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Müslüman Olmayan Topuluklar (Millet Sistemi)", *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Ermeni Sorunu*, Ankara, 2000, pp. 45-163; İdris Bal, Mustafa Çufalı, *Dünden Bugüne Türk-Ermeni İlişkileri*, Ankara, 2003, pp. 76-110; Gülnihal Bozkurt, *Alman İngiliz Belgelerinin ve Siyasi Gelişmelerin Işığında Altında Gayrimüslüm Osmanlı Vatandaşlarının Hukuki Durumu (1839-1914)*, Ankara, 1989; H. Gibb, H. Bowen, *Islamic Society and the West, V.I., Part II*, Oxford, 1969.

the Armenians, being the Christian element throughout the Ottoman Empire, were for legal issues (mostly concerning religious and national affairs) organized as “millets” under religious leaders. Armenians, like other Christians in Turkey, were provided with an environment of religious tolerance. This system bolstered the influence of the Armenian Church, provided the Armenians autonomy in religious and educational affairs, and encouraged a strong sense of community and initiative in Armenians that would later on turn into national consciousness. Identifying the revolutionary ideas in Europe and the example of Balkan states as a model, the Armenians came to be noticed more and more as being “supporters of violent acts” in effort to gain autonomy and even independence.<sup>28</sup> The disappointment experienced in 1878 would encourage Armenians to become more aggressive, and the rivalry and indecisiveness of the European states adversely affected their condition. The last remarks of the report about Ottoman-Armenian relations had a character that summarized the viewpoint of the British General Staff. The outbreak of Armenian nationalism, alongside the “tyranny and cruelty” of the police and central government,

*Religious differences played a minor role in the hostilities between the two, and the Ottoman policy had favored the Kurds in the form of maintaining a feudal authority over the Armenians.*

created an atmosphere of distrust and suspicion between the two communities. As of 1918, the focus of Turkish-Armenian issue was whether or not the Armenians in Turkey would remain under Turkish rule.

The next section of the report that is entitled as “Armenians and Kurds” started with the emphasis that the relations between the two societies had not been particularly bad. Nonetheless, the Kurds, who possessed nomadic and semi-nomadic rural elements, and the Armenians, the agricultural cultivators of the plains, conflicted against each other. Religious differences played a minor role in the hostilities between the two, and the Ottoman policy had favored the Kurds in the form of maintaining a feudal authority over the Armenians. Towards the end of 19<sup>th</sup> century, the interest of the European states in the Armenians had a negative effect on the Kurds. Kurdish-Armenian relations were fatally aggravated by Abdulhamid II’s policy of setting the Kurds against the Armenians. The British General’s expressions, thereafter, shows traces of

28 These expressions used in the report had a character that exposed the true nature of the Armenian question, which would be carried onto international platforms under different guises and justifications starting from the end of the 19th century. In fact, the Armenian question was different from the Serbian, Greek, and Bulgarian nationalist movements aimed at seceding from the Ottoman State; to which the Armenian question was being likened to by certain circles. The main particulars of the Armenian question were that the Armenians were not settled enough in any specific region of the Ottoman Empire to constitute a majority, that they were therefore far from fulfilling the condition necessary to transform into a nation-state; that as such their uprising changed from a people’s rebellion against imperial rule into inter-communal fighting, and which intensified during a time when the Ottoman Empire was about to wage a war against foreign powers (Stefanos Yerasimos, *I. Dünya Savaşı ve Ermeni Sorunu*, Ankara, 2002, p. 3).

the propaganda efforts accompanied by chronicled prejudices. After 1908, even though the CUP attempted to mend matters, they could not undo the fatal mistake of supplying arms to the Kurds. Since the First World War, they returned to the policies of Abdulhamid and outdid him in their successful efforts to exterminate the Armenians. Nonetheless, during the "1915 massacres", the Kurds, especially those from Dersim and Aleppo *vilayets*, showed themselves friendly to the Armenians.<sup>29</sup>

The following section, examining the two important Christian groups in Trans-Caucasia and North-East Asia Minor, "Armenians and Georgians", denoted that these two groups did not have much in common related to their temperaments and characteristics, nor to their literary or cultural development.<sup>30</sup> It was mentioned that the Byzantine Emperors had utilized Georgia and Armenia as barriers against the succession of Turkish-Azeri peoples that swept in from the east and northeast and against the Arab encroachments of the Caliphs. It was also noted that the only common link between the Armenians and the Georgians was the Russian policy.

The report next summarized the Russia's policy towards Armenia in historical context in the section entitled as "Armenians and Russia". The section noted that the Armenians had been valuable to Russia as they were seen as a barrier against the Turks. Relatively wealthy and stable condition of the Russian Armenians encouraged significant emigration from Turkey. Nonetheless, in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, the Russian policy towards the Armenians changed; Loris Melikov's plans for an Armenian state with the inclusion of Armenians of Trans-Caucasia and Armenia under the supremacy of Russia collapsed. With these developments, Armenians felt significant pressure and the two peoples (Russians and Armenians) never really interacted. The report went on to note that the Russian policy towards Armenians had been "to cause a gravitation of hopes and political energies" to Istanbul right before the First World War. Even though the hopes were ruined by the "Turkish massacres" and the Young Turk revolution, many Armenian leaders still considered more could be achieved from the side Turkish side than by the contact with Russia. Here, the author

---

29 The British Historian Andrew Mango makes the following remarks on the Kurds of the Dersim area: "Dersim (now Tunceli) massif, 10,000 feet at its highest point, was home to unruly Kurdish tribes, professing their own form of Shiite Islam and speaking a Kurdish language (*Zaza*) unintelligible to the majority of Ottoman Kurds. The Dersim tribes augmented their meager livelihood from their herds of sheeps and goats by extracting subsidies for good behavior indifferently from the Ottoman authorities and from their domestic and foreign enemies. The alternative to subsidies was brigandage. In the Great War, the tribes had provided services to the Ottomans, the Russians and the feeling Armenians." (Mango, *Atatürk*, *ibid*, p.280)

30 For more information on Armenian-Georgian relations, see: Stephen F. Jones, "Georgian-Armenian Relations in 1918 to 1920 and 1991 to 1994: A Comparison", *Transcaucasia, Nationalism, and Social Change*, Ed. Ronald Grigor Suny, The University of Michigan Press, 1996, p.441-460; Şota Tetvadze, Otar Tetvadze, *Somhebi Sakartveloşi*, Tiflis, 1999; Paul G. Forand, "Accounts of Western Travellers Concerning the Role of Armenians and Georgians in Sixteenth Century Iran", *The Muslim World*, LXV, 4 (1975), p. 246-278; Gérard Garitte, "La Source Grecque des "Trente Articles" Géorgiens Contre les Arméniens", HA, XC, 1-12 (1976), p.111-116; P. B. Henze, "Fire and Sword in the Caucasus: The Nineteenth Century Residence of North Caucasian Mountaineers", *Central Asian Survey*, II, 1 (1983), pp.5-44.

most likely intended to emphasize the collaboration between the Armenians and the Young Turks against the autocratic rule of Abdulhamid. The expansionist Russian policy in the Eastern Anatolia before the First World War was omitted from the report. So as the historical data that laid out that the Armenians fully reverted to Russia.<sup>31</sup> In addition, the report touched upon the Russian treatment of the Armenians of Turkey during the First World War and deliberated that it had not been shaped by friendly feelings. The report defined the main characteristics of the Russian treatment as excessively strict military control, importation of Russian labor battalions, support of the Kurds, schemes for settling Cossaks on Armenian lands, and most importantly, Russians' demand that Armenians must provide written evidence as to prove ownership of their land.<sup>32</sup> In fact, the Russian attitude<sup>33</sup> mentioned in the report along with the peace formula "without annexations or indemnities" had shocked the Armenians<sup>34</sup> as they recognized that they were being used by the Russians.

The last two sections of the report, prior to the the "Statistics as to Armenians" section, were on Armenians' relations with Iran and Azerbaijan.<sup>35</sup> In history, Armenia has served as a passageway for people moving or raiding from the east as well as a struggle ground between the Empires of Persia and the Roman, Byzantine, Seljuk and Ottoman Empires and consequently, the region frequently came under rule of Persia. What caused the Persian rule abate were the persistent control by the Turkish under the later Ottomans over the Van-Ararat region and the Russian occupation of Trans-Caucasia. The expressions that stood out in the report with regard to the Armenian-Azerbaijani relations are about the position of Azerbaijanis in Azerbaijan, South-East Trans-Caucasia and the Baku district. It was a cutting off the Armenians and the Caspian Sea. Besides, Armenians never attempted to get hold of the Caspian as a passage to Russia and Central Asia. The rise of the oil industry around Baku in the 20<sup>th</sup> century caused the immigration of Armenians to Baku and the district in significant numbers. The report pointed out that alleged massacres of the Armenians during the Azerbaijani-Armenian conflict in 1905 were an

---

31 For Russia's policy towards the Armenians in early 20th century, please see: Tolga Başak, *ibid.*, pp.126-144.

32 "Historical and Ethnological Notes on the Armenians", General Staff, War Office, 5th April, 1918, p.5.

33 Russia, when it occupied the most crucial parts of Eastern Anatolia, didn't allow the Armenians, who were moved from the region in line with the 1915 decision, to come back to the region and settle in. Russia's political attitude was designed in line with the slogan of "having as few Armenians as possible in Russian lands", and even of "Armenia without Armenians". (S. Torossian, "Soviet Policy in the Armenian Question", *Caucasian Review*, IV, (Munich, 1957), p.10-11; Richard G. Hovannissian, "Caucasian Armenia Between Imperial and Soviet Rule the Interlude of National Independence", *Transcaucasia, Essays in the History of Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia*, Ed. Ronald Grigor Suny, The University of Michigan, 1983, p.260; Somakian Manough Joseph, *Empires in Conflict: Armenia and the Great Powers, 1895-1920*, New York, 1995, pp.102-103.)

34 TNA. PRO. FO. 371/3016/208687, Foreign Office to Lord Bertie (Paris), No: 2686, November 10th, 1917; Lord Bertie (Paris) to Foreign Office, No: 1265, November 15th, 1917; Torossian, *agm*, s.12; "New Chapter of Armenian Massacres; Betrayal by the Bolshevists", *The Times*, Monday, February 18, 1918, p. 5.

35 As in all British documents, the Turks of Azerbaijan was denoted as "Tartars".

exception, although, it described the Azerbaijani-Armenian relations as certainly bad.<sup>36</sup>

The report included population statistics as to Armenians in the 'Appendices' section. The Russian Official Census for 1897 was given as the main resource in the report for the Armenian population in the Russian Empire. At the same time, it was mentioned in the report that the statistics collected by the Gregorian Church and various missions represented an over-estimate. According to these statistics, the Armenian population in Trans-Caucasia prior to the First World War was about 1.500.000.<sup>37</sup> In the last 75 years, especially in 1830 and in 1839, during the Russo-Turkish war in 1777-78, and in 1890s, there was considerable migration of Armenians from Turkey into the Russian Caucasia. Notably, Tiflis had a big colony of 150.000 Armenians. The report went on to mention some proportional data as for the Armenian population in Tiflis, Gence (Elizabetpol), Erivan, Kars, Baku and Kutais, and according to this, the Armenians made up %53 of the population in Erivan, %19 of Tiflis, %25 of Kars, and %9 of Baku. Erivan had a Turkish population that made up the %38.<sup>38</sup> The number of Armenians in the rest of Russia was about 200.000.<sup>39</sup>

The report later on discussed the situation in the Ottoman Empire and made a general examination of the statistics and the 1915 events. According to this, there had been a distortion in the data regarding the Armenians<sup>40</sup> as the Turkish official figures had underestimated the population.<sup>41</sup> Records by the Armenian

---

36 Please see the following for Azerbaijani-Armenian relations: Mahir Garibov, *I. Dünya Savaşı'ndan Günümüze Azerbaycan-Ermenistan İlişkileri*, Doktora Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara, 2006; Nesrin Sarahmetoğlu, *Azeri-Ermeni İlişkileri*, (1905-1920), Ankara, 2006.

37 The data also shows that there were 2.000.000 Georgians and 2.000.000 'Tartars and Turkish-speaking peoples' in Trans-Caucasia prior to the war.

38 In a study based on Russian resources and Russian census statistics, demographics of the Erivan province was studied and statistical data that covers between 1827- 1922. According to this study, the Muslim population in the Erivan district between 1886-1915 was 40.4 per cent of the total population on average. Statistics for the same district in 1908 showed that the Muslim population was 42.4 per cent. (Yavuz Aslan, "Rus İstilasından Sovyet Ermenistanı'na Erivan (Revan) Vilâyetinin Demografik Yapısı, (1827-1922)," *Yeni Türkiye, Ermeni Sorunu Özel Sayısı*, II, (Mart-Nisan, 2001), Yıl: 7, Sayı: 38, p.1022.)

39 "Historical and Ethnological Notes on the Armenians", *General Staff, War Office*, 5th April, 1918, p.7.

40 The belief that the Ottoman population statistics had underestimated the number of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire on purpose was especially expressed by the Armenians and their circles after the First World War. At the same time, studies show that the most reliable among existing data were the Ottoman. In fact, European consuls and military attachés who served for many years in the Ottoman Empire accepted that the Ottoman statistics were basically reliable, and consequently, these statistics were used by Ubicini, Boué, Urquhart, Kutscherai Paul bautet, A.Ritter zur Helle von Somo, Ernst Behm, H. Wanger, Vital Cuinet and others. Because there was an important step after years 1881-1882 with regard to the reliability and consistency of the official Ottoman data that was published, British, also, started feeling confident about it. (Kemal Karpat, *ibid.*, p. 34-35, 149-150.) That said, Ottoman Empire's statistics on the Christian population was criticized. Those who advocated for an independent Armenia at the end of the first world war said many times that the censuses conducted by the Ottoman Empire had not scientific character and they shouldn't be relied on. (Justin McCarthy, *Müslümanlar ve Azınlıklar*, pp.59-60.)

41 These expressions in the report are valid. It is known that the Ottoman resources underestimated the population by around %17-22, and this was because of the rationale behind conducting census in the Ottoman Empire. The officials based the census on men with regard to taxation registers and recruiting rolls, and therefore, omitted the others, especially women from the census. (Kemal H. Karpat, *Osmanlı Nüfusu, 1830-1914*, İstanbul, 2010, pp.8-9.)

Church, on the other hand, were overestimated to a great extent. The report viewed Cuinet's<sup>42</sup> and Lynch's<sup>43</sup> statistics as the most reliable of 1890s, and points out that figures drawn up by the Armenian Patriarch at 1912 differed by as much as 500.000, which was impossible.<sup>44</sup>

At this point, the most crucial point that the report omitted is the fact that the population in Anatolia was counted and recorded only by the Ottoman Empire. Consuls, representatives of minorities such as the Patriarch and explorers only made guesses about the population.<sup>45</sup>

The assessment by the report of the 1915 events, on the other hand, does not constitute an alternative point of view on how the Christian world viewed the events. The assessment of the Turkish-Armenian relations as a propaganda tool during the war and that the War Office made a great effort for this cause<sup>46</sup> formed the basis of the expressions in the report. According to this, while mentioning that "the 1915 massacres" officially accounted for 600.000 people, the report pointed out that this number could actually be bigger. Likewise, it mentioned that a 600.000 were "deported"<sup>47</sup> -of whom a significant number died-, but the actual number could be bigger if the refugees in Trans-Caucasia are included. The report noted that the number of refugees in Trans-Caucasia prior to the war was 200.000, and no matter what the truth was, it noted that, in this process, there was an enormous change for the Armenians in Turkey as well as a significant reduction in the Armenian population.

The report referenced Blue Book, which was the most important product of the propaganda movement during the war, emphasizing that A. Tonybee, the editor, noted that total Armenian population in Turkey was about 1.800.000. In the next paragraph, the report itself gave numbers as to the population of the Armenians in the Turkish Empire. According to this, it was estimated that, in 1914, there were 1.600.000 Armenians living in Turkey, of which 900.00

---

42 The mentioned resource here is Vital Cuinet's book entitled as "La Turquie d'Asie, IV. Cilt, Paris, 1890-1994". In fact, this was compiled from Ottoman resources that was revised. (Justin McCarthy, *Müslümanlar ve Azınlıklar*, p. 68.) In a German resource that was based on this book by Vital Cuinet, the number of Armenians living in the six districts in 1896 was 651.134. (A. Petermann, *Mitteilungen aus Justus Peterke's Geographischer Anstalt 24* (1878), directly on page. 8 Kemal Karpat, *ibid.*, pp.150-151 and footnote. 40.)

43 H. F. B. Lynch, *Armenia, Travels and Studies*, II, London, 1901.

44 "Historical and Ethnological Notes on the Armenians", General Staff, War Office, 5th April, 1918, p.7.

45 Justin McCarthy, *Müslümanlar ve Azınlıklar*, pp.2-3.

46 For more information on the effects of the British war propaganda on the Armenian question, please see: Tolga Başak, *ibid.*, pp.196-228.

47 As in many British documents, as well as in other foreign documents on the subject, the General Staff's report used the term "deport" to denote the dispatching of the Armenians. But, this is wrong, as the Armenians were not actually deported, but re-located. In this case, it would be better to use "re-location" to define the Armenian dispatching in 1915.



lived in the six "Armenian vilayets"<sup>48</sup>, 200.000 in Istanbul, 200.000 in Zeydan, and 300.000 in the rest of the empire.

The report furthermore went on to summarize the region's population structure by going into particulars of the six provinces, denoted as "Armenian vilayets", and by providing proportional characteristics of these provinces. According to this, the Armenians broadly made up the %25 of the population in Erzurum, %40 in Bitlis, %15 in Mamüretülaziz (Harput), %25 in Diyarbakır, and %16 in Sivas. In the province of Van, although the number of Muslims exceeded the number of Armenians in the city, in the case of dividing the population into segments such as Turkish, Kurdish and Armenians, the Armenians, the report noted, make up the dominant group. While the Armenians constituted more than 50 per cent of the population in the *sanjak* (Van), the Kurdish ranked the second with a 20 per cent slice. The total number of Armenians in rest of the empire was about 650.000.<sup>49</sup>

Following the section on the Russian and Turkish empires, the report mentioned that the Armenian population living in other parts of the world was around 300.000-350.000. The report expressed that, as in the event of the reconstitution of some form of an independent Armenia, the ranks of communities of Armenians in Cairo, Egypt, Singapore, Calcutta, Bucharest, Switzerland, London, Manchester, Paris and the United States might be utilized for recruiting administrators and leaders.

While demonstrating that the Armenian population in 1914 in the world as a whole was 3.650.000, the report, by clarifying prior data, expressed that

---

48 After the Treaty of Berlin, the issue regarding the population of the Armenians within the Ottoman Empire also attracted the attention of British officials and studies were conducted accordingly towards the end of the 19th century. The Ottoman statistics and the numbers declared by the British officials to London showed a very little difference. At this point, Commander Henry Troter, who examined his own data as well as the Turkish and the Armenian, assisted the British government in a great extent in its initiative to calculate estimations of the population. Troter, who denied the Armenian statistics presented to the Congress of Berlin, did a comparative analysis of all the existing information (Armenian and Turkish) on the population, together with Lieutenant C. W. Wilson. Consequently, detailed and comprehensive data on Eastern Anatolia was prepared. According to this study, non-Muslims, of which the most is Armenians, in Erzurum, Van, Bitlis, Diyarbakır and Harput districts amounted to 567.000, and the Muslims, excluding tribes, refugees and immigrants, amounted to 1.488.000. In the case of including the groups that were excluded, the number would have been amounted to 3.000.000. Recent data compiled by the British in 1896, however, indicated that there were 697.598 non-Muslims and more than 2.750.000 Muslims in the region. A confidential study conducted by the Ottoman in 1897, on the other hand, pointed out that the total population in the region had rose to 3.179.000, of which 2.5 million was Muslim and 566.267 was Armenian and the rest was composed of peoples with other nationalities. (Kemal Karpat, *ibid.*, p.9. footnote. 4, pp.142-143, 145, 148-149, 402-403, 412-413.)

49 "Historical and Ethnological Notes on the Armenians", *General Staff, War Office*, 5th April, 1918, pp. 7-8. While the statistics presented by the report reflected more or less on the population profile in the region, (Justin McCarthy, *Müslümanlar ve Azınlıklar*, p.45-90.), Justin McCarthy examined these statistics: "The area claimed as "Turkish Armenia" was commonly known as the Six Vilayets-Van, Bitlis, Mamuretulaziz, Diyarbahr, Sivas, and Erzurum. In 1912, there were only 870,000 Armenians in the Six Vilayets as a whole. Accordingly, the Armenian population in the six provinces was not even one fifth of the total population. In some provinces of the Six Vilayets, Moslems outnumbered Armenians six to one. Moreover, Armenians were settled an over the Ottoman Empire, not simply in the East. As many Armenians lived in the rest of the Ottoman Empire as in the Six Vilayets. However, even if all the Armenians of the Empire had come together to live in Eastern Anatolia, the Moslems would still have outnumbered them by more than two to one."

1.700.000 lived in the Russian empire, 1.600.000 lived in the Ottoman Empire, and 350.000 lived in the rest of the world. In addition, the report included figures of the Katholikos of Echmiadzin<sup>50</sup> and of Patriarch of Istanbul, as well as official Turkish figures just prior to the war. The population of Armenians in Turkey was shown as 2.100.000 in the figures of the Patriarch of Istanbul, and as 1.100.000 in the official Turkish figures. There was a difference of about 1.000.000 between the two.<sup>51</sup> As Kemal Karpat expressed in his analysis of the Ottoman population, “the population statistics became the first weapon to be used in a battle to be carried out with weapons in the future.”<sup>52</sup>

The first part of the appendices section included two statistical tables as to the six provinces, and in the first table, with the resource given as “Orange Book, 1915”, population statistics of the six provinces in the 19<sup>th</sup> century by the Armenian Patriarch, Lynch, Turkish Ministry of Justice, and Cuinet were compared.

In general terms, the difference between the number of Muslims and the Armenians living in the six provinces were 353.700 in the Armenian Patriarch’s data, 435.582 in Lynch’s, 1.624.049 in Turkish Ministry of Justice’s, and around 2.000.000 in Cuinet’s. It was emphasized here that the data presented by Lynch for the Erzurum and Bitlis provinces had been taken from Turkish resources respectively in 1887 and 1893, and the mentioned data were only related to the provinces of Erzurum and Bitlis and the *sanjaks* of Harput, Dersim and Van. Likewise, the Armenian data did not include the statistics of the province of Diyarbakır.<sup>53</sup> In the same table, the Armenian Patriarch’s data (1881) on the Muslim population of Bitlis was shown as 21.121, as it was reflected on the total population, and this number was absolutely wrong. So much so that the population of the mentioned province was actually around

50 For more information on Katholikos of Echmiadzin, please see Ali Arslan, *Kutsal Ermeni Papalığı*, İstanbul, 2005.

51 “Historical and Ethnological Notes on the Armenians”, *General Staff, War Office*, 5th April, 1918, p.8.

52 Kemal Karpat, *ibid.*, p. 124. The Armenian Patriarch, for the first time, give out information on the population of the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire during the Congress of Berlin, and demanded recognition of Armenia’s independence as in the case of Bulgaria. While in the Ottoman documents and reports by the British Consulate, the Armenian population between 1878-1914 was indicated as 1.250.000-1.400.000, the Patriarch reflected it as 2.5 million. This number turned into a reference point for some politicians and scholars and was started to be used for propaganda purposes. Marcel Léart, supposedly a Frenchman but actually an Armenian from Istanbul whose actual name was Kirkor Zohrap, based on this data, presented that the population of Ottoman Armenians was 2.5 million in his book called “*La Question Arménienne à la Lumière des Documents, Paris: A Challemeil, 1913*” (p. 50-59) and this number was a source of inspiration for similar studies after this. In addition, by this period, the statistics presented by the Patriarch was objected by the British officials who had been serving in the region and it was determined that data was false. Patrik Nerses, who used fraudulent number to multiply the population of Christians and understate the number of Muslims, was seriously criticized. The data presented by the Patriarch was so inconsistent that it was demanded an explanation of its method of calculation. Despite all this, publishing of “subjective” and “totally false” information resumed. (Kemal Karpat, *ibid.*, p.9 ve dip.5, p.141,144-146,150. For more information on the Armenian Patriarch’s data on the Armenian population in the Ottoman Empire, see: Justin McCarthy, *Müslümanlar ve Azınlıklar*, p.50, Tablo: 3. 2, p.51, Table: 3. 3, p.52, Table: 3. 5, p.55, Table: 3. 6.)

53 “Historical and Ethnological Notes on the Armenians”, *General Staff, War Office*, 5th April, 1918, p. 8.

200.000.<sup>54</sup> In fact, the statistics by the Armenian Patriarch (1881) presented in the report did not overlap with Patriarch's data presented in some resources (1882).<sup>55</sup> For example, while the Armenian population in the six provinces (excluding the Diyarbakır province) was presented as 1.420.000<sup>56</sup> in the Patriarch's data, which appeared in the works of Esat Uras and Justin McCarthy, the data in the mentioned report used the number 751.000. Likewise, while the Muslim population in the six provinces excluding Diyarbakır was shown as 1.104.748 in the Armenian Patriarch's data of 1881 presented in the report, it was 1.738.760 according to the general census by the Ottoman in 1881/82.<sup>57</sup> In short, Patriarch's data based on the Russian Orange Book was not reliable. The Muslim and the Armenian population, although exaggerated and inconsistent, were shown under "the actual data of the Patriarch".

The rest of the data in the report indicated that Lynch's figure for the Muslim population of the Bitlis province was 145.454, while Cuinet's was 254.000. There was little difference between Cuinet's data as presented in Esat Uras' work and in the mentioned report.<sup>58</sup> On the other hand, the data presented by the Turkish Ministry of Justice regarding the Armenian and the Muslim population in 1890 and data in other sources overlapped with each other.<sup>59</sup>

In the second table that appeared in the General Staff report, on the other hand, there was data regarding the Armenian and the Muslim population in the six provinces for the 20<sup>th</sup> century based on some sources. According to this, while Ormanian's<sup>60</sup> records of 1910, which only examined the Armenian population, registered the Armenian population in the six provinces as 967.700, didn't provide any information on the Muslims. Russian Consul-General's data solely

---

54 Justin McCarthy, *Müslümanlar ve Azınlıklar*, p.35. 1881/82 According to the general census by the Ottoman, the number of Muslims in the province of Bitlis was 167.054. (Kemal Karpat, *ibid.*, p.274.) The Patriarch's data of the year 1913 pointed to a Muslim population of 162.000 in the region. ("Historical and Ethnological Notes on the Armenians", General Staff, War Office, 5th April, 1918, p.9.) 19. For Turkish data and statistics on the Muslim population in the six provinces towards the end of century and the beginning of the 20th century, please see: Justin McCarthy, *Müslümanlar ve Azınlıklar*, p.24, Tablo: 2.11; p.34, Tablo: 2.18; p.35, Tablo: 2.19; p.36, Tablo: 2.20; p.39, Tablo: 2.22; p.41, Tablo: 2.23; p.43-44, Tablo: 2.24. (Kemal Karpat, *ibid.*, pp. 310-311, 317-318, 320-327, 330-333, 352-355, 358, 359, 366, 368, 372, 374-75, 382,-83, 396, 409-410.

55 Although 1881 was given in the report as the appropriate year for the Patriarch's data, it actually should have been 1882. (Justin McCharty, *Müslümanlar ve Azınlıklar*, p.49; Kemal Karpat, *ibid.*, p.149.)

56 Esat Uras, *ibid.*, p.138, Justin McCarthy, *Müslümanlar ve Azınlıklar*, p.55.

57 Esat Uras, *ibid.*, pp.310-313.

58 For example, while the Armenian population in Erzurum was indicated as 120.466 in Cuinet's data presented in Esat Uras' work, it was indicated as 134.967 in the General Staff report. (Esat Uras, *ibid.*, p.139.)

59 Kemal Karpat, *ibid.*, p.412, Table: II. 6. According to the Turkish sources referenced in Kemal Karpat's work, the Muslim population of the six provinces was 2.028.351 in 1881-82 (p.310-312, Table: I. 8. B), 2.028.182 in 1894 (p.316-18, Table: I. 9), 2.700.940 in 1896'da (p.326-28, Table: I. 12), 2.332.760 in 1897'de (pp.330-32, Table: I. 13), 2.483.135 in 1906-7(pp.352-54, Table: I. 16. B) and 2.861.511 in 1914. (Kemal Karpat, *ibid.*, p.396, Table: I. 17. B)

60 The Armenian Patriarch Malachia Ormanian, provides the mentioned data in the appendix section of his study entitled as "L'Eglise Arménienne, Paris, 1910." According to the mentioned data, the total number of Armenians living in Turkey is 1.579.000. (Justin McCarthy, *Müslümanlar ve Azınlıklar*, p.57; Esat Uras, *ibid.*, p.138.)

on the provinces of Erzurum and Bitlis<sup>61</sup> for 1912, on the other hand, indicated to 1.047.000 Muslims and 350.000 Armenians. According to same data, compared to the Muslim population of 550.000 in the province of Erzurum, there was 200.000 Armenians living in the province. Data on the province of Bitlis, while obtained from the Russian Consul-General in Bitlis, was only concerning the Gregorian Armenians.

The Armenian Patriarch's data on the six provinces as a whole in 1913 was another resource utilized in the table.<sup>62</sup> Here, the Armenian population was recorded as 1.018.000, and the Muslim population was 1.178.000.<sup>63</sup> These numbers overlapped with the Patriarch's data (1912) provided in other resources.<sup>64</sup> In addition, the number of Muslims residing in the provinces excluding the province of Sivas was –probably mistakenly- understated; but this situation was not reflected in general total. The Patriarch's data of 1913 on the province of Erzurum, compared to 1912 data by the Russian Consul-General in Erzurum, it could be observed that the number of Muslims went down by 180.000, in addition to an increase in the number of Armenians by 15.000. The same comparison provided an increase by 30.000 in the Armenian population and a decrease by 335.000 in the Muslim population in Bitlis.<sup>65</sup>

The last two resources, which provided data solely on the provinces of Bitlis and Van, were of Mayevsky's (1889)<sup>66</sup> and of the Russian Vice-Consul's (1912). In the foremost of these closely related resources, it was mentioned that eight different censuses were done for one household, and the Armenian population in the mentioned provinces were 296.488, while the Muslim population was 522.184. Russian Consul-General Olpherev, on the other hand, pointed to 300.000 Armenians and 520.000 Muslims living in these provinces.

61 Although it is indicated in the bottom section of the table, which provides total population, that the mentioned data provides information regarding “vilayets of Erzurum and Van only”, the content of the table included data regarding Erzurum and Bitlis.

62 In fact, the mentioned data was of the year 1913. (Justin McCharty, *Musulmanlar ve Azınlıklar*, p.47, Table: 3.1; p.49.)

63 It was indicated in the table that south of Malatya, northwest of Sivas province, Hakkari and Beşiri were not included in these numbers. (“Historical and Ethnological Notes on the Armenians”, General Staff, War Office, 5th April, 1918, p.9.)

64 Esat Uras, *ibid.*, p.39; Justin McCarthy, *Müslümanlar ve Azınlıklar*, p.51, Tablo: 3. 3.

65 “Historical and Ethnological Notes on the Armenians”, General Staff, War Office, 5th April, 1918, p. 9. Allegedly, the statistics by the Armenian Patriarch was generally based on the registrations of baptism and death. Data on Muslims in these statistics, when compared to the Ottoman records, it could be easily noticed that Patriarch's numbers were very low. The officials of the Patriarch, although not able to do a census for the Muslim population, did not accept the Ottoman data and produced its own estimates. The understatement of the Muslim population would serve some political interests. (Justin McCarthy, *Müslümanlar ve Azınlıklar*, pp. 48-49, 51-53.)

66 Mayevsky, a Major General serving in the Russian General Staff, was commissioned by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office in the region for more than five years, visited almost all parts of Van and Bitlis and prepared population records related to these provinces. Mayevsky's published statistics, which were prepared by examining documents remaining from the Ottomans, were analyzed by the Ottoman Ministry of War, and the book was later translated into Turkish and was published. The book entitled “Van ve Bitlis Vilayetleri Askeri İstatistiği” (Translator: Suvari Binbaşısı Mehmet Sadık, İstanbul, Matbaa-i Askeriye, 1330.), provided duplicates of registries that included each village, family and ethnic-religious community. (Justin McCarthy, *Müslümanlar ve Azınlıklar*, pp.75-76.)

Following the statistics on the six provinces, the last part of the appendices section of the General Staff report was about the Brest-Litovsk Treaty and the Armenians, and went on with the population statistics of Batum and Kars regions.<sup>67</sup> According to this, while the Russian Yearbook of 1914 pointed to a total population of 172.000 in the Batum region, the Russian official census of 1897 pointed to the existence of 40.000 Turkish people. By 1914, there was a considerable amount of Greeks in Batum, where the Muslim Georgians made up the most of the population, and the number of Armenians did not exceed 5-6 thousand.

Data, presented under the title "Government of Kars" and based on the 1897 Russian Official Census, provided that the total population in the region was 292.498 and the Armenians, with 73.406 people, made up the %25 of the total population. The total population of the region, according to the Russian Yearbook, would rise to 389.000 in 1914.

Finally, by 1914, Armenians made up the 120.000 of the total population of the "Batum and Kars" district with 420.000 people.

The British General Staff, with summaries of the mentioned historical processes and statistical information on the population, targeted and was successful to provide well-organized data on the Armenians about whom many discussions took place regarding their political future and outgoing attitude was shown related to their independence by 1918. Especially, the statistics related to the Armenian population in the Eastern Anatolian provinces prior to the war were significantly important. In addition to this, mentioning of the manifestation of the Armenian nationalism in the 19<sup>th</sup> century with revolts and massacres only superficially, and the lack of mention of the Armenian revolts and the British and the Russian state policies towards the Armenians, as well as the chronicled, one sided, prejudiced and exploitive points of view related to the 1915 events and deprivations presented in the report were among the most important shortcomings of the report.

After the First World War, the British War Office Office's point of view on the Armenian question and its plans related to Eastern Anatolia, denoted as Armenia, would be highly realistic. The British General Staff would emphasize

*The British General Staff, with summaries of the mentioned historical processes and statistical information on the population, targeted and was successful to provide well-organized data on the Armenians about whom many discussions took place regarding their political future and outgoing attitude was shown related to their independence by 1918.*

67 "Historical and Ethnological Notes on the Armenians", General Staff, War Office, 5th April, 1918, p.10

that Erzurum should not be included in the Armenia to be founded<sup>68</sup> and would remind that Muslims had made up most of the population in Erzurum prior to the war.<sup>69</sup>

The British army officials, while leaving on one side the hostility towards the Turkish which blinded the British politicians in Paris, would start examining the events with a realistic point of view, bringing the matters related to peace conditions to be offered to Turkey and to the policy towards Armenia to the table in line with realist principles. The British War Ministry, which had the view that the Foreign and Commonwealth Office had reputed policies towards Armenia, would voice that the promises and intentions towards the Armenian independence had expressed nothing at all.

The issue of the future of Armenia would become an issue that the British General Staff was concerned about, and the founding of the planned Armenian state would not be a applicable policy that the General Staff supported.<sup>70</sup>

---

68 TNA. PRO. FO. 608/271/4, "General Staff Comments on M. Berthelot's Note of 12.12.19. and the Comments of the Political-Section Thereon", Lieut. Colonel, G.S. M. Gribbon, 10 January 1920.

69 HLRO. LG/F/206/4/14, "Erzerum and the Western Boundary of Armenia" General Staff War Office, 11.2.1920, B.B Cubitt, (WO) to Secretary of the Cabinet, 12 February 1920.

70 TNA. PRO. CAB. 24/103, C. P. 1014, "General Staff Memorandum on the Turkish Peace Treaty", The War Office, 1st April, 1920.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Archives

The National Archives of United Kingdom, Public Record Office (TNA. PRO)

Foreign Office Documents (FO)

Cabinet Papers (CAB)

The Parliamentary Archives, House of Lord Record Office (HLRO)

Lloyd George Papers (LGP)

### Published Resources

*British Documents on Foreign Affairs: Report and Papers from the Foreign Office Confidential Print*, Part: I, Series: B, The Near and Middle East, 1856-1914, Volume: 20, Ed. David Gillard, Her Britannic Majesty's Stationary Office, 1985.

*British Documents on the Origins of the War, 1898-1914*, Ed. G. P. Gooch and Harold Temperley, Volume: X, Part: I, The Near and Middle East on the Eve of the War, London, 1936.

*House of Commons Parliamentary Papers*, 1878, Volume: LXXXII-LXXXIII.

(H.C.P.P)

*The Treatment of the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, 1915-1916*, Documents Presented to Viscount Grey of Fallodon with a Preface by Viscount Bryce, Misc No: 31, Cmd 8325, H. M. Stationery Office, London, New York and Toronto, 1916.

*The Case for Armenia*, The British Armenia Committee, London, 1921.

*Van ve Bitlis Vilâyetleri Askerî İstatistiği* (Çev. Süvari Binbaşısı Mehmet Sadık, İstanbul, Matbaa-i Askeriye, 1330.

### Newspapers

The Times (United Kingdom)

## Books and Articles

ADONTZ, N., *Histoire d'Arménie: Les Origines* (du X au VI s.av. J.C.), Paris, 1946.

ARSLAN, Ali, *Kutsal Ermeni Papalığı*, İstanbul, 2005.

ARSLANIAN, Artin H., "British Wartime Pledges, 1917-1918", *Journal of Contemporary History*, Volume:13, Number: 3, (July, 1978), s.517-529.

ASLAN, Kevork, *Armenia and the Armenians*, New York, 2005.

ASLAN, Yavuz, "Rus İstilasından Sovyet Ermenistanı'na Erivan (Revan) Vilâyetinin Demografik Yapısı, (1827-1922)," *Yeni Türkiye, Ermeni Sorunu Özel Sayısı*, II, (Mart-Nisan, 2001), Yıl: 7, Sayı: 38, s. 1017-1028.

BAL, İdris; ÇUFALI Mustafa, *Dünden Bugüne Türk-Ermeni İlişkileri*, Ankara, 2003.

BAŞAK, Tolga, *İngiltere'nin Ermeni Politikası*, İstanbul, 2008.

BOURNOUTIAN, George A., *A Concise History of the Armenian People*, USA, 2002.

BOZKURT, Gülnihal, *Alman-İngiliz Belgelerinin ve Siyasi Gelişmelerin Işığında Gayrimüslüm Osmanlı Vatandaşlarının Hukuki Durumu (1839-1914)*, Ankara, 1989.

BOZKUŞ, Yıldız Deveci; KÜÇÜKER Sultan Deniz, *Armenia, Ermeniler ve Armenia Bölgesinin Eskiçağ Tarihi*, Ankara, 2011.

BRAUDE, Benjamin, "Millet Sistemi'nin İlginç Tarihi", *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Ermeni Sorunu*, Ankara, 2000, s.131-145.

BURNEY, C. A.; LANG David Marshall, *The Peoples of the Hills: Ancient Ararat and Caucasus*, London, 1971.

CUINET, Vital, *La Turquie d'Asie*, IV. Cilt, Paris, 1890-1994.

ERCAN, Yavuz, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Müslüman Olmayan Topluluklar (Millet Sistemi)", *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Ermeni Sorunu*, Ankara, 2000, s.45-163.

ERSAN, Mehmet, *Selçuklular Zamanında Anadolu'da Ermeniler*, Ankara, 2007.



- FORAND Paul G., "Accounts of Western Travellers Concerning the Role of Armenians and Georgians in Sixteenth Century Iran", *The Muslim World*, LXV, 4 (1975), s. 246-278.
- GARIBOV, Mahir, *I. Dünya Savaşı'ndan Günümüze Azerbaycan-Ermenistan İlişkileri*, Doktora Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara, 2006.
- GARITTE, Gérard, "La Source Grecque des "Trente Articles" Géorgiens Contre les Arméniens", HA, XC, 1-12 (1976), s.111-116.
- GIBB H.; BOWEN H., *Islamic Society and the West*, VI., Part II, Oxford, 1969.
- GROUSSET, René, *Başlangıcından 1071'e Ermenilerin Tarihi*, İstanbul, 2005.
- GÜLER, Ali; AKGÜL, Suat, *Sorun Olan Ermeniler*, Ankara, 2003.
- GÜNALTAY, Şemseddin, *Yakın Şark IV. Romalılar Zamanında Kapadokya, Pont ve Artaksiad Krallıkları*, Ankara, 1951.
- HENZE, P. B., "Fire and Sword in the Caucasus: The Nineteenth Century Residence of North Caucasian Mountaineers", *Central Asian Survey*, II, 1 (1983), s.5-44.
- HOVANNISIAN, Richard G., "Caucasian Armenia Between Imperial and Soviet Rule the Interlude of National Independence", *Transcaucasia, Essays in the History of Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia*, Ed. Ronald Grigor Suny, The University of Michigan, 1983, s. 259-291.
- İLTER, Erdal, "Ermenistan Adı, Ermenilerin Menşei ve Türk-Ermeni İlişkileri Konusunda Tespitler", *Dünden Bugüne Türk-Ermeni İlişkileri*, Ed. İdris Bal, Mustafa Çufalı, Ankara, 2003, s.3-10.
- JONES, Stephen F., "Georgian-Armenian Relations in 1918 to 1920 and 1991- to 1994: A Comparison", *Transcaucasia, Nationalism, and Social Change*, Ronald Grigor Suny (Edt.), The University of Michigan Press, 1996, s.441-460.
- JOSEPH, Somakian Manough, *Empires in Conflict: Armenia and the Great Powers, 1895-1920*, New York, 1995.
- KARPAT, Kemal H., *Osmanlı Nüfusu, 1830-1914*, İstanbul, 2010.
- KILIÇ, Davut, *Osmanlı Ermenileri Arasında Dini ve Siyasi Mücadeleler*, Ankara, 2006.

KIRAKOSSIAN, Arman J., *British Diplomacy and the Armenian Question, from the 1830's to 1914*, London, 2003.

KOCAŞ, Sadi, *Tarih Boyunca Ermeniler ve Türk-Ermeni İlişkileri*, Ankara, 1967.

KÖYMEN, M. Altay, *Selçuklu Devri Türk Tarihi*, Ankara, 1989.

KURAT, Yuluğ Tekin, “Çok Milletli Bir Ulus Olarak Osmanlı İmparatorluğu”, *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Ermeni Sorunu*, Ankara, 2000, s.163-171.

KÜÇÜK, Cevdet, “Osmanlı Devleti'nde Millet Sistemi”, *Ermeni Sorunu Özel Sayısı*, II (Mart-Nisan 2001), Ankara, s.692-702.

KÜRKÇÜOĞLU, Erol, *Roma'dan Selçuklu İdaresine Ermeniler*, Erzurum, 2005.

LANG, David Marshall, *Armenia, Cradle of Civilisation*, London, 1980.

LÉART, Marcel, *La Question Arménienne à la Lumière des Documents*, Paris: A Challemeil, 1913.

LONG, James, *The Position of Turkey in Relation to British Interests in India*, East India Association, London, 1876.

LYNCH, H. F. B., *Armenia, Travels and Studies*, II, London, 1901.

MACLER, Frédéric, *La Nation, Arménienne, Son Passé, ses Malheurs*, Paris, 1923.

MANGO, Andrew, *Atatürk, Modern Türkiye'nin Kurucusu*, Türkçesi: Füsun Doruker, İstanbul, 2006.

MARTIN, V. De Saint, *Mémoires Historique et Géographiques sur l'Arménie*, Paris, 1818.

MCCARTHY, Justin, *Müslümanlar ve Azınlıklar*, İstanbul, 1998.

MCCARTHY, Justin, “Ermeni Terörizmi: Zehir ve Panzehir Olarak Tarih”, *Uluslararası Terörizm ve Uyuşturucu Madde Kaçakçılığı Sempozyumu*, Ankara Üniversitesi, 1984, s. 81-91.

ORMANIAN, Malachia, *L'Eglise Arménienne*, Paris, 1910.

ÖZKAYA, İnyetullah Cemal, *Le Peuple Arménien et les Tentatives de Reduire le Peuple Turc en Servitude*, İstanbul, 1971.

PANOSSIAN, Razmik, *The Armenians: From Kings and Priests to Merchants and Commissars*, New York, 2006.

PETERMANN, A., *Mitteilungen aus Justus Peterke's Geographischer Anstalt* 24 (1878)

REDGATE, A. E., *The Peoples of Europe The Armenians*, USA, 1998.

SARIAHMETOĞLU, Nesrin, *Azeri-Ermeni İlişkileri*, (1905-1920), Ankara, 2006.

SEVİM, Ali, *Genel Çizgileriyle Selçuklu-Ermeni İlişkileri*, Ankara, 1983.

SONYEL, Salahi, "Hristiyan Azınlıklar ve Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Son Dönemi", *Yeni Türkiye, Ermeni Sorunu Özel Sayısı*, II (Mart-Nisan 2001), Ankara, s.687-692.

SONYEL, Salahi, *The Ottoman Armenians, Victims of Great Power Diplomacy*, London, 1987.

SÜREYYA, Münir, *Ermeni Meselesinin Siyasî Tarihçesi*, (1877-1914), T.C.

Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, Osmanlı Arşivi Daire Başkanlığı, Yayın No: 53, Ankara, 2001.

TETVADZE, Şota; TETVADZE Otar, *Somhebi Sakartveloşi*, Tiflis, 1999.

THOMSON, Robert W., Mouses, *Khorenatzi's History of Armenia*, England, 1980.

TOROSSIAN, S., "Soviet Policy in the Armenian Question", *Caucasian Review*, IV, (Münich, 1957), s. 9-22.

TOYNBEE, Arnold J., *Armenian Atrocities, The Murder of a Nation*, London, New York, Toronto, 1915

TOYNBEE, Arnold J., *The Western Question in Greece and Turkey, A Study in the Contact of Civilisations*, London, Bombay, Sydney, 1922.

URAS, Esat, *Tarihte Ermeniler ve Ermeni Meselesi*, İstanbul, 1987.

YERASIMOS, Stefanos, *I. Dnya Savařı ve Ermeni Sorunu*, Ankara, 2002.

YERASIMOS, Stefanos, *Milliyetler ve Sınırlar, Balkanlar, Kafkasya ve Orta Doęu*, İstanbul, 2000.