

ANALYSIS OF THE TURKISH PROGRAM OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Safrastyan R. A.

Academician of NAS RA

Director of the Institute of Oriental Studies of NAS RA

Genocide is not only a historical phenomenon or a scientific abstraction, but a severe reality of our days, the gravest crime against humanity, which prevention can save millions of human lives. From this perspective, all scientific research, examining the regularities of the genesis of genocide or genocidal programs, can contribute to the choice and application of more effective means of prevention. One of the most important and, perhaps, least researched aspects of genocide is the conceptual explication of realization of the role of a state power. Among these problems, the study of the process of preparation of genocide by the supreme state bodies stands out. This process results in a state program, stating the criminal intent to commit genocide, and the means to realize it.

The process of genesis of a genocidal program in the Ottoman Empire started back in 1876 as an attempt of radical reaction to the pro-Western reforms in conditions of abrupt intensification of anti-Christian sentiments among the ruling Turkish elite and the Muslim population of the empire. The policy of the Ottoman authorities, oriented to attaining that goal was expressed in concrete forms of transition from a social reality, where genocide does not exist as a fully shaped phenomenon, to a novel reality, where genocide does exist as its manifestation. This governmental program was directed against Bulgarians¹.

The first anti-Armenian program of a genocidal nature appeared in the mid-90s of the XIX century. Its implementation resulted in mass killings of the Armenian population of the Ottoman Empire, where victims totaled about 300,000.

Let us examine the state program of genocide during the Young Turks' rule, who also targeted Armenians. The program comprised three documents. In all three, both the intent to commit genocide and the means to commit it are present. The analysis of these three documents reveals the fact that they are nothing but a program for committing Armenian Genocide - a program, adopted by the Ottoman government and ratified by the sultan, thus appearing in law.

¹ On this program see our paper: Սաֆրաստյան Ռ., Օսմանյան կայսրությունում ցեղասպանության քաղաքականության ակունքների հարցի շուրջ. հակազդեցություն 1876 թ. բուլղարական ապստամբությանը, Հայոց ցեղասպանության պատմության և պատմագրության հարցեր, 10-11, ՀՀ ԳԱԱ. Հայոց ցեղասպանության թանգարան-ինստիտուտ, Երևան, 2005, էջ 65-77.

The first of these documents is the record of the resolutions, passed at the secret meeting of a group of leading figures of the Ottoman Empire, headed by Talât, during World War One. The document is known as “10 Commandments”. It became known to the general public in 1919 from the Armenian and Turkish newspapers of Constantinople.

Prof. Dadrian scrutinized thoroughly the British archives and discovered a number of important facts, related with the origination of said document and the circumstances of finding it, and published it². In particular, it became known that at the meeting present were Interior Minister and leader of the Central Committee of the Young Turk party Mehmet Talât, members of the Central Committee, leaders of the “Special Organization” Bahattin Şakir and Nâzım, Chief of the Interior Ministry's Directorate General of Public Security Ismail Canpolad, and Chief of Division of the Intelligence of the General Headquarters of the Ottoman Army Major Şevket Seyfi. Chief of the Intelligence Service of the Interior Ministry Colonel Esad, the secretary of the meeting, documented the resolutions.

The document is not dated. The English officer, to whom Esad had handed it, set an approximate date between December 1914 and January 1915. In the light of the facts, known today, these dates are acceptable, since in February, signs of implementation of some points of the program were already observed. Thus, well-informed German Lieutenant-Colonel Stange³ reported that on February 10, deputy director of the Ottoman Bank of Armenian origin was killed for “political reasons”, and a few days before or after - the Armenian bishop of Erzincan⁴ (Yerznka in Western Armenia). Then dismissals of Armenian-born officials from public service began, then - disarmament of Armenian-born soldiers of the Ottoman army, then - arrests of officers⁵. Some scholars assert that the final decision about mass killings of Armenians was made by the Young Turk Central Committee in the middle of the same month of 1915⁶. This is indirectly confirmed by the letter published by Aram Antonyan from the Central Committee of the Young Turk party to the responsible representative of the Central Committee in the vilayet of Adana Kemal, written on February 18, where it said that a decision had already been made to ruthlessly extirpate all Armenians, and that requisite

² Dadrian V.N., The secret Young - Turk Ittihadist conference and the decision for the World War I Genocide of the Armenians, *Holocaust and genocide studies*, 1993, vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 173-201.

³ He was one of the leaders of the “Special organization”. See: Dadrian V.N., *Documentation of the Armenian genocide in German and Austrian sources*. New Brunswick, 1994, p. 110. The military rank of Stange is mistaken here for colonel.

⁴ Der deutsche Oberstleutnant Stange an die deutsche Militärmission in Konstantinopel, Erserum, den 23. August 1915, Geheim, Militär Mission J. Nr. 3841, Bericht über die Armenier vertreibungen. - 1915-08-23-DE-013-V.-
<http://www.armenocide.net/armenocide/armgende.nsf/WebStart-De?OpenFrameset>

⁵ Walker Ch. J., *Armenia: the survival of a nation*, London, 1983, p. 200.

⁶ Ibid.

orders from the government would be shortly sent to governor-generals and army commanders⁷. So, we may infer that in the frame of preparatory work for making the final decision on the Armenian Genocide, the “10 Commandments” represent the phase when an integrated and coordinated program of acts and measures towards fulfilling concrete tasks was completed.

The guilt of Talât, Bahattin Şakir⁸ and Nâzım in organizing and perpetrating the Armenian Genocide has long been known and documented. Canpolad's murderous activity against the Armenians is also well-known. In particular, he was the chief responsible figure for arrests and exiles of the Armenian intelligentsia and the representatives of other social strata in Constantinople. He was noted for his inhuman cruelty and blood thirsty inclinations even among his own party members, and thus had earned the epithet “murderous soldier”. English officer Andrew Ryan, who interrogated the arrested Young Turk leaders, admitted that he felt the least empathy for him compared with the others. Mustafa Kemal, instead, not only sympathized with the “murderous soldier”, but spoke highly of him as a “statesman”. The fifth member of that criminal group - Major Seyfi of General Headquarters, also belonged among those who were responsible for the Armenian Genocide.

In May of 1915 the Ottoman authorities passed a Law that was to serve as a “legal” disguise for the premeditated mass extermination of the Armenian people, or genocide. It appeared to be one of the bloodiest and most brutal laws in human history. In special literature, devoted to the history of the Armenian Genocide, it is often referred to as the “Law on Deportation”.

On May 24, 1915 the three powers of the Entente - Russia, Great Britain and France - came forth with a Joint Declaration, in which the mass slaughters of Armenians were severely condemned and qualified as “new crimes of Turkey against humanity and civilization”. They underscored that the members of the Ottoman government would be recognized as personally amenable to law for that crime⁹. On the same day, the French text was submitted to the “Havas” Telegraph Agency on behalf of the Foreign Ministry of France, and was immediately dispatched to Constantinople and Berlin. The official presentation of the note to the Ottoman government took place not long after, via a third party, as between the Entente countries and Turkey diplomatic relations did not exist.

The published documents allow us to retrace the entangled progress of that procedure. At first, the copy of the note was handed via US Ambassador to Paris

⁷ See in the text of the letter: Աստոնյան Ա., Մեծ ոճիրը: Հայկական վերջին կոտորածները և Թալեաթ փաշա, Երևան, 1990, էջ 130:

⁸ Talât and Bahattin Şakir were shot by Armenian avengers.

⁹ See in the text of the Declaration: Notification of the Department to the “Havas” agency, Urgent, Paris, May 24, 1915. - Great Powers, Ottoman Empire and Armenians in French archives. Vol. 1. Owing to Arthur Beylerians' assiduity. Foreword by Jean Baptiste Duroselle. Translated from French by Varuzhan Poghosyan. Yerevan, 2005, p. 99 (in Armenian).

William Sharp to State Secretary William Bryan in Washington, at the request of French Foreign Minister Théophile Delcassé¹⁰. It happened on May 28. A day later, on May 29, the latter telegraphed it to US Ambassador to Constantinople Henry Morgenthau¹¹, who eventually submitted the note to Sadrazam Sait Halim Paşa. The response of the members of the Ottoman government to the note was quite hot. Ambassador of Austria-Hungary to Ottoman Empire Johann von Pallavicini reported to Vienna that it drove Sadrazam Said Halim Paşa furious¹². US Ambassador H. Morgenthau described in his diary Said Halim Paşa's state after he had become familiarized with the note as "very much annoyed"¹³.

Turkish historians in their turn gave the name of Minister of Interior Talât, one of those threatened with the Declaration, as by his orders deportations and massacres had started and were in progress. The latter obviously feared lest the whole burden of guilt should be laid onto his and only his shoulders. In an attempt to avoid it, he initiated a process aimed to disperse the guilt for the crime among the government members, making it a matter of collective amenability, rather than his personal. Worth noticing is that the criminal realized very well the measure of his responsibility. Talât's unique confession on that subject has been preserved in the memoirs of his close friend Halil, a leading figure in the Ottoman Empire and in the "Committee of Union and Progress". According to him, Talât once acknowledged that he was the one to make the decision about the deportation of Armenians¹⁴.

The authorities were in such a panic that they even violated the regular procedure of passing laws. Without convening a session of the government and without the requisite resolution of the government, the "Law on Deportation" was hastily passed on May 27; on June 1 it was published and enforced immediately under the title "Temporary Law on Measures to Be Taken from Military Point of View Against Those Who Act in Opposition to the Government's Activity in Wartime". It was signed by the sultan and Minister of War Enver.

Following Talât's initiative, on May 30, prior to the promulgation of the "Law on

¹⁰ Sharp - to Secretary of State, Paris, May 28, 1915. - Documents: The State Department File. - Hayrapetyan A., "Race Problems" and the Armenian Genocide: The State Department file. - Armenian Review, Spring 1984, vol. 37, No. 1, p. 64; US Ambassador in Paris Mr. W. Sharp to Foreign Minister Mr. Delcasset, Paris, May 28, 1915. - Great Powers, Ottoman Empire and Armenians in French archives. Vol. 1. Owing to Arthur Beylerians' assiduity. Foreword by Jean Baptiste Duroselle. Translated from French by Varuzhan Poghosyan. Yerevan, 2005, p. 101.

¹¹ Bryan - to American Embassy, Constantinople, Washington, May 29, 1915. - Documents: The State Department file. - A. Hayrapetyan, "Race Problems" and the Armenian Genocide: The State Department file. - Armenian Review, Spring 1984, vol. 37, No. 1, p. 65.

¹² Pallavicini - an Baron Burian, Constantinople, an 18. Juni 1915. - K. u K. - Dokumente: Armenien in Österreichischen Archiven (Fotokopien). Band II: 1915 - 1917. Herausgeber: Artem Ohandjanian. S. 884.

¹³ June 7, Monday. - [Henry Morgenthau], United States Diplomacy on the Bosphorus: The Diaries of Ambassador Morgenthau 1913 - 1916. Compiled with an Introduction by Ara Sarafian. Princeton and London, 2004, p. 249.

¹⁴ Menteşe H., Osmanlı Mebusan Meclisi Reisi Halil Menteşe'nin Anıları. Giriş: İ. Arar. İstanbul, 1986, s. 216.

Deportation”, a session of the government was convened. It adopted a resolution to begin the deportation. The text of the resolution is published. It is entitled “Protocol on Discussions of the Council of Ministers” and consists of two parts: “Brief Description” and “Resolution”. The document is signed by members of the Ottoman government. The segment “Resolution” also contains a statement which reveals the genocidal intent of the Ottoman government - the “necessity to completely destroy and put an end” to the Armenian movement (“imhâ ve izâlesi kat’iyyen muktezî”)¹⁵.

Let’s turn to the “Law on Deportation”.

Investigation of the Turkish materials enabled us to find out the source of the “tradition” of falsification, adopted by contemporary Turkish historians. It began back in 1916, at the time when the Armenian Genocide was still in progress. The Ottoman government, seeking to mislead the world community and avoid the potential responsibility, at first in Turkish, then in the European languages published a massive reference book, in which the reality is impertinently falsified and an attempt is made to shift the responsibility for the Armenian Genocide onto Armenians. The distorted text of the “Law on Deportation” with only three Articles is brought there; Article 4 is missing, as well as the last paragraph. The names of those who signed the Law are not brought either. It should be noted that the Ottoman government did attain its goal. Many of the contemporary and future historians based their works on the version of the “Law on Deportation”, placed in the governmental reference book, not the one in the official newspaper.

A question arises, what was such an approach of the authorities of the Ottoman Empire conditioned by? The Ottoman official documents, presently in circulation, do not give a clear answer. We may only presume that it is because the then ruling Turkish elite, namely Enver Paşa, strived to shake off the responsibility for the deportation of Armenians, cost what it might. The mass deportation of the Armenian people had started long before passing and publishing the Law, and it was carried out by the initiative and under the guidance of the Minister of Interior and the factual leader of the Young Turk party Talât. The fact is that not a single governmental official document, related to the Law in question, has come out to date. Turkish historians have put into circulation the photocopy of the first page of the “Takvim-i Vekayi”, dated June 1, 1915, where the Law (“Temporary Law on Measures to Be Taken from Military Point of View Against Those Who Act in Opposition to the Government’s Activity in Wartime”) is printed. It only proved feasible after the photocopy of the official “Takvim-i Vekayi”, dated June 1, 1915, became available. The official version of the “Law on Deportation” documents that the Law consists of four Articles, was passed on May 27, 1915, enacted

¹⁵ Meclis-i Vükelâ Müzâkerâtına Mahsûs Zabıtname: Hülasâ-i me’âlî, 17 Mayıs 1331.-
<http://www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/icerik/438/harp-bolgelerine-yakin-yerlerde-bulunan-ermenilerin-dusmanla-isbirligi-faaliyetlerine-girisip-osman/>

on June 1, 1915, and Enver was personally made responsible for the enactment. The Law is signed by Sultan Mehmed Reşad V, Sadrazam Said Halim Paşa, as well as War Minister and Deputy Commander in Chief Ismail Enver Paşa. The translation of the text of the Law is given below:

Article 1. In the wartime, army, troop and division commanders and their deputies, commanders of individual positions, upon seeing any manifestation of opposition by the population against the governmental orders, actions and measures towards ensuring the defense and calm in the country, as well as any attempt of armed assault and resistance, are authorized and obligated to immediately, by force of arms and most rigorously, bring them back to mind and destroy the assault and the resistance.

Article 2. Commanders of armies and individual troops and divisions, based on special military laws, at suspecting espionage or betrayal, may send the residents of villages or townships, singly or massively, to other settlements and resettle them.

Article 3. The Law is enacted as of the date of publishing.

Article 4. The responsible person for implementation of the provisions of this Law is Deputy Commander in Chief, War Minister¹⁶.

I deigned to order that, in order to ensure lawfulness, the text of this Law be presented at the session of the General Assembly¹⁷, be enacted temporarily and added to the laws of the state power. 13 Recep 1333, May 14, 1331¹⁸

Reşad¹⁹,

Sadrazam Mehmet Said²⁰

Deputy Commander in Chief, War Minister Enver²¹.

The Law, according to its authors, was to disguise the genocide. Yet the provision of Article 2 reveals their striving to employ the army in committing genocide against Armenians. This Article is consistent with the fact of large-scale involvement of the Turkish military in the genocide²².

The Kemalists decided to accomplish the cause initiated by the Young Turks - this time enslaving the Republic of Armenia and subjecting to genocide Armenians in Eastern Armenia. Evidence for this is the official document created in November, 1920. Its prehistory is as follows: November 1920 proved fatal for the Republic of Armenia. On

¹⁶ These posts were occupied by Enver Paşa.

¹⁷ The joint session of the upper and lower houses of the Ottoman Parliament is meant.

¹⁸ Corresponds to May 27, 1915.

¹⁹ Sultan Mehmed Reşad V.

²⁰ Grand Vizier Mehmet Said Halim Paşa.

²¹ Takvîm-i Vekâyi, 18 Receb 1333 /19 Mayıs 1331, 7. sene, nr. 2189.

²² Dadrian V.N., The role of the Turkish military in the destruction of Ottoman Armenians: a study of historical continuities. - Journal of political and military sociology, 1992, Vol. 20, No. 2 (Winter), pp. 257-288.

October 30 the Turkish army captured Kars and continued its aggression. The weight of the struggle moved to the sphere of diplomacy. As a result of intense multilateral negotiations of nearly one month's duration, the Treaty of Aleksandropol was signed on December 2.

The Turkish documents of that period provide information about the real goals of the policy towards Armenia, pursued by the “founding fathers” of republican Turkey taking shape on the ruins of the Ottoman Empire. In particular, the documents irrefutably show that Turkey’s foremost goal in the last phase of the war was to destroy Armenia. According to the statement in the encryption (dated November 8, 1920) sent by Ahmet Muhtar (Acting Foreign Minister of Grand National Assembly of Turkey) to Commander of the Eastern Front Musa Kâzım Karabekir Paşa: “It is an absolute necessity that Armenia be politically and materially removed from the arena”²³. This is an unconcealed statement of the genocidal intent: by destroying Armenia as a state, both “politically and materially”, the Turkish nationalists prepared the ground for physical extirpation of the surviving Armenians in Eastern Armenia.

Karabekir was entrusted by the Kemalist leaders to continue the genocide of the Armenian people and destroy Armenia. But this time, the plans of the Turks remained unaccomplished. True, Armenia had sustained incredible losses, yet was not “removed from the arena”; it was integrated into the Soviet Union, owing to which part of the Armenian people avoided physical extermination.

In modern Genocide Studies, comparative analysis of genocides has become a marked tendency. As a result, a special attention is devoted to the methodology of comparative studies. In particular, a “matrix for comparing and studying different cases of genocides”²⁴ has been proposed. At the same time, we proposed the so-called comparative-structural method, which includes both elements of comparative analysis and analysis of concrete texts. This provides an opportunity to consider the three basic components of the analysis of genocide - definition, factual material, interpretation - suggested by the American sociologist Steven Katz²⁵. Comparing the program of 1915 with the document of 1876 from that perspective, we may conclude that, during the four decades in between, the Turkish elite had refined its skills in preparing genocide and drafting requisite programs to commit it.

In the documents of 1915, the destruction of a whole nation was programmed to

²³ Hariciye Vekili Ahmet Muhtar, Şark Cephesi Kumandanına, Ankara, 8/11/1336. – K. Karabekir, İstiklâl Harbimiz. İstanbul, 1959-1960, s. 901.

²⁴ Ezell W.K., Investigating genocide: a catalog of known and suspected cases, and some categories for comparing them. – Remembering for the future: working papers and agenda. Vol. III: the impact of the holocaust and genocide on Jews and Christians. Oxford, 1989, pp. 2880-2892.

²⁵ Katz S.T., Quantity and Interpretation: Issues in the Comparative Historical Analysis of the Holocaust. – Remembering for the future: working papers and agenda. Vol. III: the impact of the holocaust and genocide on Jews and Christians. Oxford, 1989, p. 2510.

be carried out, employing diverse well-coordinated activities of respective state bodies, guided from one center. Among these activities was forcible deportation, meant to disguise physical extirpation, mass destruction or forcible Islamization of previously selected groups of Armenians, etc. Also specified was, which particular power structure was to carry out extermination of which particular segment of the population. The factor of time was taken into account too - accentuated was the necessity to act simultaneously.

Special attention was devoted to measures of disguise and top secrecy of the plan. The mentioned genocidal acts were to be perpetrated not only in Western Armenia, but all over the empire. The first of the three documents, constituting the 1915 program, is a result of a secret meeting, details of which remain completely unknown to date. The document was not disclosed not only to the public at large, but even to some members of the government; at the beginning it was put into practice in conditions of secrecy, as stipulated by the last paragraph. This notwithstanding, the incredibly brutal massacre of the peaceful Armenian population all through the empire was impossible to keep secret long as follows from the fact of the abovementioned note of Russia, Great Britain and France to the Ottoman government, making the members of the latter personally responsible for the crimes perpetrated by Turkey against "humanity and civilization".

The leadership of Turkey - the actual authors of the genocidal program - to disguise their crimes and avoid responsibility, represented the slaughter of Armenians as deportation from war zones. On Talât's initiative, from the next day after the note had been published, the Turkish authorities began undertaking actions that would make the forcible displacement post factum appear "legal". Thus, the principal organizers of the Armenian Genocide, fully conscious of their own guilt, in the first phase of carnages were already exerting themselves to avoid responsibility. From the analysis of the presently known documents, reflecting the last phase of making a decision on the Armenian Genocide, it follows that, unlike the year 1876, now the Young Turk perpetrators were contemplating falsification of the reality and concealment of their actions at the very start. The programs contain some apparently identical provisions. For instance, both in the 1876 and 1915 programs, the necessity of total extermination of a definite social-professional stratum - Bulgarian and Armenian teachers, is emphasized. In both documents, forcible Islamization is viewed as an additional instrument to eradicate a nation. Generally, the 1876 program is an intermediate phase between the policy of massacres, widely applied in the Ottoman Empire against Christians as a means of punishment, and the policy of large-scale genocide. That is why it is "incomplete" as a document determining concrete genocidal actions. Whereas the paragraphs of the 1915 program clearly determine the goals and the thoroughly elaborated in conditions of secrecy actions towards their attainment.

The state program of 1915 makes apparent that the Turkish elite “mastered” the “skills” in organizing mass slaughters of representatives of other ethnicities and confessions, and in that aspect that document can be only juxtaposed with the documents, planning the genocide of Jews in Nazi Germany. In any case, it is one of the most atrocious documents of the last century, a condensed manifestation of absolute evil. Between the documents of a genocidal nature, analyzed by us, there is yet another principal difference. The one from 1876 offered radical means to react to the ongoing Bulgarian armed rebellion, while that from 1915 is a result of preparatory work of long years, launched back in 1910; no armed rebellion of Armenians was underway at that time in the Ottoman Empire. Besides, from the 1890s, the Turkish powers had been practicing the severest means of perpetrating Armenian massacres, so in 1915 they certainly took advantage of their “experience”. With Bulgarians such experience was but limited.

The program of 1876 was not fully realized. Despite the fact that the April insurgence was severely suppressed, Bulgarians still resided in their own territory, and shortly were able to build up prerequisites for becoming independent. The 1915 program had been fully realized, since **the Armenian people were totally eradicated from its Homeland’s bigger part - Western Armenia and Cilician Armenia.**

The year 1920 stands apart because the target was not a subject people, but an independent state, which factual destruction would lead to physical annihilation of the remaining Armenians, and establish a through access to artificially formed Azerbaijan - part of the “Muslim world”. That would continue and accomplish the policy of Armenian Genocide. In the abovementioned document Armenia’s “removal from the arena” was “grounded” as follows: “It is impossible that Armenia, being located in the center of the great Muslim circle... decline at its own convictions the obligation of a severe gendarme and decide to fully relate its fate with Turkey and Islamism”²⁶. In another place of the same document it said that “keeping in our hands all the roads, connecting Turkey with Azerbaijan”, was essential. These statements explicate the motivation of the Kemalists’ genocidal program.

Described are also the means to attain the goal: force and diplomacy. Thus, the encryption underlined, “At present, it is an absolute necessity to demobilize the Armenian army and confiscate the arms, thereby making impossible the restoration of its military structure. Under the pretext of keeping the railways under control and defending the rights of the Muslim population, it is necessary to establish military control over the entire territory of Armenia”. In another passage we read: “You may temporarily accept the Brest-Litovsk borderline, since the goal set is first of all, to receive a written proposal from Armenians concerning the border, and thus to avoid reaching a cul-de-

²⁶ Hariciye Vekili Ahmet Muhtar, Şark Cephesi Kumandanına, Ankara, 8/11/1336. – K. Karabekir, İstiklâl Harbimiz. İstanbul, 1959-1960, s. 901.

sac at the talks. Yet, it is necessary to pave the way for never-ending interference under the pretext of defending the rights of the Muslim minority, remaining on the other side of the border”²⁷.

The encryption also reveals the ideological background of the Kemalist policy. Having adopted the political preferences of the Young Turks, they relied on the ideological-political teaching of pan-Turkism: “Special efforts should be exerted towards deliberate arming of Turkic peoples of the region and creating national armed forces. They will connect the East and the West and make Azerbaijan an independent Turkic state”²⁸. Some statements in the document evince that the authors paid special attention to disguising their criminal actions. In the encryption we read: “The goal mentioned above shall be attained covertly and softly, meaning both the text of the Treaty and the actions proceeding from it - to appear ever peaceful in the eyes of Armenians”²⁹. In another passage of the document the striving to disguise the reality is more open: “The provisions of the armistice to be submitted to Armenians shall be oriented towards deluding Armenians and appearing peaceful before Europe, rather than withdrawing from Armenia. In reality, they shall be aimed at stepwise preparation and maturation of preconditions for attaining our true goal”³⁰.

The program drawn up by the Kemalists bespeaks that they had done their best to learn the “genocide” lessons, delivered by the Young Turks. Furthermore, they demonstrated even greater “skills”, ready to export the genocidal policy and to implement it beyond their borders, against an independent state. The latter circumstance compelled them to be more resourceful in disguising the crime.

The existence of genocidal programs against two different nations, programs, separated by a time period of over four decades, proves that the ruling circles in the Ottoman Empire regarded the policy of genocide - deportation being a version of it - as a radical means of transformation of the multi-ethnic and multi-confessional empire into a homogeneous state, and maintaining its territorial integrity, whereas they were guided by Mustafa Kemal Turkish nationalists, who had rebelled against the sultan’s imperial government, were ready to also apply the genocidal policy against an independent state.

In essence, preparation and implementation of the crime of genocide became an integral part of state functions. According to some scholars, in cases like that in question we may even speak about certain persistence in pursuing genocidal goals, shown by the governing elite of the given state power for years, even if said goals were

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid.

not always formulated properly³¹. This conclusion reinforces the position of those researchers, who suggest characterizing the Ottoman Empire during the last half-century of its history as a “genocidal” and “criminal” state³².

Preparation and implementation of the crime of genocide constituted a significant segment of the functions of state power in the Ottoman Empire. Certain elements of such modus operandi passed via the Kemalists to republican Turkey.

³¹ Chalk F., Definitions of genocide and their implications for prediction and prevention. – Remembering for the future: working papers and agenda. Vol. III: The impact of the holocaust and genocide on Jews and Christians, Oxford, 1989, p. 2382.

³² Kuper L., Genocide: its political use in the twentieth century. New Haven and London, 1981; Horowitz I. L., Taking lives: genocide and state power. New Brunswick-London, 1997; Ternon Y., L'Etatcriminel: les génocides du XXe siècle, Paris, 1995, et al. We also support this approach.