

THE ARMENIAN QUESTION: SCHOLARLY ETHICS AND METHODOLOGY

Erman ŞAHİN
Researcher-author
Erman.sahin4@gmail.com

Abstract: *Following the assassination of the renowned Turkish Armenian journalist Hrant Dink, two Turkish authors, Temel Demirer and Sibel Özbudun, published an article dealing with the Armenian Question entitled “1,500,001st Ahbarik”. While it is understandable and necessary to express moral outrage over the horrible murder of Dink, the authors’ article goes beyond this point, and engages in the polemics over the tragic incidents of 1915. Moreover, the quotations and footnote citations presented by the authors in their article raises certain ethical questions since on close inspection, these reveal that the authors have not actually consulted or checked the sources they cite. Rather the two authors copied the references from different authors with citation errors and hence without proper acknowledgment. This article will discuss these points by presenting specific examples.*

Key Words: *Temel Demirer, Sibel Özbudun, Armenian Question, Scholarly Ethics.*

Introduction

Following the assassination of the renowned Turkish Armenian journalist Hrant Dink, two Turkish authors, Temel Demirer and Sibel Özbudun, published an article dealing with the Armenian Question entitled “1,500,001st Ahbarik”. After being published in several journals, the article finally appeared in a book, comprised of the authors’ collected essays and entitled *Hayır Evet’ten Önce Gelir, Hukuk(suzluk) Yazıları (No Comes Before Yes, Essays on (Il)Legality)*.¹ Dink, an important bridge between Armenian and Turkish peoples, was also a highly regarded journalist and intellectual of Turkey. While it is understandable and necessary to express moral outrage over the horrible murder of Dink, the authors’ article goes well beyond this point and discusses the subject on a completely different level. It should be noted that the title of the article runs parallel to the expression “1.5 million + 1,” which was earlier formulated by the English journalist and author Robert Fisk, whereby Hrant Dink’s name has become an instrument for the politicized genocide debates.

1 Sibel Özbudun and Temel Demirer, *Hayır Evet’ten Önce Gelir: Hukuk(suzluk) Yazıları (No Comes Before yes, Essays on (Il)Legality)*, Ankara: Ütopya Yayınevi, 2008, pp. 161–179. The first page of the article, page 169, provides a list of journals the article has been published in previously.

In discussing the 1915 Armenian relocation, which they describe as an act of “genocide,” the authors arrived at various conclusions, some of which are highly contentious. Moreover, the authors’ article and attitude raises certain “technical and ethical” problems. This short critique, which essentially focuses on such “technical and ethical” problems, does not seek to provide a comprehensive analysis of the tragic events of 1915. It is, therefore, beyond the scope of this short article to assess whether or not there was a deliberate or systematic policy of genocide toward the Armenian population during the First World War.

Technical Problems

A close examination of the article reveals that the authors are not in command of the subject matter that they discuss, and have approached the issue from quite a narrow and ideological perspective. The article is also problematic with respect to the accuracy of the quotations presented and the cited sources. In addition, the authors do not seem to be familiar enough with certain individuals on whom they provide speculative assessments.

The authors correctly note that a greater emphasis should be placed on the human dimension of the tragic occurrences of 1915. Within this context, the authors approvingly quote another observer, Markar Eseyan as stating that “before anything else, it is necessary to develop a moral and scrupulous approach” with regard to the tragic events of 1915, and, thus, indicate their belief that the Armenian issue should be approached in this way. However, the authors’ attitude displayed in the article casts doubt on their sincerity on these points. The authors’ use of Ahmet Refik (Altınay)’s account and attempt to conceal the massacres committed against the Muslims is a case in point. In a booklet published in the armistice period, the anti-Unionist author Ahmet Refik spoke of “the Armenians’ Van massacre” (p.164), an expression which he used to describe the massacres of the Muslim population committed by the Armenians in the province of Van. In using Ahmet Refik’s account, however, the authors rendered this specific expression in modern Turkish as “Armenians’ Van battle” (p.164). Because of this seemingly minor alteration made by the authors, the readers with limited knowledge on the subject will not be able to realize that Ahmet Refik is, in fact, referring to the massacres committed against Muslims in Van. Such attempts on part of the authors to cover up the massacres perpetrated upon the Muslim population, unfortunately, do not contribute to the development of a “moral and scrupulous approach” on the catastrophic events of 1915.

The article under review also addresses some questions on several aspects of the Armenian tragedy, some of which are significant in demonstrating the extent of the authors’ research and knowledge on the subject. One such question is the following: “How close was it to the battlefield that of the 63 thousand Catholic Armenians in the State of Ankara – these were an apolitical community being culturally and politically different than the Gregorian Armenians – 61 thousand were subjected to the relocation?” (p.175). The number 63 thousand, which the authors put as the number of Catholic

Armenians in the nonexistent “State” of Ankara, in fact represents the total number of Catholic Armenians in the whole of the Ottoman Empire (63,967). It should also be clear to the readers that it would be unrealistic to argue that all of the Catholic Armenians of the empire were living only within the “province” of Ankara, which the authors incorrectly refer to as a state.

In support of their contentions, the authors also present some interesting quotations and passages from certain sources. However, some of these quotations contain serious inaccuracies and are presented in quite a different form than the actual versions in the original sources. One such quotation presented by the authors is the statement made by (Hafiz) Mehmet Emin Bey, the deputy for Trabzon, during his speech on the Armenian Question in the Ottoman Parliament:

Hafiz Mehmet, himself an ardent Unionist and a member of the Ottoman Parliament, stated that, “I saw [this] with my own eyes. They were putting the Armenians on boats in Samsun, and then were killing them by tipping them into the sea. I have talked to Talat about this, [but] I could not prevent it.” In any case, it was Talat Pasha who arranged the whole affair. (p.168)

The statement quoted above, which the authors attributed to the Trabzon deputy (Hafiz), is taken from an interview conducted with Taner Akçam by the Turkish journalist Neşe Düzel and published in 2005 by the Turkish daily *Radikal*.² Yet, the quotation has been rendered rather differently from Mehmet Emin Bey’s actual speech in the Ottoman Parliament. First of all, the incident did not take place in Samsun, but in the district of Ordu. Second and more importantly, the statements made by Mehmet Emin Bey about the incident which he saw with his “own eyes” actually indicates the opposite of what the authors made him say:

There was a prefect in Ordu district. He loaded a boat with the Armenians on the pretext of sending them to Samsun, and had them tipped into the sea. I heard that Governor [of Trabzon] Cemal Azmi had treated them in the same way. I could not go that far. I had to return from the district of Ordu. As soon as I arrived here, I told what I witnessed to the Interior Minister [Talat Pasha]. Thereafter, they sent an inspector and dismissed the prefect. They put him on trial.³

2 Neşe Düzel, “Atatürk ‘katiller’ diye bağırıyordu (Atatürk was screaming ‘murderers’),” *Radikal*, 30.05.2005. The complete interview can be found on the following website: <http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=154213>

3 In the rest of the speech, Mehmet Emin Bey states the following about Governor Cemal Azmi: “But I could not have them do anything about the Governor. Perhaps I have struggled for three years but nothing happened.” Here, the difference between a witnessed incident and a rumor should also be kept in mind. In addition to this, in the same speech Mehmet Emin Bey also related how he and the Greek deputy Kofidi Efendi complained to Talat Pasha about a lieutenant-governor that engaged in violent acts against the Greek population in Samsun and how Talat Pasha had dismissed the governor the following day: “We came here together with Kofi Efendi and told Talat Pasha. Thereafter, he [Talat Pasha] dismissed the lieutenant-governor the following day.” *Meclisi Mebusan Zabıt Ceridesi*, Term 3, Assembly year 5, vol. 1, Ankara: TBMM Basımevi, 1992, p.300.

As can be seen from the above passage, Mehmet Emin Bey does not speak of an event that he saw with his “own eyes” and which he could not prevent after having talked to the Interior Minister Talat Pasha. On the contrary, according to Mehmet Emin Bey’s statements, the district prefect was removed from his post and put on trial. Therefore, the authors seem to have not been careful enough with regard to the reliability of the sources they utilized and accuracy of the quotations they presented.

The authors also discuss the role and activity of the prisoners that were released during the war. According to the authors, these people were released so as to annihilate Armenian convoys which were subjected to the relocation:

Upon an amnesty decreed by the Interior Ministry and the Ministry of Justice, thousands of ferocious criminals have been released from the prisons of Istanbul and other provinces to be used in the massacres, and after receiving the military training, they have been sent in the form of bands to their “mission” zones to eliminate the Armenian problem. Their mission was to ambush and destroy the Armenian convoys which were deported, and it can be said that they have thoroughly fulfilled their duties (p.173).

The authors, however, fail to adduce anything in support of this critical assertion while also indicating their lack of knowledge in that the use of prisoners for military duty during wartime had precedent and was used by other countries during the First World War.⁴ Moreover, the authors seem unaware that the persons whose names they held in high esteem and whom they mention with praise also rejected this allegation. For instance, in his testimony given at the Yozgat Trial “Cemal Bey, the lieutenant governor of Yozgat” whom the authors list in their article among the “real and sane Turks” and whom they praise as the “honor” of Turks, had indicated that this accusation was not correct. At the 11th session of the Yozgat Trial, the public prosecutor asked Cemal Bey the following question: “When we entered the Great War, a band was formed out of the able-bodied men from the prisons. There is the possibility that this could be about the Armenians. Is this the case?” In response, Cemal Bey stated that “These [prisoners] have not been released for the Armenians. In fact, I had been hearing that those who still kept misbehaving among these murderers were being hanged by the telegraph poles.”⁵

Ethical Problems

Throughout the article, the two authors present various passages dressed in quotation marks by referring to certain sources. However, a careful inspection of the footnotes provided by the authors reveal that the two authors have not actually seen or checked the

4 For example, “During World War I, U.S. courts released almost 8,000 men convicted of serious offenses on condition of their induction into military service.” Guenter Lewy, “Revisiting the Armenian Genocide,” *Middle East Quarterly*, Vol.12, No:4, 2005, p.8.

5 Nejdet Bilgi, *Yozgat Ermeni Tehciri Davası (Yozgat Trial)*, Istanbul: Kitabevi Yayınları, 2006, p.256; ?İkdam Version”.

sources they cited. Rather the authors seem to have copied these quotations and references, along with citation errors, from the works of other authors who had earlier utilized these sources. The limited examples discussed below may help to give the readers an idea on these points.

Plagiarism: On the Figures Given by Eşref Kuşçubaşı

In discussing the treatment accorded to the Christian populations in Western Anatolia in 1914, Temel Demirer and Sibel Özbudun provide the following information:

Eşref Kuşçubaşı, a leader in the Special Organization, says that alone in 1914, and in the first months of the war, the number of deported from “the Greek-Armenian population...who were settled and concentrated in the Aegean region, especially in the coastal areas” was 1,115,000 (p.172).

As their source for the sentence given within quotation marks in the above quote, the authors refer to the sixth page of a book by the Turkish author Cemal Kutay entitled *Birinci Dünya Harbinde Teşkilat-ı Mahsusa ve Hayber’de Türk Cengi (The Special Organization in WWI and the Turkish Battle at Khayber)* which comprises Kutay’s interviews with Eşref Kuşçubaşı, a prominent member of the Ottoman Special Organization (hereafter S.O.). Unfortunately, the general flow of the sentence given above, which the authors present as their own sentence, has been lifted from another book without proper acknowledgement. In discussing the deportation of Christians in Western Anatolia, in his book entitled *Ermeni Tabusu Aralanırken Diyalogdan Başka Çözüm Var mı? (As the Armenian Taboo is Exposed, Is There Any Solution Besides Dialogue?)*, Taner Akçam wrote the following:

Kuşçubaşı says that alone in 1914 and the first months of the war, the number of deported from ‘the Greek-Armenian population... who were settled and concentrated in the Aegean region, especially in the coastal areas’ was 1.150.000.⁶

As his source for the sentences given within quotation marks in the above passage, Akçam refers to the sixth page of Kutay’s aforementioned book. However, page six of the book in question does not contain any number or information which could form any basis for the above quotation. The sixth page is the last page of Cemal Kutay’s preface for his book and does not contain any statement made by Eşref Kuşçubaşı. Rather the number mentioned above can be found on the 60th page of Kutay’s work:

[I]t was plainly visible that if the Greek-Armenian population of 1,150,000 in the Aegean region, settled and concentrated especially in the coastal areas, had not

6 Taner Akçam, *Ermeni Tabusu Aralanırken Diyalogdan Başka Çözüm Var mı? (As the Armenian Taboo is Exposed, Is There Any Solution Besides Dialogue?)* Istanbul: Su Yayınları, 2002, p.225.

*been taken to the interior a short time before the outbreak of the war and during the first months of the war, then even the defense in Çanakkale [Gallipoli] would not have been possible.*⁷

When referring to this sentence and the figure given on the 60th page of Kutay's book, Taner Akçam mistakenly refers to the page "6" of the book in question. Taner Akçam repeats this reference error in all of his works that use this specific figure and statement from Kuşçubaşı.⁸ Following this reference error, Demirel and Özbudun, who have copied the quotation and reference word for word from Taner Akçam, also cites the incorrect page number of "6" in Kutay's work as a reference for their assertions. In addition, the two authors also make a copying error by incorrectly giving the number as "1,115,000", the correct version of which is given by Akçam and Kutay as 1,150,000. The figure of "1,150,000" deported, which is given for "1914 alone" is grossly exaggerated. There is no other source that verifies and corroborates the existence of a population movement on such a massive scale "in 1914 alone". That Akçam and the authors make this assertion by referring to Kuşçubaşı also does not change this reality.

Plagiarism: Celal Bayar and Numbers

Immediately after quoting the statement of Eşref Kuşçubaşı examined above, the authors contend that:

Celal Bayar, who quotes extensively from Kuşçubaşı's memoirs, gives separate figures for specific cities. The total number of these is the same as the figure above [i.e. 1,150,000] (p.172).

As their source for this assertion, the authors refer to the fifth volume and the 1576th page of Celal Bayar's memoirs, the title of which the authors give as *Ben de Yazdım (I, too, Have Written)*, and which they likely have not seen or checked. Unfortunately, this sentence, too, has been copied word for word and without proper acknowledgement from Taner Akçam's book mentioned above. In his footnote, Taner Akçam, after having provided an (inaccurate) reference to Kutay's book, adds the following information:

*Celal Bayar, who quotes extensively from Kuşçubaşı's memoirs, gives separate figures for specific cities. The total number of these is the same as the figure above.*⁹

7 Cemal Kutay, *Dünya Harbinde Teşkilat-ı Mahsusa ve Hayber'de Türk Cengi (The Special Organization in WWI and the Turkish Battle at Khayber)*, İstanbul: Tarih Yayınları, 1962, p.60.

8 Taner Akçam, *İnsan Hakları ve Ermeni Sorunu, İttihat ve Terakki'den Kurtuluş Savaşı'na*, Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 2002, p.191 footnote 452 Taner Akçam, *Armenien und der Völkermord: Die Istanbul Prozesse und die türkische Nationalbewegung*, Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2004, p.43; p.373, note 102. Taner Akçam, *From Empire to Republic: Turkish Nationalism and the Armenian Genocide*, London: Zed Books, 2004, p.147, p.156 note 120. Taner Akçam, *A Shameful Act: The Armenian Genocide and the Question of Turkish Responsibility*, New York: Metropolitan Books, 2006, p.106, p.403 note 150. Taner Akçam, *Ermeni Meselesi Hallolunmuştur*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2008, p.100 footnote 77.

9 Taner Akçam, *Ermeni Tabusu...(As the Armenian Taboo...)*, p.205 footnote 251

In support of this assertion, Akçam refers to page 1576 of the fifth volume of Bayar's work *Ben de Yazdım: Milli Mücadeleye Giriş (I, too, Have Written: Joining the National Struggle)*. However, since Akçam earlier referred to Bayar's memoirs in his study, in his subsequent references to these memoirs, Akçam provides an abridged version of its title as *Ben de Yazdım (I, too, Have Written)*. Not realizing this, Demirer and Özbudun, who lifted the sentence and the reference exactly from Akçam, assume that this abridged version, provided in Akçam's footnote, is the full title of the Bayar's memoirs and therefore they cite the title of this memoir in this incomplete form in their article. Another point demonstrating that the authors have copied the sentence and reference from Akçam is that they are again repeating a mistake made by Akçam. Notwithstanding Akçam's claims, the total of the figures given in Bayar's memoirs do not make 1,150,000 as had been claimed. The total of the figures given in Bayar's memoirs is 760,000:

*There were 120,000 Greeks concentrated in the region of Ayvalik gulf; 90,000 in the Çanakkale region (including the town itself); 190,000 in the capital of İzmir; 130,000 in the region from Urla peninsula and southeast İzmir to Çeşme; 80,000 in the environs of Aydın; 150,000 in and around Akhisar, Manisa, Alaşehir, and Uşak.*¹⁰

As Demirer and Özbudun have not actually seen or checked the source they cite, they could not notice this discrepancy and repeated Akçam's mistake in claiming that the total of the figures given in Bayar's memoirs is 1,150,000. Within this context, it is necessary to draw attention to another issue. Immediately after the above figures, Bayar's memoirs provide the following information as an addition: "As a result of the continuous emigration made from Greece [to these islands], there gathered a population of up to 150,000 in Mitylene, 70,000 in Chios, and 100,000 in Samos."¹¹

Presumably, adding these figures given for the islands to the other numbers mentioned above, Akçam reaches a figure close to "1,150,000". From this point, Akçam, thus, concludes that the figures provided by Bayar confirms and corroborates the number given by Kuşçubaşı in Kutay's aforementioned book. However, it should be noted that none of these three islands, which were lost to the Ottomans in 1912, were within the borders of the Ottoman Empire by 1914. Therefore any Ottoman-controlled population movement on these islands would be out of question. Moreover, a closer inspection of Bayar's memoirs reveal that the figures provided are given for population concentration in specific regions and have no relation whatsoever to the number of people deported. In addition as the figures in question seemed exaggerated, Bayar has added a footnote of caution stating that "[the accuracy of] these numbers have not been checked by myself."¹² Furthermore, upon hearing these figures, İsmail Canbolat, the general director

10 Celal Bayar, *Ben de Yazdım: Milli Mücadeleye Giriş (I, too, Have Written: Joining the National Struggle)*, Vol.5, Istanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1967, p.1576

11 Celal Bayar, *Ben de Yazdım... (I, too, Have Written)*, p.1576

12 Celal Bayar, *Ben de Yazdım... (I, too, Have Written)*, p.1576, footnote 1.

of security, is said to have remarked “How can this be possible? If a fourth of this number arrives at Mtylene, they would not be able to find a place to sleep.”¹³

Another book by Kutay, which apparently neither Akçam nor the authors have seen, provides a more accurate and precise information with regard to the origin of the figures in question. According to this work by Kutay, which also includes detailed statements of Kuşçubaşı, the figures in question were obtained from a book prepared by the University of Athens upon the request of Greek Government. Under a subtitle which reads “Why Are the Greek Offices Prone to Exaggerations?? Kutay’s book provides the following information about these figures:

In addition, we had the information which our agents at Athens relayed from the Archives of the Greek Foreign Ministry. This was the information taken from a book entitled “The Greekdom in the Aegean” and which the Greeks had the University of Athens prepare. According to the figures given here:

There were 120,000 Greeks living in the region of Ayvalık gulf; 90,000 in the Çanakkale region (including the town itself); 190,000 inside İzmir; 130,000 in the region from Urla peninsula and southeast İzmir to Çeşme; 80,000 in the environs of Aydın; 150,000 in and around Akhisar, Manisa, Alaşehir, and Uşak.

The same book also noted that as a result of the continuous emigration made from Greece [to these islands] only in the last two years, there was a population upwards of 150,000 in Mtylene, 70,000 in Chios, and 100,000 in Samos. İsmail Canbolat [general director of security], who listened to these figures, smiled and said “How can this be possible? If a fourth of this number arrives at Mtylene, they would not be able to find a place to sleep.”¹⁴

As can be clearly seen from the above passage, the figures given are identical to those provided in Bayar’s memoirs. In addition, the figures (which are described as being exaggerated) refer to the amount of population living in specific regions, and are entirely unrelated to the number for deported or relocated. As Demirer and Özbudun have never seen or checked the source they refer to, it has not been possible for them to take note of any of these confusing issues and figures.

Plagiarism: Colonel Seyfi, İsmail Canbolat and Teşkilatı Mahsusa

According to the authors the Ottoman Special Organization (Teşkilat-ı Mahsusa) had conducted operations to exterminate the Armenian convoys during their relocation. The authors even provide names of certain people who were supposedly in charge of these operations:

13 Cemal Kutay, *Emiki Eterya’dan Günümüze Ege’nin Türk Kalma Savaşı*, İstanbul: Boğaziçi Yayınları, 1980, p.213.

14 Cemal Kutay, *Emiki Eterya’dan Günümüze...*, pp. 212–213

Colonel Seyfi (Seyfi Düzgören who became a brigadier-general of the Turkish Republic which was to be established some time later), Director of Security Canpolat were also among the prominent persons in charge of S.O.'s annihilation campaign (p.172).

In support of their allegations, the authors refer to two different sources which again appear to have not been consulted or seen by them. The first one is a British Foreign Office document for which the authors give the following reference “Archive of British Foreign Office, FO 371/4173 File 345,” but provide no information on the date and the author of the document and to whom it was sent.

The other source that the authors use is one that does not actually exist: the 297th page of the second volume of Fuat Balkan's memoirs. Following the authors' false reference, the readers who do not have any preliminary knowledge on the subject may try to find, in vain, the second volume of Fuat Balkan's memoirs, which does not exist. What the authors are actually trying to refer to is the memoirs that were partially published in the 23rd issue (on pages 296 and 297) and the second volume (August 2, 1962) of a journal entitled *Yakın Tarihimiz (Our Recent History)*.¹⁵ In the previous and subsequent issues of the journal, the other parts of the memoirs were also published.¹⁶

Both of these sources cited by the authors as a reference for their claims have been lifted from the Turkish translation of the Armenian scholar Vahakn N. Dadrian's articles, which are published in Turkish in the form of collected essays¹⁷ It is remarkable that in neither of these sources is there any information on or any reference to İsmail Canbolat, the general director of security, whom the authors incorrectly name as “Canpolat”. It, thus, becomes rather difficult to comprehend how, on the basis of these two sources, Demirer and Özbudun could arrive at the conclusion that İsmail Canbolat was among the prominent persons in charge of “S.O.'s annihilation campaign” toward the Armenians.

Colonel Seyfi (Düzgören)'s name is mentioned in both sources. However, the information contained in these sources is entirely unrelated to the authors' allegations. According to the memoirs of Fuat Balkan, Colonel Seyfi had spoken rather positively on the services of Fuat Balkan in Western Thrace during the First World War and requested that Fuat Balkan be sent to the same region to assume new duties:

Starting the conversation, Seyfi Bey recounted, at length, how I worked under his command in the Special Organization throughout the whole First World War, especially the services I rendered for the motherland through the blows I have inflicted on the enemy forces in Western Thrace – with such praising expressions

15 “Fuat Balkan'ın Hatıraları,” *Yakın Tarihimiz (Our Recent History)*, Vol.2, No: 23, August 2, 1962, pp.296–297.

16 In 1998 these memoirs were republished in the form of a book by Arma Yayınları. See Metin Martı (haz.), *İlk Türk Komitacı Fuat Balkan'ın Hatıraları (Fuat Balkan's Memoires)*, İstanbul: Arma Yayınları, 1998.

17 Compare, Vahakn N. Dadrian, *Ermeni Soykırımında Kurumsal Roller (The Role of Institutions in the Armenian Genocide)*, Collection of Dadrian's Articles, İstanbul: Belge Yayınları, 2004, p.45, footnote 5 and 6. See also: the same book page 132, footnote 75; p.133 footnote 78; p.134.

that blushed me. And he wanted my appointment with the utmost possible speed for the duty which would be carried out in Western Thrace rather than being uselessly kept here. Addressing İsmet Bey, he said:

“- You’ll not have any financial difficulties. I have transferred the entire secret funds of the S.O. to you. He should be immediately sent to the duty.”¹⁸

The above passage is the only instance in the relevant source which contains any reference to Colonel Seyfi Bey, and which Sibel Özbudun and Temel Demirer attempted to refer to when declaring Colonel Seyfi among “the prominent persons” in charge of the S.O.’s annihilation campaign toward the Armenians.

The British document, which the authors refer to without examining, concerns the ill treatment which Colonel Seyfi is said to have accorded the prisoners of war during the war. There is no mention of either Armenians or the S.O. in the entire text of the document, which provides the following information in regards to Colonel Seyfi:

Seifi Bey, Chief of Military Intelligence at the Turkish War Office. It was chiefly owing to the studied and brutal indifference of this man to the constant requests of the American Embassy on behalf of the prisoners of war in Turkey that a great part of the mortality and suffering among them was due. Seifi Bey was vested with great power and might have relieved the conditions of the prisoners and it may be stated that he did as much as, if not more than, his associates to check and prevent the extension of assistance.¹⁹

To conclude on the basis of this document that Colonel Seyfi was among “the prominent members” of the S.O. “charged with the extermination” of the Armenian deportees requires quite a vivid imagination. However, as the authors have not actually consulted the document which they refer to, they also see no problem in using this document in this manner.

Plagiarism: Eşref Kuşçubaşı and Teşkilat-ı Mahsusa

In discussing the activities and the assignments of the S.O., the two authors, by referring to Kutay’s interviews with Kuşçubaşı, write that:

Eşref Kuşçubaşı, one of the principal leaders of the S.O., described the function of the organization as accomplishing the duties which the Government and the security forces “absolutely could not”, and also as the “execution of measures against non-Turkish nationality population clusters” (p.172).

18 “Fuat Balkan’ın Hatıraları... (Fuat Balkan’s Memoires), p.297. Also see: Metin Martı, *İlk Türk Komitacıları...*, p.50.

19 Public Record Office F.O. 371/4173, Folio 345. Report by the US Acting Secretary of the State William Philips, dated 20 Mach 1919, and sent to the US Ambassador in England.

As their source for the phrases given within quotation marks in the above passage, the authors refer to the pages 18, 38, and 78 of Kutay's aforementioned book that contains the interviews he conducted with Kuşçubaşı. Unfortunately, the phrase "*execution of measures against non-Turkish nationality population clusters*" given within quotation marks does not exist in the book, neither in the pages to which the authors refer nor in the other pages. Instead, there is another sentence that may seem similar, but essentially different to the one above:

*It is certain that during these years, the S.O. had rendered services which the visible forces of the government and law enforcement agencies could absolutely not accomplish, not only through the secret intelligence [gathering], but also through measures taken outside the Ottoman State, as well as in areas lying within its borders, but whose commitment and loyalty to the central [government] always raised suspicions and in which the non-Turkish races and nations formed the majority.*²⁰

Although the passage given above may seem similar to the text provided by the authors, the phrase offered by the authors within quotation marks (which reads "*execution of measures against non-Turkish nationality population clusters*") does not actually exist in the book. The discrepancy between these two versions of quotations creates a rather difficult situation for the authors to explain, who are expected to cite their sources by actually checking and reading these sources. Again, the real source of the authors' quotation is another work by the Armenian scholar Vahakn N. Dadrian that has been translated into Turkish. In this study, Dadrian states the following:

*[t]he other, a principal Special Organization Chief who had "assumed duties" in connection with the Armenian deportations, admitted to having accomplished things which the government and the law enforcement agencies "absolutely couldn't," namely, "the execution of measures against non-Turkish nationality population clusters".*²¹

As the source for the quoted passage above, the Turkish translation of Dadrian's article cites the pages 18, 38 and 78 of Kutay's book. The main reason for the difference between Kutay's original text and the quotation given by Dadrian is that the text has been translated twice. Dadrian had first used the quoted passage in his lengthy essay published in *The Yale Journal of International Law* in 1989 in English.²² Subsequently in 1995, this lengthy essay was translated into Turkish by Yavuz Alogan and was published in the form of a book by Belge Yayınları. Therefore, the quoted passage has been subjected to translation twice, first by Dadrian from Turkish to English, and then by Dadrian's

20 Cemal Kutay, *Birinci Dünya Harbinde... (The Special Organization in WWI...)*, p.18

21 Vahakn N. Dadrian, *Ulusal ve Uluslararası Hukuk Sorunu Olarak Jenosid: 1915 Ermeni Olayı ve Hukuki Sonuçları (Genocide as a Problem of National and International Law)*, İstanbul: Belge Yayınları, 1995, p.58.

22 Vahakn N. Dadrian, "Genocide as a Problem of National and International Law: The World War I Armenian Case and Its Contemporary Legal Ramifications," *The Yale Journal of International Law*, Vol.14, No:2, 1989, p.276.

translator from English to Turkish. Not realizing this point and the discrepancy that occurred between the two versions of the texts, Temel Demirer and Sibel Özbudun seem to have seen no harm in attributing their quotation and reference to Cemal Kutay's original book while, in fact, copying the sentence and the reference from Dadrian.

Within this framework, it is necessary to note that even though the text preserved in the original book by Cemal Kutay, and the version presented by Dadrian may seem similar, there exists a crucial difference between the two versions of quotations. In the original book, Eşref Kuşçubaşı spoke of the S.O.'s measures taken "*in areas?* in which the non-Turkish races and nations formed the majority" and not against a group of population. Dadrian, on the other hand, alters this expression into another one which reads "the execution of measures against non-Turkish nationality population clusters," and whereby he renders a certain population group as a target. Other scholars have also noted that Dadrian has on different occasions misrepresented the words of Eşref Kuşçubaşı.²³

Conclusion

On the basis of these examples, it seems appropriate to conclude that the author's article engages in serious violations of scholarly ethics and constitutes an act of disrespect toward their readers. Throughout, the authors arrive at inaccurate, controversial and even distorted conclusions on the basis of sources which they have not actually consulted or seen. The authors, who write and pass judgments on history, do not respect the scholarly and ethical requirements of the task, even at a minimum level.

The authors need to update and expand the level of their knowledge on the tragic events of 1915 since they are not familiar enough with the existing literature on the subject. Their interpretations of these tragic incidents remain bounded by a biased line drawn by scholars such as Dadrian and Akçam, which fail to provide a fair and accurate assessment of the tragic events of 1915. However, the in-depth knowledge on any given event alone cannot guarantee the accuracy of the conclusions that would be drawn since conformity to scholarly ethics and methodology are the indispensable preconditions in reaching accurate conclusions. Unfortunately, the article under review fails to fulfill both of these indispensable preconditions.

Demirer and Özbudun also dress their subtitles with rather meaningful quotations such as "*One of the most difficult things in the world is to think and say what everyone says without thinking*" (p.164). They seem, however, not to have grasped the essential message conveyed in this quotation, especially when one takes into consideration their conduct in the article in question. Therefore, Temel Demirer and Sibel Özbudun have to think more seriously about what this quotation might actually signify in relation to their article and the shortcomings associated with it.

23 Guenter Lewy, *The Armenian Massacres in Ottoman Turkey: A Disputed Genocide*, Salt Lake City: The University of Utah Press, 2005, p.85.

CONFERENCE REPORTS

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayşegül BAYDAR AYDINGÜN

Middle East Technical University
Department of Sociology

39th WORLD CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF SOCIOLOGY CONFERENCE REPORT

**The spirit of the 39th World Congress of the International Institute of Sociology:
Can sociology arrive at a reformulated understanding of dilemmas of humanity in
the contemporary world?**

The 39th World Congress of the International Institute of Sociology (IIS) took place at Yerevan State University, Yerevan, Armenia during 11-14 June 2009. The theme of the Congress was “Sociology at the Crossroads”. As mentioned by the Conference Organizers, the Congress in Yerevan had the same spirit of the five previous World Congresses of the IIS, which aimed at highlighting the dilemmas of human existence and societal institutions in the contemporary world. As usual, the encounter of various theoretical approaches among the members of the international community of sociologists was also one of the leading objectives of this Congress. Sociologists from more than forty countries participated to the Congress and more than eighty sessions were held.

The organization of the 39th World Congress, specifically in Yerevan was an indication of a search for the extension of sociological dialogue to new issues and regions of the world. Organizers have clearly expressed that the realization of the IIS Congress in Armenia was a conscious decision. It was mentioned in the opening presidential session that Armenia has been at the crossroads of civilizations. It is important to remind that historically, the Caucasus has always been a region where different Empires’ interests clashed, with a long history of conflicts and wars. It is possible to argue that nothing much has changed nowadays.

Currently, global actors are competing for power in the region, while regional actors are also trying to increase their influence. However, it is essential to realize that both global and regional actors determine their strategies by limiting their considerations to short term strategic and economic interests. They mostly ignore historical and sociological aspects and data. Such a myopic view is a high risk in a region in shaping. As known, the collapse of the Soviet Union caused the formation of new nation-states and a revival of nationalism during the process of national identity formation. Since the collapse,

these newly independent republics experienced a complicated transition period. Referring to Durkheim, this was defined by some colleagues as a situation of *anomie*.

In several sessions, many scholars have underlined the strategic importance of the region and the significance of Armenia and other countries of the region. Thus, the establishment of security and stability should be the main objective, not only for the benefit of the countries of the region, but also for the benefit of global actors. The new shape of the region will be to a certain extent, dependent on the capability of the global actors in understanding the factors that are influential in the region. Such understanding necessitates sociological knowledge. The need for sociological studies was also clearly expressed. Many of them have said that the region is an important laboratory for sociologists.

The following observation was crucial in the discussions: many colleagues touched upon the issue that sociology as a scientific discipline is not quite capable of finding solutions to the existing social problems. Thus, they have referred to the crisis of sociology; the necessity of considering the transnational dimension and transnational cooperation; the need for self-reflexivity in sociology; the need for establishing new intellectual avenues and the need for mobilizing the potential of sociology against eurocentrism and ethnocentrism. It was argued that the relative marginalization of the discipline, which is also one of the main reasons for its weakness in finding solutions to social problems, is due to this crisis. It was also indicated that sociology has lost, to a certain extent, its imagination and its potential to predict the future. Thus, sociologists have to rethink their discipline, think globally and develop a strong interdisciplinary engagement, which will render prediction and warnings about the future possible.

Within this framework, some colleagues have mentioned the weakness of the link between sociology and politics, or in other words, between sociologists and those in the position of decision-making. Related to this weakness, some have complained about the inefficient use of sociological knowledge for the well being of human societies. It was pointed out that sociologists can build bridges between different communities and can contribute to the resolution of certain conflicts, provided that their views are taken into serious consideration by those possessing the political power.

Sociologists can mobilize their knowledge and work together on new projects aimed at extending the sociological dialogue among the members of the transnational community of sociologists. It is important to consider the extension of a sociological dialogue to new regions of the world, and the potential of collaborative works among sociologists of different regions of the world. Such a dialogue has the capacity to develop new understandings with the help of a self-reflexive attitude, which will end the crisis of sociology.

Relatedly, the vitality of grasping the transnational dimension, which requires a transnational collaboration among the sociologists of different societies and regions of the world, was also among the main ideas expressed. In that perspective, the 39th World

Congress of IIS that took place in Yerevan was an important activity that made possible the encounter of sociologists from different countries. These included scholars from Armenian diaspora and from Armenia, Turkish scholars, scholars from many western European countries, from the US, as well as scholars from Africa, Iran, post-Soviet republics and Eastern Europe. This time in Yerevan, although from different cultural, ethnic, and ideological backgrounds, the sociologists' capacity to speak the same language and their potential for academic collaboration, was an impressive sight to witness.

In addition to the academic dimension, this Congress in Yerevan had also, for some colleagues, a personal and emotional dimension. It was a very good occasion for those sociologists from Armenian origin living in different countries to visit their historical homeland, including sacred places like the Saint Etchmiadzin Cathedral, which is the spiritual centre of all Armenians. As known, Etchmiadzin maintained its central role throughout centuries for Armenians independently of the residence of the Catholicos who moved to another place between 484 and 1441. Etchmiadzin continues to play a consolidating role for the Armenian nation and especially for the Armenian diaspora. I had the opportunity to observe that, for many scholars from the Armenian diaspora, this visit to Armenia had a very symbolic meaning.

My own experience as a Turkish sociologist was quite promising. The hospitality and gallantry which are specific to the region and especially to the South Caucasus were the most impressive characteristics that need to be highlighted. After having learned that it was impossible to enter Armenia with a Green (Official) Passport that Turkish civil servants possess, except official visits, I contacted the conference organizers in Armenia. The problem was immediately solved with an invitation letter from the Armenian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which gave me the possibility to enter the country without a visa. The Congress provided me with the opportunity to meet Armenian colleagues from Armenia including the president of the Armenian Sociological Association, who were very welcoming and ready for academic collaboration with Turkish sociologists. It was also thought-provoking to discern the relative differences between the attitudes of colleagues from Armenia with whom I felt that I share many cultural elements, especially as a Turkish citizen having roots in the South Caucasus, and those from the diaspora, the latter being more distant. However, it was equally thought-provoking to experience the power of personal interaction, which in most cases, wipes out this distance. Outside the congress hall, in shops, restaurants and museums, the people who were from where I come, did not change their attitudes when I said 'from Turkey'. In some cases, they hesitated for few seconds and then, continued to behave in the same manner. Thus, officially, academically, and also as a Turkish tourist walking in the city, I did not experience any negative attitude during my six-day visit.

Despite many conflicts related to issues having their sources deep in history, I had the opportunity to observe, especially among Armenian scholars, a belief in sociology in action, to construct a better future for all of us. While discussing with them, I have observed a readiness to come together and work together on topics of common interest. Through

sociological projects, it may be possible to generate collaborative bonds between sociologists from Armenia and Turkey. I had also the impression that such collaboration is possible on an entirely academic basis which will hopefully have political consequences and without sharing the same thesis about events of the past, requiring however, a sincere respect to each others' views. It is clear that such a new and challenging understanding which will take as starting point the accord signed in Zurich on October 10, 2009 between Armenia and Turkey, will definitely facilitate a large-scale collaboration between the sociologists of both societies. This will be most probably followed by institutional collaboration in the near future. This requires the courage to interact, to be ready for debates, and to large-scale collaborations among the sociologists of Armenia and Turkey. Such a large-scale academic initiative has to begin with an entirely new understanding and may be a good starting point aimed at contributing to the normalization of relations between the two societies. If realized, it can be an excellent example for other cases of conflict.

The development of relations among sociologists of both countries, who are capable of understanding the perceptions of different groups and nations, can contribute to the rapprochement between the two countries, by preparing mechanisms for exchange of thoughts, feelings, attitudes, and beliefs among people of both societies. It is vital to realize that the signing of the accord in Zurich between Armenia and Turkey is about the political dimension of establishing relations, once ratified in the parliaments of both countries. This is not necessarily enough for the normalization of the relations at the societal level. At this point, sociologists, as intellectuals operating outside the government, may play a role and they may mobilize their creativity and potential in reconciliation and in contributing to the development of democracy. The support of the intellectuals, academics, and non-governmental institutions of both societies is vital for the success of the above-mentioned political initiative.

As it is essential to realize that it is not possible to solve any conflict without the consent of the people involved, the re-establishment of trust between the two nations is essential. Sociologists have the potential to contribute to this re-establishment. They may also issue warnings concerning the chauvinistic nationalism and the formation of a destructive national identity. These characteristics of sociology, which was in fact present in the very formation of the discipline, should be developed with the help of self-reflection, as already mentioned, and will allow sociologists the possibility to revive their creativity and imagination.

I strongly believe that creating an atmosphere of scientific dialogue among Turkish and Armenian sociologists and discussing the ways sociology can arrive at a reformulation of an entirely new understanding that will put aside the old rhetoric is possible. An inclusive collaboration among sociologists and 'sociology in action' have the potential to contribute to the normalization of the relations between Armenia and Turkey, and to re-establish trust between the two nations. It is within this framework of reference that I have decided to share my observations, impressions and views as a sociologist.

“TURKEY-ARMENIA RELATIONS FROM PAST TO PRESENT: AN INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACH” ORGANIZED BY THE POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

Aslan Yavuz ŞİR
Specialist of AVİM
ayavuzsir@avim.org.tr

25-26 December 2009

Ankara University

Political Psychological Association (Ankara) organized a conference entitled “Turkish-Armenia Relations from Past to Present: An Interdisciplinary Approach” in 25-26 December 2009 at University of Ankara Rectorate conference room. During the conference, scholars, experts and journalists made presentations, exhibiting different perspectives to the subject. Participation to the conference and during the presentations was observably high. President of the Center for Eurasian Studies (AVİM) Retired Ambassador Ömer Engin Lütem had also made a speech entitled “Evolution and Present State of the Armenian Problem”. This report will try to summarize presentations made by the participants in the conference.

In the first presentation entitled “Historical and Political Dimension of Turkish-Armenian Relations”, Prof. Dr. Semih Yalçın from Gazi University Department of History claimed that there has been no Armenian problem for Turkish society, since all problems concerning this issue were all resolved at Lausanne Conference. However Yalçın argued as of today that the issue is tried to be brought back as a problem. Yalçın highlighted that from the viewpoint of Turkish-Armenian relations, 77-78 Ottoman-Russian War was a breaking point, which was followed by Balkan Wars and in the First World War, the state suffered increasing number of defeats which caused the Armenian problem to reach peak levels. Underlining that Tehcir (relocation) was a precaution against losing control over Ottoman lands, Yalçın claimed that Turkish state has also ignored Armenian problem in the beginning that was brought to international attention, but soon this shortfall was overcome by amplified academic and political attention to the issue. Prof. Yalçın argued that Armenian theses that the relocation was the cause for Armenian uprisings were ungrounded and in fact these uprisings constituted the main cause for the decision to relocate in this region.

Retired Ambassador and President of AVİM (Center for Eurasian Studies), in his presentation entitled “Evolution and Present State of the Armenian Problem” presented an overall and detailed analysis of Turkish-Armenian relations and the Attitude of the Armenian society. Touching upon the critical issues of Armenian

nationalism and Diaspora nationalism, Lütem argued that the fear of assimilation which arrived in about 1946 lies at the core of the current Armenian genocide claims that became a permanent discourse among the Diaspora and Armenian society. Thus, according to Lütem, opinion leaders of the Armenian society announced that in order to be able to overcome the threat of assimilation, it is necessary to refer and emphasize genocide as a propaganda tool while expand the idea of enmity towards the Turks, and to keep Armenian identity strong. Lütem indicated that Armenian terrorism which began in the 70s aimed to bring this propaganda for the recognition of Armenian genocide into international attention, thus we see several resolutions and decisions taken by different countries all over the world began to emerge in the 80s. Lütem argued that Armenian genocide propaganda was transformed into an “Armenian Genocide Industry” when Armenian terror ended to become an international political movement. As a result of the activities of this industry, the process was politicized and especially after 2000 Armenian genocide claims were slowly beginning to gain ground in Europe. Lütem indicated that Turkey recognized Armenia, but since the mutual problems could not be resolved, diplomatic relations could not be established, since Turkey’s three demands (1. Recognition of the territorial integrity, 2. Reaching a mutually agreeable solution about genocide claims, 3. Armenia reviewing its Karabakh policies) from Armenia were not acknowledged, Azerbaijan territory was occupied and consequently Turkey closed its borders with Armenia. Lütem underlined that the signing of the Protocols would bring mutual gains for both sides, but if examined, Turkey is more advantageous compared to Armenia in this process. Moreover, Lütem argued that ant possibility of a bottleneck during the process would be more harmful for Armenia than it would possibly be for Turkey.

In his presentation entitled “Psychological War and the Armenian Problem”, Dr. Murat Köylü from the 21st Century Turkey Institute argued that in the international arena and within Turkey, a psychological war is taking place. Köylü claimed that the propaganda activities that are defined in American intelligence field manuals as “limiting enemy’s will and capacity to exploit its power by delivering intentionally selected information and resources” are used in order to inject the Armenian problem into Turkey’s and global agenda, which Köylü argues had been successful until today.

Associate Professor Vahdet Keleşyılmaz from Gazi University Department of History, in his presentation entitled “A Humanist Approach to Turkish-Armenian Relations” argued that the Armenian problem must be evaluated as a whole while humanist perspective should be highlighted. Keleşyılmaz emphasized that when looked into the past, it is observable that Armenians are “the children of this country” even if religion, belief and values may differ, and common culture and common language must be taken as the fundamental basis for communication. In that respect, Keleşyılmaz claimed that the reasons behind relocation should not be forgotten, that the Ottoman state executed a responsible and inevitable policy, and that the suffering stemmed from state’s incapability and inability. Keleşyılmaz argued that the Armenian propaganda which prioritizes Armenian psychological suffering does not take Turkish suffering into

consideration, and that the psychology of wars and defeats deeply affected Ottoman policies before and during the relocation.

In his paper themed “The Juridical Dimension of the Armenian Issue”, Başkent University, Faculty of Law, Assoc. Prof. Sadi Çaycı dealt with the juristic validity of concepts such as the “recognition of genocide claims” and “apology” in terms of judicial process and practicality of the genocide law in the Turkish-Armenian relations. Çaycı, who mentioned the “Crime of Genocide (Prevention and Punishment) Law of 1948 and the non-applicability of statutory limitations to war crimes convention of 1968, questioned the identifiability of the issue with reference to these two conventions. Hereunder, Çaycı argued that the Ottoman Empire made efforts to compensate all probable moral and material damages and losses that may occur as a result of the endeavors to defend the homeland and suppress riots, investigate and prosecute the offenders and the deportation. Çaycı added that there are evidences that the Armenian had revolted against the Ottoman Empire and collaborated with enemy forces. He also emphasized that the legal relations between Turkey and Armenia have been settled with the article 15 of the Kars Treaty, the article 5 of Ankara Treaty and the article 58 and appendix VIII of the Lausanne Treaty. Çaycı stated that the 1915 incidents lie beyond the scope of the law of genocide, issues between Turkey and Armenia have not been settled yet but the Armenian side is still trying to impose a new legal framework on Turkey.

In his presentation themed “The Moral Aspect of the Armenian Issue”, METU Philosophy Department Chief, Prof. Ahmet Inam made assessments on the issue of morality, beginning from the antic Greek period to our day. Inam stated that in the West; morality evolved on individual basis and was defined not only through actions but also through characters. He focused on the practicality of this principle -which was defined as virtue morality by Aristotle- in International Relations. Inam accordingly stated that coexistence can only happen in an ideal state; but today’s conception of an ideal state and the moral responsibilities and characters of states are defective. In this context, he also dealt with the concept of “sojourn” which is one of the most significant qualities of Anatolia and states that in contrary to the West, “sojourn” and “hospitality” have developed as common moral values in Anatolia. These concepts conjure up the mutual responsibilities in Turkish-Armenian relations. Inam concluded that free will and honesty are the only ways to develop a moral approach towards Turkish-Armenian relations.

Chief of the Department of Psychology at the Ankara University Faculty of Medicine and President of the Political Psychology Association Prof. Dr. Abdulkadir Çevik, in his presentation entitled “Turkish-Armenian Relations: Psychological Dimension” argued that common values such as language and culture exists between Turkish and Armenian societies. Çevik highlighted that today some of the common values began to be lost and reasons behind this loss must be examined. Çevik indicated that Turkish society has also experienced sufferings in the past, but these sufferings are ignored by taking pride in the victories and successes. He claimed that it would a mistake to examine the past from a modern perspective. Çevik also argued that Armenians were attracted by the sympathy

towards the Jews after the Holocaust, but still Turkey's intervention in Cyprus in 1974 is claimed to play a huge role in the emergence of positive attitudes towards Armenian genocide claims. Çevik suggested that migrations cause national identity to suffer retrogress, desperation, marginalization and other difficulty experiences, which led to a struggle to overcome the assimilation via uniting society around hatred against the Turks. Çevik argued that Turkish society never uses otherization to define its identity or mourn the sufferings in the past, and underlined that any attempt for the normalization of Turkish-Armenian relations in the 90s and after 2000. Çevik suggested that Armenia's attack against Karabakh was in fact of symbolic value that Armenians could not dare to attack Turkey but what was seen as a part of the Turkish identity, namely Azerbaijani territory.

Prof. Hikmet Özdemir from Ankara University Department of Political Science (Mülkiye) has begun his speech by commemorating Gündüz Aktan. Özdemir, who has indicated that Turkish-Armenian relations have a unique depth and complexity, has also stated that Armenians have put forth a one-sided assertion and attempted to implement the Genocide Convention for the period before the Convention was signed. Özdemir has expressed that the events taking place in Anatolia during that time was due to the Ottoman Armenians resistances taking place under the command of the general staff of the hostile states and has underlined the fact that as a result of these resistances, massacres were committed against civil Ottoman society. He has also stated that a similar relocation has taken place by the U.S. against the Japanese community against the threat of a likely Pacific operation and that similar policies are being conducted worldwide. Özdemir has emphasized that the Ottoman State had no intention of annihilation, that no document or order exists which could prove this intention, and that those being negligent have been put on trial and punished. Moreover, he has drawn attention to the fact that commissions have been established for the protection of those being relocated and that this stands as the most important evidence in showing that no deliberate negligence exists within the state. Özdemir has stated that the Armenian resistance should not exist on any platform which is not based on the principles of international law. Özdemir who has expressed that the Armenian propagandas, from 2005 onwards, have also been put on the very top of the agenda in Turkey, has emphasized that the smear campaign continues to be carried out in Turkey. He has also said that it is necessary to be careful against the activities carried out under three headings of the restoration of monuments, visiting of Turkish territories by Armenians and the historical reviews of families.

In his presentation entitled "Diaspora's View of Turkey", director of International Strategic Research Organization, Assoc. Prof. Sedat Laçiner has characterized the Armenian Diaspora as one of the most influential Diasporas in the world. Laçiner has drawn attention to the idea that the Diaspora has been concentrated upon a case which holds them so close together that they could shed blood for this cause and that the emigration the Armenians have been exposed to and the events before and after 1915 have caused the creation of today's Armenian Diaspora. He has said that the Armenian society is based on the Anatolian culture; therefore, the divergence taking place after

1915 has led to a heavy destruction for the Armenians. Thus, Laçiner who has emphasized that the Armenian identity has been reformed after the emigration, has described Armenian nationalism as a “malcontent nationalism”. He has stated that the Armenian community has no story of victory and that generally they remember grievances and losses, therefore statelessness exist at the center of this dissatisfaction. Laçiner who has stated that the Armenian political parties, by using these emotions, have started creating new political identities for the Armenian community being exposed to assimilation, has also expressed that this hatred exists at much higher levels within the 2nd and 3rd generations. He has indicated that this hatred of the Armenian Diaspora against Turks will only be abolished if communication channels open between the two sides and that the base of the Armenian identity will also be gotten rid of. Laçiner has also stated that he is hesitant of the abolishment of this psychological barrier between the Turks and Armenians and has reacted because of this reason.

Member of Linguistics, History and Geography Faculty (DTCF), Ankara University, Prof. Dr. Birsen Karaca, in her presentation entitled “The Contributions of Armenian Scriptwriters to the Efforts in Establishing a New Social Consciousness”, has analyzed the references existing in the Armenian literature and media during the process of creating a social consciousness. Within this framework, Karaca has based her research on the reason for including the Armenian allegations, these allegations showing a continuity and targeting Turkey. In her research, she has examined the Turkish image within the Armenian social consciousness being described as representing all bad characteristics not belonging to Armenia within the scope of cinema, literature and articles published in the media. Karaca has stated that after the second half of the 20th century, “genocide” has been used instead of the word “relocation” found in all these articles. This way, Karaca has emphasized that the relocation has started to be explained in a way that is far from the historical truth. Karaca who has put forth that the Armenian social memory is focused on the 1915 relocation, has also stated that the Armenian terror has tried to be justified by asserting that it has arisen due to the 1915 events and that rather than regretting the Armenian terrorist activities, grudge and revenge has been brought forth.

TURKSAM Coordinator Asst. Prof. Dr. Şenol Kantarcı in his speech entitled “The Role of Armenian Diaspora in Turkish-Armenian Relations” suggested that Armenians had been one of the most loyal and progressive part of the Ottoman Empire. But with the role of major developments in international politics such as the emergence of Industrial Revolution that was followed by the emergence of nationalism, nationalities in the Ottoman Empire were attracted by the national and independent state idea, which lead to revolts and dissolution. Armenians were among the sympathizers of the nationalism movements, which were soon induced by countries such as Russia, France, Britain, United States and Germany. According to Kantarcı, these states had ambitions in the Ottoman lands and they aimed to gain more influence in the region. During the World War I, Ottoman Empire found itself encircled and fighting in several fronts, which forced the state to take precautions against the internal conflicts that may have harmful effects

on the integrity of the state. Kantarcı argued that the relocation of the Armenians took place in extraordinary conditions, but still Ottoman state successfully relocated these Armenians by making huge efforts. He argued that today Armenian problem is a reflection of the past experiences, as foreign involvement in the problem, such as an alienated and marginalized Diaspora has an active role today in Turkish-Armenian relations. Moreover, Kantarcı argued that unless Karabagh problem is resolved Armenia's aggression could not be tolerated.

Murat Yetkin from the Radikal Newspaper has shared his views about the process starting with his interview conducted with the Armenian President Sarkisian in 2008 to the signing of the Protocols. By touching upon the fact that Armenia does not have the luxury to ignore Turkey, Yetkin has conveyed that Armenia must develop its relations with Turkey.

Prof. Dr. Temuçin Faik Ertan, Director of the Institute of Turkish Revolution History has touched upon the problems existing during the process of explaining and examining the Armenian question. According to him, the education system in Turkey has not been able to provide enough information to the students at the sufficient level and depth. By criticizing the defensive approach taken by academicians and politicians in Turkey against Armenian allegations, Ertan has underlined that Armenians must prove their allegations. Ertan has stated the Ittihat and Terakki have made a difficult decision during that period under strained political and military conditions. He has emphasized that today Armenian question is a political subject being based entirely on global and regional origins.

Ercan Çitlioğlu, the Director of the International Security and Strategic Research Center of Bahçeşehir University, has assessed the decision, draft and other documents which have brought the genocide allegations on the agenda. When examined historically, Çitlioğlu has expressed that the U.S. has been the greatest supporter of the Armenian allegations both on the provincial level and within the international sphere. Moreover, he has drawn attention to the 1974 Cyprus Peace Operation which has been a breakthrough for the U.S. in bringing the international recognition of the Armenian genocide allegations on the agenda. Çitlioğlu who has expressed that the Armenian terror starting in 1975 has been a result of this breakthrough, has also stated that during the same period, draft resolutions in the U.S. have started to be put on the agenda on 24 April. By drawing attention to the American activities in Anatolia before the First World War, Çitlioğlu has said that the U.S. has always been at the center of the Armenian question before 1915 when the problem first arose, and after. Stating that the Treaty of Lausanne is a victorious document, Çitlioğlu has emphasized the necessity to review the Lausanne records in depth in order to bring light upon the process of reaching this victory. Çitlioğlu, reading extracts of the dialogues of Dr. Rıza Nur with the foreign representatives found in the records of the Minority Commission, has expressed that Turkey's proud and honorable attitude displayed during the victory of Lausanne has been forgotten today.