



The Tragedy of Cilicia in the Pages of The New York Times



Tatul Hakobyan
Yerevan

Official Turkish historiography, when it attempts to deny the fact of the Armenian Genocide on Ottoman Turkey's territory, presents three fundamental "justifications." The first, it was war and a world war at that and in that process not only Armenians, but also Turks fell victim. Second, Armenians were organizing volunteer units and were fighting among the ranks of Russian forces against the Ottoman Empire. Third, Armenian political parties, in particular

the Social Democratic Hinchak Party and the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, through rebellion were fostering hatred within the Ottoman fatherland and whose objectives were to create an independent Armenia.

Turkish "justifications" are clearly discredited, when as a subject of study, one looks at the Armenian massacres in Cilicia in 1909, which were realized in two stages - April 14-18 and April 25-28. What war was there in 1909? What volunteer units? And finally, not only did Armenian political parties of the day in 1909 not rebel against the Ottoman Empire and not have a plan for the creation of an independent Armenia, but on the contrary, they were cooperating with the Ittihad ve Tarekki (Union and Progress Party), who were in power.

The declaration of the Ottoman Constitution in 1908 by the Young Turks and its slogans of freedom, justice and equality, were greeted with joy and hope for the future by the Christians in the Ottoman Empire, especially by the Armenians, who during the reign of Abdul Hamid, primarily 1894-1896 were subjected to massacres. The massacres in April of 1909 in Cilicia quickly dissipated those hopes.

The reasons for the Armenian massacres, according to some researchers are several. The first, that apparently in Cilicia, the Armenians were planning the creation of an independent state. Secondly, the Armenians in Cilicia were financially better off (which is the reality because of their talent and work ethic) than the Turks and Kurds. The third reason is the March 31, 1909 movement in Constantinople when the Union and Progress Party temporarily lost control against the regime of Abdul Hamid.

Exactly one century has passed since those days, when on the banks of the Mediterranean (where in the Middle Ages, for three hundred years the Armenian state of Cilicia flourished) the massacre of the Armenians took place, which are better known as the Adana massacres or by the name the Tragedy of Cilicia. Almost 30,000 Armenians were killed; 7883 children were orphaned; 4072 women became widows and close to 30,000 people became homeless. In the end, 32 Armenian churches, 19 schools, 2923 homes and 593 stores were looted and burned to the ground.

In 1909 The New York Times covered dozens of stories about the Cilicia tragedy. Below are some of them.

"Days of Horror Described; American Missionary an Eyewitness of Murder and Rapine"

The New York Times, April 28, 1909

Adana, April 27 The Rev. Herbert Adams Gibbons of Hartford, a missionary of the American Board of Foreign Missions stationed here and at Tarsus, was an eyewitness of the scenes of terror and destruction at the center of the Moslem uprising. He gives the following story of massacre, rapine and incendiarism:

"The entire villayet of Adana has been visited during the last five days with a terrible massacre of Armenians, the worst ever known in the history of the district. The terror has been universal, and the Government is powerless to check the disorders. Adana, the capital of the province, has been the storm center."

"Conditions have been unsettled for some time past, and there has been animosity between

Turks and Armenians, owing to the political activity of the latter and their open purchasing of arms."

"Early last Wednesday morning, while I was in the market, I noticed that the Armenians were closing their shops and hurrying their homes. An Armenian and a Turk had been killed during the night and the corpses were paraded through their respective quarters. The sight of the dead inflamed the inhabitants, and crowds at once began to gather in the streets armed with sticks, axes, and knives. A few young Armenians assembled in the center of the covered market and began firing revolver shots into the air."

"The military commander of Adana was by my side in the market when the firing commenced. He had not the courage to endeavor to disperse the mob: he returned to his residence and did not venture out for two days."

"Willam Chambers, Field Secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association, and myself proceeded to the Konak and found a howling mob demanding arms with which to kill the Giaours. We then went to the telegraph office to summon the British Consul. On the steps of the building we saw three Armenians who had been killed. Their bodies had been mutilated. While we were in the telegraph office a mob burst into the room where we were and killed two Armenians before our eyes. The unfortunates were supplicating the protection of the Vali when they were struck down."

"That afternoon the situation grew distinctly worse. The Armenians withdrew to their quarter of Adana, which is situated on a hill, and converted the houses that held advantageous positions into fortresses. Here the fighting went on for two days, during which the Armenians succeeded in beating off their Turkish assailants."

"Wednesday evening Major Daughy-Wylie, the British Vice Consul at Mersina, arrived at Adana and established headquarters in the house of the dragoman of a wealthy Greek resident, where many refugees had been received. The wife of the British Vice Consul, who was brought into Adana under fire on Thursday, tended personally to many wounded women and children."

"Adana was a hell. The bazaars were looted and set on fire. There was continuous and unceasing shooting and killing in every part of the town, and fires raged in many quarters."

"Moslems from the neighborhood began pouring into the city, and notwithstanding our protests, the Vali distributed arms to these men, alleging that they were Turkish reserves."

"Major Daughy-Wylie, at the head of troops which he compelled the Vali to supply, went to the railroad station of the town and was successful in preventing the villagers from coming into Adana. Later, while the Major was attempting to pacify the town he was shot and disabled."

"On Thursday Daniel Miner Rogers and Henry Maurer, American missionaries, were killed under treacherous circumstances."

"Adana is in a pitiable condition. The town has been pillaged and destroyed, and there are thousands of homeless people here without means of livelihood. It is impossible to establish the number of killed. The corpses lie scattered through the streets. Friday, when I went out, I

had to pick my way between the dead to avoid stepping on them."

"The condition of the refugees is most pitiable and heartrending. Not only are there orphans and widows beyond number, but a great many, even the babies, are suffering from severe wounds."

"The situation in Adana itself is unspeakable. On Friday afternoon 250 so-called Turkish reserves, without officers, seized a train at Adana and compelled the engineer to convey them to Tarsus, where they took part in the complete destruction of the Armenian quarter of that town. which is the best part of Tarsus. Their work of looting was thorough and rapid. It is said that they spread with kerosene and fired the great historic Armenian Church at Tarsus, the most important building in the city. They demolished marble statues and shattered important historic tablets. Everything portable was carried away, but the church itself resisted their attempts to burn it. Fortunately few persons were killed here. This was owing to the proximity of the American College, where 4.000 destitute and homeless persons had sought and found shelter."

"Brooklyn Man Saw Missionaries Shot: Stephan Trowbridge Describes Killing of Rogers and Maurer by Moslems at Adana"

The New York Times, May 2, 1909

Stephan Trowbridge of Brooklyn, a missionary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, was the only American or European who was an actual eye-witness of the killing in Adana of D. M. Rogers and Henry Maurer, fellow missionaries at Adana. Mr. Trowbridge has supplied the following account of the occurrence, dated Adana, April 24, to representatives of the Grand Vizir, and he has written it out also for the Mission Board at home.

"... So we came back to the school and asked for volunteers. Mr. Rogers came at once. He had been in Miss Wallace's house and did not know how close the fire had come. He carried water back and forth three times. Mr. Maurer was using the crowbar against a wall, and I, higher up on the roof, was pouring water on places just catching fire. We had thus worked a considerable time without being harmed by the Moslems when the Armenians at the other end of the street commenced firing on the houses where the looters were at work. Suddenly two shots rang out not more than eight yards from where we were working. Mr. Rogers who was in the street bringing water, was mortally wounded. He called to me by name and then fell in the middle of the street. The other bullet hit Mr. Maurer in the left lung near the heart, a wound that caused him to suffer great pain. The crowbar fell from his hands. He then climbed down the ladder and collapsed at the side of Mr. Rogers.

"I dropped almost flat on the roof and made my way to the edge, whence I could see Mr. Maurer climbing down the ladder with the great difficulty. I could also hear Mr. Rogers groaning. My first thought was to help my two comrades home to have their wounds treated. Consequently, without concealing my intention, I stepped to the lower roof and climbed down the same ladder Mr. Maurer had used. It was clear that both men would have to be carried in. I went on rapidly to the school to tell Dr. Thomas D. Christie and Mr. Frederick W. Macallum."

"Just then the British Vice Consul at Mersina, Major Daughy-Wylie, arrived with twenty Turkish soldiers on a tour of the city. They rode up and found Mr. Rogers and Mr. Maurer lying wounded in the street. The entire neighborhood was deserted. The soldiers were ordered to the roofs to fire in several directions, but by this time the murderers had disappeared."

"Mr. Maurer died a few minutes later in the school building, and Mr. Rogers lived only a few minutes longer than Mr. Maurer. He did not regain consciousness."

"Both men passed peacefully away. They died as good soldiers of Jesus Christ."

"Massacres Continue Adana Terrorized: Thousands of Soldiers Loot, Shoot, and Burn-French Schools Destroyed: Apprehension for Hadjin and Tarsus, Dead Number 30.000, Armenian Women Traded for Horses"

The New York Times, May 5, 1909

Adana, May 3- Adana is still lawless. More people were killed in the city yesterday.

Adana is terrorized by 4,000 soldiers, who are looting, shooting, and burning... The new Governor has not as yet inspired confidence. There is reason to believe that the authorities still intend to permit the extermination of all Christians... There are 30.000 dead in Adana Province as a result of the massacres, and 35.000 homeless and penniless refugees are wandering in the villayet. The deaths in Adana City alone are estimated at 6.500.

Tatul Hakobyan is the author of the book "Green and Black, Artsakh Diary." Next year his second book will be published called "Looking from Ararat, Armenians and Turks." Tatul Hakoyan is a political analyst with the US based Armenian Reporter weekly.

30,000 KILLED IN MASSACRES

Conservative Estimate of Vic-
tims of Turkish Fanaticism
in Adana Vilayet.

DEADLY WORK CONTINUES

Tribesmen Besiege Towns and
March on Others—Messengers
to American Women Slain.

CLASH FEARED AT BEIRUT

Druses Gather to Avenge Murder of
Deputy and Mohammedans Pre-
pare to Oppose Them.

Going in circles with Turkey: lack of pre-conditions undermines Armenia's
position



Emil Sanamyan

USA

Special for Analyticon

President Serge Sargsian admitted on April 17 that eight month-long negotiations with Turkey may not result in a breakthrough after all. At the same time he appeared willing to continue talking until the return World Cup qualifying match between Armenia and Turkey in October.

While one might understand the desire of President Sargsian to support the struggling national team amid hostile crowds, no new decisive circumstances are likely to emerge in the next four months to push Turkey or Armenia to change their policies to allow for headway in talks.

Third failure

Thus, President Sargsian's attempt to engage Turkey is likely to soon become the third such effort by an Armenian government to fail since Armenia's independence.

Administration of President Levon Ter-Petrossian was first to try to launch a new relationship with Turkey without pre-conditions. In the end Ter-Petrossian proved unable to either subdue diaspora activism on the genocide issue or restrain Armenian military success in Karabakh to be able to satisfy Turkey's demands for normalization of relations.

Turkey's decision to talk to the Robert Kocharian government came after Armenia caught Turkey's attention by threatening to veto the OSCE summit from taking place in Istanbul in 1999 and the publicity surrounding 2000 push for an Armenian genocide resolution in the U.S. House of Representatives.

President Kocharian agreed to talk to Turkey first by indirectly supporting an informal Track II initiative the Turkish-Armenian Reconciliation Commission (TARC) and then through direct talks between foreign ministers. But those efforts, also conducted on the basis of no-preconditions by Armenia, too brought little progress.

The most recent round of talks initiated by President Sargsian came amid the rise of a U.S. administration comprised of past supporters of genocide affirmation and as Turkey drew politically close to Armenia's ally Russia.

For now, the only noticeable success of the Sargsian administration has been procedural:

Turkey no longer insists on talking to Armenia in the presence of Azerbaijan. (This has visibly irritated the easily irritable Azerbaijani government.)

The on-again off-again Armenia-Turkey talks have also helped build up some reservoir of mutual respect.

But factors encumbering progress in relations continue to prevail over arguments for change.

After addressing immediate concerns related to Russia's role in the Caucasus and the Obama Administration's position on Armenian genocide, Turkish leaders have returned to pre-conditions linking relations with Armenia to its unilateral compromises in bilateral relations and on Karabakh.

Skewed priorities

The fundamental disconnect between Turkey and Armenia is due each country's weight in international affairs. Turkey has more than 20 times the population, 17 times the territory and 10 times the armed forces than Armenia and can simply afford to ignore Armenia's concern so long as they are not also raised by great powers.

Additionally, Turkey's priorities appear tangible and clear, Armenia's not so much.

First and foremost, seeking to become one of the world's most important countries Turkey wants an end to the embarrassing campaign of Armenian genocide recognition. It is no accident that each new bout of high-level Armenia-Turkey talks follows new developments in the genocide campaign.

Turkey also wants Armenia to surrender, on behalf of Armenians worldwide, any claims real or financial that stem from the mass violation of the basic rights of Ottoman Armenians and subsequent generations of Turkish Armenians.

Finally, although less insistently, Turkey wants Armenia to commit to compromises over the Karabakh conflict that would satisfy Turkey's co-nationals in Azerbaijan.

What does Armenia want as part of normalization? Nothing, Armenia has declared repeatedly, there are no pre-conditions.

That leaves having diplomatic relations and an open border with Turkey as Armenia's priority.

But that makes little sense from the point of view of real Armenian interests with regard to Turkey and in Karabakh. More immediately such posture undermines Armenia's negotiating position with Turkey.

Why pre-conditions are needed

Diplomatic ties and open borders alone do not imply ♦normal♦ or even non-hostile relations. There are countries in the world that have an open border while engaging in a direct confrontation.

At the same time, it would be quite reasonable for Armenia to want Turkey to condemn past violence against Armenians, stop discriminating against Armenians and protect Armenian cultural heritage remaining on Turkey♦s territory, and for Armenia to so state as part of a normalization process.

Moreover, a less biased Turkish position on the Karabakh dispute could serve as indication that Turkey no longer condones genocidal policies against Armenians and is finally ready to accept a viable Armenian state on its border.

It is understandable that such policies will take time for Turkey to warm up to. But with these issues absent from bilateral conversations, talks inevitably shift to what Turkey wants ♦ an end to recognition campaigns and a pledge to not make any claims.

Since an Armenian government can never deliver on these demands, even if it tried, this leaves conversations going around in circles.

Even those Turkish officials who genuinely want a normal relationship with Armenia have a hard time justifying a change of policy towards Armenia without Armenia reciprocating in any obvious way.

Arguments that a border opening would be mutually beneficial are not convincing ♦ Armenia is small country that can be bypassed and the Turkish regions bordering on Armenia carry little weight in Ankara♦s decision-making process.

Pre-conditions have become a dirty term in Armenia♦s political lexicon. In fact, they are a common way to outline one♦s priorities in any negotiation.

By obfuscating own priorities, the successive Armenian governments have only confused their own public as well as Turkish interlocutors and have not helped achieve a normalization of relations.

Top Twenty Tall Turkish Tales

Lucine KASBARIAN
USA

1. That Turks, who turned up in Anatolia from Central Asia thousands of years after the ancient Hittite, Urartian, Armenian, Assyrian, Greek, Roman, and Byzantine structures in present-day Turkey were constructed, are somehow responsible for having built them.

2. That Turks and Armenians lived in peace, brotherhood, and equality ever since the Seljuk Turkish invasions, and that the Ottoman Empire was a model of tolerance towards its subject peoples.

3. That the Ottoman massacres of hundreds of thousands of Armenian civilians in 1894-1897 and 1909 were simply examples of Turkish self defense.

4. That there was no Armenian Genocide. The deaths were just an unfortunate consequence of civil war or wartime conditions. But if there was a genocide, it was Armenians who committed it.

5. That US Ambassador Morgenthau, American and European diplomats, missionaries and others who witnessed and wrote about the Genocide were not credible since they disliked Turks. Even German eyewitnesses (allies of Turkey in World War I) were not credible since they disliked Turks too.

6. That the hundreds of historians and genocide experts who confirm that there was an Armenian Genocide have all been duped by Armenians.

7. That those peoples who ♦revolted♦ against the Ottomans or Turkey deserved whatever the Turks did to them because all such revolts were unjustified. (The Young Turks ♦ revolt against the Ottoman Sultan in 1908, on the other hand, was entirely justified.)

8. That the Armenian death toll was ♦only 600,000,♦ not 1.5 million, hence the deaths could not be considered a genocide.

9. That due to wartime necessity, the ♦deportations♦ were limited to Armenians from the eastern part of the Ottoman Empire (even though, in fact, Armenians from all parts of the Empire were ♦deported♦).

10. That the Ottoman Turkish archives are fully open, haven♦t been tampered with, and prove that Turkey did not commit the Armenian Genocide.

11. That the Genocide survivors and their descendants seek recognition, reparations, restitution, restoration, and return of their so-called historic homeland out of delusion and greed.

12. That the enormous amount of territory allocated to Turkey in the 1920 Treaty of Sèvres was somehow inadequate.

13. That teaching and talking about the Armenian Genocide is a form of hate speech.

14. That Turkey and Armenia would be ♦reconciled♦ by now were it not for the malevolent Armenian Diaspora which, instead of acting in Armenia♦s best interests, vilifies Turkey with

baseless allegations. (Naturally, Turkey acts only in Armenia's best interests.)

15. That Turkey's proposal to hold a joint historical commission on 1915 -- which would include denialist historians -- is not a delaying tactic, but is sincere and would arrive at a truthful verdict.


16. That the Nagorno-Karabagh Republic (NKR) is not historically Armenian; that it was the Armenians in Karabagh who initiated pogroms against Azeris; and that NKR is not entitled to self-determination.

17. That Turkey is qualified to be a member of the European Union and should have been admitted years ago (even if it violates the human rights of its population, stifles free speech, and condones torture).

18. That Turkey is a loyal NATO ally (even if it threatens the United States and Europe and rejects US requests for military cooperation).

19. That if the Genocide resolution passes in the US Congress, Turkey will severely punish the United States.

20. That Turkey's efforts to penetrate the Caucasus and Central Asia are not attempts to fulfill a longstanding ambition to create a Pan-Turkic empire.



The United States, Turkey and the Armenian Genocide



Ara S. Ashjian

An Iraqi Armenian settled in Yerevan, Armenia

The election of Barak Obama as U.S. President brought a new hope to Armenians worldwide that another U.S. President could recognize the Armenian Genocide fulfilling his campaign promise. U.S. President Ronald Reagan in 1981 and U.S. House of Representatives twice (in 1975 and 1984) recognized the Armenian Genocide. However, the historical fact of the

Armenian Genocide does not need such confirmation, which will not bind Turkey to recognize it. 21 countries in the world (beside international bodies and political figures) and 42 U.S. states had recognized the Armenian Genocide so far.

Everything changes fast in this world; no eternal allies and interests. US-Turkey relations were changed during and after Iraq's invasion in 2003 and Turkey-Israel relations were also changed after Gaza's military operations and Turkey's stance on this issue. Turks themselves accept that the new U.S. administration is the most pro-Armenian administration ever. Let us look at the history of recognizing the Armenian Genocide and the successes of the Armenian Cause in the last 40 years and learn lessons from. Armenians should concentrate on "Recognition" of the Genocide, "Restitution" for losses suffered and "Return" of Our historical lands. Only Recognition is not enough. Meanwhile, Armenians should all engage in boosting Armenia's economy and keeping the liberated Artsakh-Karabakh (NKR) Republic. Armenians in Diaspora also have to pay attention to the other main goal: preserving our language and identity. The newly established Ministry of Diaspora should boost this aim. The Armenian government should put the priority of repatriating Armenians of Diaspora.

I think that recognizing the Armenian Genocide by the U.S. President for the second time will not damage U.S.-Turkey relations as some politicians assume. Nothing happened when President Reagan recognized the Armenian Genocide in 1981. Turkey will "warn" and "threaten" but nothing will be changed. Let us remember what happened when France and Germany and other European countries, which have strong relations with Turkey, recognized the Armenian Genocide.

On April 8, 2009, the Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan confirmed that Nagorno-Karabakh's status must be resolved before Turkey and Armenia can open full diplomatic relations. Armenian Foreign Minister Eduard Nalbandian called the statement an attempt to scuttle the talks.

"Turkey sets a number of preconditions including abandoning demands for international recognition of the Armenian genocide and NKR conflict settlement on Azerbaijan-stipulated terms. This is what we'll never sacrifice for normalization of ties. Both Turkey and Azerbaijan are aware of it," RA president stated.

Political analysts expected that Turkey would wait until April 24 this year to see if U.S. President Barak Obama uses the word ♦Genocide♦ in describing the mass killings of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire. The analysts believed that Turkey, then, would decide its steps towards Armenia: to open the borders it closed in 1993 and to establish diplomatic relations with Armenia.

The latest developments, however, showed that Turkish officials, after U.S. President Obama's visit and remarks on the Armenian Genocide, concluded that Obama will use the term "Genocide" in his first annual speech on April 24. This shows that external motives, rather than national interests, inspire Turkey in its foreign policy.

In a letter to Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice on July 28, 2008, then Sen. Obama described the official U.S. position on the events of 1915-23, which is not to describe them as a genocide, as "untenable." He reminded Ms. Rice that "the occurrence of the Armenian genocide in 1915 is not an 'allegation,' a 'personal opinion,' or a 'point of view.' Supported by overwhelming evidence, it is a widely documented fact."

International Crisis Group - New Report

Turkey and Armenia: Opening Minds, Opening Borders

Istanbul/Yerevan/Baku/Brussels, 14 April 2009: Turkey and Armenia should seize their best opportunity yet to normalise relations, work on a new approach to shared history and open a European border that for nearly a century has been hostage to conflict.

Turkey and Armenia: Opening Minds, Opening Borders,* the latest report from the International Crisis Group, examines how a decade of academic and civil society outreach laid the foundations for what is now intense official engagement between the governments. The two sides are now close to agreement on a package deal that will establish diplomatic relations, open the border and set up bilateral commissions to address a range of issues.


These commissions will include one on joint historical dimensions of the Armenian-Turkish relationship, which will work to broaden understanding of the Ottoman-era forced relocations and massacres of Armenians, widely recognised as the Armenian genocide. Turkey contests the term genocide, disputing its legal applicability and pointing to mitigating circumstances as the Ottoman Empire fought on three fronts in the First World War. But many Turks, including officials, now publicly express regret over the tragic and high loss of Armenian life.

◆Turks◆ and Armenians◆ once uncompromising views of history are significantly converging, showing that the deep traumas can be healed◆, says Hugh Pope, Director of Crisis Group◆s Turkey/Cyprus Project. ◆At this sensitive time, third parties should avoid statements or resolutions in the politicised debate over genocide recognition or denial that could inflame opinion on either side◆.

A separate but related issue, the stalemated Armenia-Azerbaijan conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh, still risks undermining final agreement on the Turkey and Armenia normalisation package. Azerbaijan opposes any border opening until Armenia withdraws from its occupied territory. But Turkey should not sacrifice this chance to move forward, and should persuade its ally that détente which makes Armenia feel secure will do more for a settlement than continuing a fifteen-year impasse.

For long-term normalisation with Turkey to be sustainable, Armenia, together with Azerbaijan, should ultimately adopt the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) Minsk Group basic principles for settlement of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict of the OSCE, and Armenia should withdraw from Azerbaijani territories that it occupies.

◆Turkey and Armenia should finalise their agreement and thus create new momentum for peace and cooperation in the South Caucasus◆, says Sabine Freizer, Crisis Group◆s Europe Program Director. ◆They should not wait until the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict is settled. But outside powers such as the U.S., EU, Russia and others should build on their rare common interest to move both Turkish-Armenian normalisation and the Nagorno-Karabakh process

forward .

Contacts: Andrew Stroehlein (Brussels)

+32 (0) 2 541 1635

Kimberly Abbott (Washington)

+1 202 785 1601

To contact Crisis Group media please click here

*Read the full Crisis Group report on our website: <http://www.crisisgroup.org>

The International Crisis Group (Crisis Group) is an independent, non-profit, non-governmental organisation covering some 60 crisis-affected countries and territories across four continents, working through field-based analysis and high-level advocacy to prevent and resolve deadly conflict.

Turkey and Armenia: Opening Minds, Opening Borders

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Turkey and Armenia are close to settling a dispute that has long roiled Caucasus politics, isolated Armenia and cast a shadow over Turkey's European Union (EU) ambition. For a decade and a half, relations have been poisoned by disagreement about issues including how to address a common past and compensate for crimes, territorial disputes, distrust bred in Soviet times and Armenian occupation of Azerbaijani land. But recently, progressively intense official engagement, civil society interaction and public opinion change have transformed the relationship, bringing both sides to the brink of an historic agreement to open borders, establish diplomatic ties and begin joint work on reconciliation. They should seize this opportunity to normalise. The politicised debate whether to recognise as genocide the destruction of much of the Ottoman Armenian population and the stalemated Armenia-Azerbaijan conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh should not halt momentum. The U.S., EU, Russia and others should maintain support for reconciliation and avoid harming it with statements about history at a critical and promising time.

Turks and Armenians once uncompromising, bipolar views of history are significantly converging, showing that the deep traumas can be healed. Most importantly, the advance in bilateral relations demonstrates that a desire for reconciliation can overcome old enmities and closed borders. Given the heritage and culture shared by Armenians and Turks, there is every reason to hope that normalisation of relations between the two countries can be achieved and sustained.

Internal divisions persist on both sides. Armenia does not make normalisation conditional on Turkey's formal recognition as genocide of the 1915 forced relocation and massacres of Armenians under the Ottoman Empire. But it must take into account the views of Armenians

scattered throughout the global diaspora, which is twice as large as the population of Armenia itself and has long had hardline representatives. New trends in that diaspora, however, have softened and to some degree removed demands that Turkey surrender territory in its north east, where Armenians were a substantial minority before 1915.

Over the past decade, Turkey has moved far from its former blanket denial of any Ottoman wrongdoing. Important parts of the ruling AK Party, bureaucracy, business communities on the Armenian border and liberal elite in western cities support normalisation with Armenia and some expression of contrition. Traditional hardliners, including Turkic nationalists and part of the security services, oppose compromise, especially as international genocide recognition continues and in the absence of Armenian troop withdrawals from substantial areas they occupy of Turkey's ally, Azerbaijan. These divisions surfaced in events surrounding the assassination of Turkish-Armenian journalist Hrant Dink in January 2007. That the new tendencies are gaining ground, however, was shown by the extraordinary outpouring of solidarity with Armenians during the Dink funeral in Istanbul and a campaign by Turkish intellectuals to apologise to Armenians for the "Great Catastrophe" of 1915.

The unresolved Armenia-Azerbaijan conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh still risks undermining full adoption and implementation of the potential package deal between Turkey and Armenia on recognition, borders and establishment of bilateral commissions to deal with multiple issues, including the historical dimension of their relations. Azerbaijan has strong links to Turkey based on energy cooperation and the Turkic countries' shared linguistic and cultural origins. Ethnic Armenian forces' rapid advance into Azerbaijan in 1993 scuttled plans to open diplomatic ties and caused Turkey to close the railway line that was then the only transport link between the two countries. For years, Turkey conditioned any improvement in bilateral relations on Armenian troop withdrawals. Baku threatens that if this condition is lifted, it will restrict Turkey's participation in the expansion of Azerbaijani energy exports. While Azerbaijani attitudes remain a constraint, significant elements in Turkey agree it is time for a new approach. Bilateral détente with Armenia ultimately could help Baku recover territory better than the current stalemate.

Outside powers have important interests and roles. The U.S. has long fostered Armenia-Turkey reconciliation, seeking thereby to consolidate the independence of all three former Soviet republics in the south Caucasus and to support east-west transit corridors and energy pipelines from the Caspian Sea. Washington was notable in its backing of efforts that kick-started civil society dialogue between Turkey and Armenia. The Obama administration is working hard at repairing the damage done to U.S. relations with Turkey by the war in Iraq. Although Obama repeatedly promised on the campaign trail to formally recognise the 1915 forced relocation and massacres of Armenians under the Ottoman Empire as genocide, he should continue to steer the prudent middle course he has adopted as president. The U.S. Congress, which has a draft resolution before it, should do the same. At this sensitive moment of Turkish-Armenian convergence, statements that focus on the genocide term, either to deny or recognise it, would either enrage Armenians or unleash a nationalist Turkish reaction that would damage U.S.-Turkish ties and set back Turkey-Armenia reconciliation for years.

U.S. support for Turkey-Armenia reconciliation appears to be mirrored in Moscow. Russian companies have acquired many of Armenia's railways, pipelines and energy utilities and

seek to develop them; Russian-Turkish relations are good; and Moscow is looking for ways to mitigate the regional strains produced by its war with Georgia in August 2008. If sustained, the coincidence of U.S.-Russian interests would offer a hopeful sign for greater security and prosperity in the South Caucasus after years of division and conflict. All sides ♦ chiefly Armenia and Turkey but potentially Azerbaijan as well ♦ will gain in economic strength and national security if borders are opened and trade normalised.

RECOMMENDATIONS

To the Government of Turkey:

1. Agree, ratify and implement a normalisation package including the opening of borders, establishment of diplomatic relations and bilateral commissions; continue to prepare public opinion for reconciliation; cultivate a pro-settlement constituency among Armenians; and avoid threatening or penalising Armenia for outside factors like resolutions or statements in third countries recognising a genocide.
2. Avoid sacrificing implementation of the normalisation package to demands for immediate resolution of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict and withdrawal of Armenian troops from occupied territories in Azerbaijan; and seek opportunities to show Baku that by easing Yerevan ♦s fears of encirclement, normalised Turkey-Armenia relations may ultimately speed up such an Armenian withdrawal.
3. Make goodwill towards Armenia clear through gestures such as joint work on preserving the ancient ruins of Ani, stating explicitly that Turkey will recognise and protect Armenian historical and religious heritage throughout the country.
4. Encourage universities and institutes to pursue broader research on matters pertaining to the events of 1915, preferably with the engagement of Armenian and third-party scholars; modernise history books and remove all prejudice from them; and increase funding for cataloguing and management of the Ottoman-era archives.

To the Government of Armenia:

5. Agree, ratify, and implement a normalisation package including the opening of borders, establishment of diplomatic relations and bilateral commissions; continue to prepare public opinion for reconciliation; and avoid statements or international actions relating to genocide recognition that could inflame Turkish public opinion against the current process.
6. Agree together with Azerbaijan to the OSCE Minsk Group basic principles on a Nagorno-Karabakh settlement; then start withdrawals from Armenian-occupied territories in Azerbaijan; and pursue peace with Azerbaijan in full consciousness that only in this way can normalisation with Turkey be consolidated.
7. Make clear that Armenia has no territorial claim on Turkey by explicitly recognising its territorial integrity within the borders laid out in the 1921 Treaty of Kars.
8. Encourage universities and institutes to pursue more research on matters relating to the events of 1915, preferably with the engagement of Turkish and third-party scholars;

modernise history books and remove all prejudice from them; and organise the cataloguing of known Armenian archives pertaining to the events in and around 1915 wherever they may be located.

To the United States, Russia and the European Union and its Member States:

9. Avoid legislation, statements and actions that might inflame public opinion on either side and so could upset the momentum towards Turkey-Armenia normalisation and reconciliation.

10. Raise the seniority and intensify the engagement of the U.S., Russian and French co-chairs of the OSCE Minsk Group until Armenia and Azerbaijan reach final agreement on Minsk Group basic principles for a settlement of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict.

11. Back up Turkey-Armenia reconciliation with projects to encourage region-wide interaction, heritage preservation and confidence building; and support as requested any new bilateral historical commission or sub-commission, development of archive management and independent Turkish- or Armenian-led scholarly endeavours to research into aspects of the 1915 events.

Istanbul/Yerevan/Baku/Brussels, 14 April 2009

--

Statment Of The Ministries Of Foreign Affairs

**JOINT STATEMENT OF THE MINISTRIES OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE
REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA, THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY AND THE SWISS FEDERAL
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS**

Turkey and Armenia, together with Switzerland as mediator, have been working intensively with a view to normalizing their bilateral relations and developing them in a spirit of good-neighborliness, and mutual respect, and thus to promoting peace, security and stability in the whole region.

The two parties have achieved tangible progress and mutual understanding in this process and they have agreed on a comprehensive framework for the normalization of their bilateral relations in a mutually satisfactory manner. In this context, a road-map has been identified.

This agreed basis provides a positive prospect for the on-going process.

22 April, 2009

U.S. STATE DEPARTMENT: ARMENIAN AND TURKISH RELATIONS WITHOUT PRECONDITIONS

Statement by Robert A. Wood, acting spokesman

The United States welcomes the statement made by Armenia and Turkey on normalization of their bilateral relations. It has long been and remains the position of the United States that normalization should take place without preconditions and within a reasonable timeframe. We urge Armenia and Turkey to proceed according to the agreed framework and roadmap. We look forward to working with both governments in support of normalization, and thus promote peace, security and stability in the whole region.

SOLANA WELCOMES THE ◆ROAD MAP◆

The EU high commissioner for foreign policy and security Javier Solana issued a statement related to the joint statement of the Armenian and Turkish foreign ministries.

◆I welcome the statement on the normalization of the Armenian and Turkish relations. This is good news for the two sides, as well as for the whole Europe. This is a contribution of great importance to the security and stability preservation in one of the axis regions of Europe. I call the two sides to take advantage of this opportunity to continue the negotiations over the ◆road map◆ and settle their relations in the nearest future. The European Union is ready to assist and contribute the sides ◆, is said in the statement.

BIDEN-SARGSYAN SECOND PHONE CONVERSATION

As the press office of the White House informs, the U.S. vice president Josef Biden had a phone conversation with the Armenian president Serge Sargsyan, on April 23. During the conversation, the U.S. vice president commended the statement of the Armenian and Turkish foreign ministries on the willfulness to settle the relations between the two countries. ◆The U.S. vice president expressed his admiration about Serge Sargsyans governing and stated that the U.S. administration will contribute Armenia and Turkey in that process ◆, is said in the official message of the White House.

The fact on the second phone conversation between Sargsyan and Josef Biden during this week proved the press speaker of the office of the president Samvel Farmanov. The latter noted that the conversation took place on the initiative of the American side, in the airplane while returning to Yerevan from Moscow. The U.S. vice president stated also that the statement to contribute the normalization of the Armenian and Turkish relations without any precondition and in reasonable period of time reflects also the stances of the U.S. president and U.S. administration.

Obama Avoids Using Word 'Genocide' in Statement Condemning Armenian

Killings

President Obama is marking the memory of an estimated 1.5 million Armenians killed in Turkey, and the choice of his exact words was being watched closely.

WASHINGTON -- President Barack Obama on Friday refrained from branding the massacre of an estimated 1.5 million Armenians in Turkey a "genocide," breaking a campaign promise while contending his views about the 20th century slaughter had not changed.

The phrasing of Obama's written statement attracted heightened scrutiny because of the sensitivity of the issue and because the two countries are nearing a historic reconciliation after years of tension. The Obama administration is wary of disturbing that settlement.

Marking the grim anniversary of the start of the killings, the president referred to them as "one of the great atrocities of the 20th century."

"I have consistently stated my own view of what occurred in 1915, and my view of that history has not changed," Obama said. "My interest remains the achievement of a full, frank and just acknowledgment of the facts."

"The best way to advance that goal right now," Obama said, "is for the Armenian and Turkish people to address the facts of the past as a part of their efforts to move forward."

For Obama, referring to the killings as genocide could have upended recent pledges of a closer partnership with Turkey, a vital ally in a critical region. Steering around the word, however, put him at odds with his own pledges to recognize the slaughter as genocide.

Obama said the Armenians who were massacred in the final days of the Ottoman Empire "must live on in our memories." He said unresolved history can be a heavy weight. "Reckoning with the past holds out the powerful promise of reconciliation," he said.

"I strongly support efforts by the Turkish and Armenian people to work through this painful history in a way that is honest, open, and constructive," he said.

<http://www.foxnews.com>