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The first proof of Armenian presence on the territories inhabited by Romanians is a Cetatea Albă tombstone dated 967 AD. Over time, this presence has become ever more significant. Thus, historian Nicolae Iorga was right to say that Armenians are somehow the ancestors of the medieval principality of Moldova. On the vast map of the Armenian diaspora, the Romanian lands have remained an important location ever since. In Romania's historical mesoregion, defined by geopolitical instability and fluid, multiple, contested identities, many people of various, entangled backgrounds (ethnic, religious, linguistic, social) could trace back their origins to some Armenian ancestor. After the 1915 genocide, a tragic new wave of Armenian immigrants has reached Romania, and some of their descendants are still around. Rumor had it that a government of Armenia could be easily formed in interwar Bucharest by the post-genocide refugees.

In recent years, worldwide attention has been devoted to the history, memory, and official recognition of the Armenian genocide. This attention has triggered a multitude of conferences and publications, research programs and civic, educational, artistic, and media initiatives.

With this in mind, an international conference is convened in Bucharest to explore the history of the Armenian genocide and of its lasting consequences (with an emphasis on their conceptual and comparative dimensions), its memory (including its forgetting, denial, forgiveness, transgenerational trauma, and public significance), and the related issues of responsibility (from the ethics of memory to political recognition, from moral solidarity to retrospective justice).

The conference is part of the series of public dialogues, Ideas in the Agora, initiated and coordinated by Sorin Antohi at the Bucharest City Museum.

The event will be open to the public, enjoy media coverage, will be video recorded and broadcast live in Internet, also being the basis for the future publication of a collective volume in English.
Friday, October 13
18:00-20:00 Session One: Armenians, Turks, and Germans in 1915 and After
Moderator: Sorin Antohi
Varujan Vosganian, Opening Remarks
Raymond Kévorkian, Le Génocide des Arméniens: les grandes lignes d’un plan de destruction
Halil Berktay, Turkey’s Difficulties. Progress and Problems Over the Last Decade
Rolf Hosfeld, Germany and the Armenian Genocide

20:00-20:15 Break
20:15-21:00 Remembering the Whisperers: Armine Vosganian reads excerpts from Varujan Vosganian’s The Book of Whispers. Varujan Vosganian shows a selection of relevant images and tells the stories in and behind them.

Saturday, October 14
9:00-11:00 Session Two: The Armenian Diaspora
Moderator: Armenuhi Ghambaryan
Gérard Dédéyan, Arméniens et arménophiles à Montpellier (vers 1880--vers 1920)
Carol Iancu, Bernard Lazare, les Juifs et les Arméniens
Hakob Matevosyan, Diaspora Revisited: Agential Forces and Structures of the Armenian Presence in East Central Europe

11:00-11:30 Coffee Break
11:30-13:30 Session Three: War and Genocide
Moderator: Felicia Waldman
Bedros Horasangian, The Gallipoli Campaign and the Armenian Genocide: History and Memory
Suren Manukyan, The (Un)changing Nature of Victimisation of Ottoman Armenians in the Run-up to Genocide
Armenuhi Ghambaryan, Reflections of the Armenian Genocide in US Congressmen’s Speeches and Statements (1918-1919)

13:30-15:00 Lunch Break
15:00-17:00 Session Four: Recognition, Responsibility, Denial
Moderator: Gabriel Andreescu

Ashot Melkonian, The International Recognition Process of the Armenian Genocide in the Context of the Reparation Issue (delivered in Armenian; English-language handouts)
Yair Auron, Israel and the Recognition of the Armenian Genocide
Gabriel Andreescu, The Case of Perinçek v. Switzerland: a Benchmark on the Armenian Genocide Denial
17:00-17:30 Coffee Break
17:30-19:30 Session Five: Denial, History, Memory
Moderator: Rolf Hosfeld
Felicia Waldman, The Great Game (and Stakes) of Denial
Cătălin Mamali, Sakharov’s Puzzle and Denial Levels of the Armenian Genocide
Sorin Antohi, The Armenian Genocide: History, Memory, Responsibility
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Gabriel Andreescu
Professor with the Department of Political Science at the National School for Political Studies and Public Administration (SNSPA) in Bucharest. His main fields of research are minority rights, multiculturalism, religious freedom and secularism, and the ethics and politics of memory. He is founder of several Romanian human rights organizations, and editor of the New Journal of Human Rights. Andreescu received several awards from Romanian or international institutions and organizations, for his books (Observatorul cultural, 2013, 2015), research (JSRI Award, Religion and Politics, 2012), and human rights work (among them Petofi Sandor Award/ Budapest, 2009, Pro Minoritate Award/ Budapest, 1995, Human Rights Monitor Award/ New York, 1990). The list of his books includes Doctrina internațională a tratării trecutului comunist. Culegere și comentarii (The International Doctrine on Dealing with the Communist Past. Documents and Comments, 2016), Existența prin cultură. Represiune, colaboraționism și rezistența intelectuală sub regimul comu-

Sorin Antohi
Born in 1957, he is an historian of ideas, essayist, translator, and consultant based in Bucharest, where he has established (2007) the Orbis Tertius / A Treia Lume Association, specialized in conferences and publications. He has studied English, French (University of Iași, Romania), and History (EHESS, Paris). He has taught mainly at the University of Michigan, the University of Bucharest, and the Central European University (CEU) in Budapest (where he has also served as Academic Pro-Rector and has founded Pasts, Inc. Center for Historical Studies). He has conducted research at universities, institutes of advanced study and other institutions in Freiburg-im-Breisgau, Bielefeld, Braunschweig, Stanford, Vienna, Essen, Berlin, Leipzig. He has lectured, participated in, (co)organized conferences, (co)directed academic projects in more than thirty countries. Among others, he has served as a member of the Board of the International Committee of Historical Studies, as well as on various editorial and foundation boards. He has published widely on intellectual history, history of ideas, historical theory and history of historiography, as well as on Romania in European contexts. With Jörn Rüsen and Chun-chieh Huang, he edits the book series, Reflections on In(Humanity), published jointly by Vandenhoek & Ruprecht and National Taiwan University Press. He has published several essays and book introductions on the Armenian genocide, focusing on its conceptual history and on its public memory, and has attended the Global Forum Against the Crie of Genocide (Yerevan, 22-23 April 2015). He has initiated and coordinates the series of public lectures, dialogues, and conferences, Ideas in the Agora, at the Bucharest City Museum.

Yair Auron
Yair Auron is an Israeli professor in the fields of genocide, genocide education, contemporary Judaism, and the Israeli-Palestinian relation. Professor Auron has published numerous essays, more than 30 books in Hebrew, English, French, German, Armenian and Russian, mainly on genocide, genocide education and the impact of the Holocaust on Jewish identity in Israel and Europe. He has edited a series of twelve books named Genocide which includes theoretical volumes regarding the phenomenon of genocide, as well as the analysis of case studies. The course he conducts has about 15000 veteran-students who have chosen it. It is the largest course on the world.

In 2016-17 Auron published two books that are dealing also with the subject of

Auron has been struggling for many years or the Israeli and world recognition of the Armenian Genocide. His book “Israel and the Armenian Genocide” was published recently in French. It analyzes the attitude of Israel to the Armenian genocide till 2017.

Auron lives in Neveh Shalom–Vahat el Salam, The only Jewish-Arab community in Israel where he has ceated a Garden of the Rescuers (Righteous) Worldwide.

Halil Berktay
Born in 1947, historian, writer, public intellectual. BA (Economics), Yale, 1968; PhD (History), Birmingham, UK, 1991. Has previously taught at the Faculty of Political Sciences at Ankara University; Middle East Technical University, Bogazici University, and for 19 years at Sabanci University (1998-2016). Visiting professorships: Harvard (1997 and 2007-2008); Michigan, Ann Arbor (January-February 2007). Research specialty: Turkish nationalism and nationalist historiography. Outspoken critic of Turkish denialism over the Armenian genocide since 2000; played a key role in organising a now-famous all-Turkish conference on the subject in Fall 2005. Since May 2017: Professor, head of the History Department, coordinator of the Graduate Program in Turkish Studies, Core Curriculum Director, and Advisor to the Rector at Ibn Haldun University.

Gérard Dédéyan
Professeur émérite à l’Université Paul-Valéry Montpellier, Membre à l’étranger de l’Académie des Sciences d’Arménie.


Entre autres publications :
Les Arméniens entre Grecs, Musulmans et Croisés, Lisbonne 2003
En collaboration avec Carol Iancu, Du génocide des Arméniens à la Shoah. Typologie des massacres du XXe siècle, Toulouse, 2015.

Armenuhi Ghambaryan
Born in 1965, she has studied History and English at the B. Brusov Pedagogical Institute of Russian and Foreign Languages, then, as a post-graduate (1993-1997) History at the Institute of History of the National Academy of Sciences. Assistant Professor at Yerevan State Medical University, where she has also been the Head of the Department of History (2006-2013). Since 1997, also a senior researcher at the Institute of History of the NationalAcademy of Sciences of the Republic of Armenia. She has published four books and more than thirty articles, has attended over 25 conferences, as well as other scholarly events. Her research interests arethe history of Armenia in the 19th and early 20th centuries; the Armenian Question; The policy of Great Powers regarding Armenia; the Armenian Genocide. Her numerous publications include: The Armenian Question and Great Britain (Yerevan, 2006), History of Armenia. ABrief Course, compiled by Armenuhi V. Ghambaryan, Chief editor Ashot A. Melkonyan (Yerevan, 2015, in English; Russian edition in 2014).

Bedros Horasangian
Born in 1947, he was educated at the Bucharest Polytechnic Institute and started his career as an engineer. Then he has worked in various positions at the Armenian Archbishopric, newspapers and cultural periodicals, as a diplomat (cultural attache at the Romanian Embassy in Athens;deputy director of the Romanian Cultural Institute, New York). He has published numerous works of fiction, political commentary, literary and musical chronicles, essays, op eds, etc.He has been very well received by the public and by critics. Among others, he has received the Prize of the (Romanian) Writers’ Union (1984), and the Prize of the Romanian Academy (1987) Curcubeul de la miezul nopții (short fiction, Bucharest, 1984); Închiderea ediției (short fiction, Bucharest, 1984); Parcul loanid (short fiction, Bucharest, 1986); Sala de așteptare (novel, 1987); În larg (novel, Bucharest, 1989); Portocala de adio (short fiction, Cluj-Napoca, 1989); Misteriosul om în negru sau Ora melomanului. Roman în foarte multe părți (novel, Bucharest, 1992), Enciclopedia armenilor (Sibiu, 1994); Bonjour popor (Bucharest, 1995); Zăpada mieilor (novel, Bucharest, 1996); Integrarea europeană (poems, Bucharest, 1997), Obsesia. Cine l-a ucis pe Olof Palme (novel, Bucharest, 2002), Miss Perfumado și alte femei (short fiction, Bucharest, 2009).He has written, translated, collected, commissioned, edited most of the materials (articles, essays, memoirs, translations, etc.) that went into Dosar 1915, a long-term effort to inform the Romanian public about the Armenian genocide.

Rolf Hosfeld
Dr. Rolf Hosfeld is the Academic Director of the Potsdam Lepsius House in Germany, a Research Center for Genocide Studies, and works as an independent writer and historian. Hosfeld has been lecturer at Free University of Berlin, editor, journalist and a film
and television producer. He has been member of the German Writers’ Union since 1982 and has served on the Board of Directors of the Peter Weiss Foundation for Art and Politics since 2002.

His most ambitious project to date has been a four-volume History of the Germans 1815-2007. Besides this he has published a history of the German Democratic Republic and biographies of the writers Kurt Tucholsky and Heinrich Heine as well as a biography of the philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel. The Friedrich Ebert Foundation awarded him its prize “Das politische Buch” (the political book) in 2010 for his book Karl Marx: An Intellectual Biography (German title: Die Geister, die er rief. Eine neue Karl-Marx-Biographie), that has been translated into several languages. His history of the Armenian Genocide Operation Nemesis, Deutschland, die Türkei und der Völkermord an den Armeniern was published in 2005 and 2009. A revised and completed edition under the title Tod in der Wüste. Der Völkermord an den Armeniern came out in 2015. He also published a book on Johannes Lepsius and one on Germany and the Armenian Genocide, as co-editor with Christin Pschichholzand co-contributor: Das Deutsche Reich und der Völkermord an den Armeniern (Göttingen, 2017).

Carol Iancu

Professeur émérite à l’Université Paul-Valéry de Montpellier, docteur honoris causa de quatre universités roumaines (Cluj, Iași, Oradea et Constanța), il est membre d’honneur à l’étranger de l’Académie Roumaine.


Raymond Kévorkian

Commissariat d'exposition
— Arménie, entre Orient et Occident (Bibliothèque nationale de France, 1996).
— Arménie 1915 (Hôtel-de-ville de Paris, 2015).

Selection de publications

Cătălin Mamali
Educated at the University of Bucharest (BA and MA in Psychology and Social Psychology, 1968; PhD in Social Psychology, 1976), and with a Fulbright Scholarship at the University of Iowa (1990-1991), has taught at the Bucharest Polytechnic Institute and at various US universities and colleges. Member of many international editorial boards, professional associations, and research networks (e.g., cross-cultural projects on relationships between parents and children; basic human needs; humane economy; societal learning; development studies; values and political attitudes). He has published widely in these fields, including the following books: The Gandhian Mode of Becoming (Ahmedabad, 1998), Balanță motivațională și coevoluție (Motivational balance and coevolution, Bucharest, 1981), Intercunoaștere (Interknowledge, Bucharest, 1974). His numerous scholarly articles and chapters include: “Interpersonal relationships in totalitarian societies”, in William B. Gudykunst, S. Stella Ting-Toomey, Tsukasa Nishida (Eds.), Communication in Personal Relationships Across Cultures (Sage, 1996), and, most recently, “Accuracy of basic

**Suren Manukyan**

Dr. Manukyan is the Deputy Director of the Armenian Genocide Museum and Institute in Yerevan, and Chair of the Department of International Relation at Gladzor University (Yerevan), a lecturer at the departments of History and Oriental Studies of Yerevan State University and the American University of Armenia. Book-review editor of the *International Journal of Armenian Genocide Studies*. Member of IAGS Resolutions’ committee.

His current research focuses on the social-psychological dimension of the Armenian genocide. It is based on his Fulbright research project “The Sociology of Armenian Genocide: Perpetrators, Bystanders, and Rescuers vs. Victims, Survivors, and Betrayers” done at the Center for the Study of Genocide and Human Rights at Rutgers University of New Jersey, USA. He is the author of about twenty articles on Genocide studies.

**Hakob Matevosyan**

PhD candidate at the Department of Sociology of Culture at Leipzig University. He has an MA of sociology from Yerevan State University, Armenia. He holds Calouste Goulbenkian Armenian Studies Scholarship from Portugal. Between 2011 and 2013 he was the head of the Data Management and Processing Department of the Institute for Political and Sociological Consulting (IPSC) in Yerevan. From 2011 to 2014 he taught various seminars on sociological theories and methods at Yerevan State University.

He currently teaches a seminar on “A Europe of Diasporas” at Global and European Studies Institute of Leipzig University.

His academic interests refer to sociological theories, ethnicity, identity and diaspora studies, and research data management. His current research project is on the struggles for diasporic identity negotiations and construction processes in the Armenian community in Hungary.

**Latest publication and conferences:**


Hakob Matevosyan co-organized an international conference on “Within and Beyond Ethnicity: Negotiating Identities in Modern Armenian Diaspora”, May 9-10, 2016 in Leipzig.

**Ashot Melkonian**

Born in 1961 (Akhalqalaki, Georgia), he has studied History at Yerevan State University, where he has also received his Candidate and Doctor degrees. He is Di-
rector of the Institute of History of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Armenia (since 2003), Professor at Yerevan State University (since 2004), and was elected to the Academy of Sciences in 2014. He has published fifteen books and more than 400 articles. For his books, *Erzrum*, and *Javakhk in the 19th Century and in the First Quarter of the 20th*, as well as for his entire activity, he has received important awards, prizes, and medals. He has participated in many international conferences, and his main scholarly interests are Western Armenia, the Genocide and the Armenian question, the history of Javakhk, Armenian-Georgian relations, the demographic problems of Historic Armenia. His latest books are: *The Problems of Historiography and Demography of Armenia* (Yerevan, 2012), *Lessons and Messages of Armenian History* (Yerevan, 2013), *Genocide and Patriocide: from Recognition to Reparation* (Yerevan, 2015).

**Varujan Vosganian**

Born in 1958 into a family of Armenians who have survived the Genocide and came to Romania, he is the President of the Union of Armenians in Romania (since 1990). He has studied Economics (PhD 1998) and Mathematics. After participating in the 1989 Revolution, he entered politics, and has held various Government and Parliament offices ever since. Besides works in the field of economics, political analyses, and numerous op eds, he has published numerous critically-acclaimed books of poems and short fiction, as well as novels, some of them becoming best-sellers in many countries (his work has been translated in more than twenty languages). He has received many national and international prizes, awards, and medals, and was nominated for the Nobel Prize for his *magnum opus, Cartea șoaptelelor* (2009), a literary and moral international phenomenon, forthcoming from Yale University Press in January 2019 as *The Book of Whispers*.

**Felicia Waldman**

Associate Professor of Jewish Studies at the Goldstein Goren Center for Hebrew Studies, Faculty of Letters, University of Bucharest, coordinator of the Center and of its MA program in Hebrew Culture and Civilization and editor of its academic journal, *Studia Hebraica*. She is also guest professor at the Romanian Diplomatic Institute. She is Deputy Head of the Romanian Delegation to the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance and incoming Chair of its Education Working Group. Her expertise covers Jewish mysticism, Holocaust education and Romanian Jewish history and heritage and she has dealt with the similarities between the Holocaust and the Armenian Genocide. She is the author of four books and fifty chapters and articles on these topics.
**ABSTRACTS**

Gabriel Andreescu, *The Case of Perinçek v. Switzerland: a Benchmark on the Armenian Genocide Denial*

This paper discusses a benchmark to the case law on the Armenian genocide denial, the Case of Perinçek v. Switzerland. Until 2005, when a Swiss court condemned Doğu Perinçek, no other state of the Council of Europe had incriminated anyone for denying that the events of 1915-1916 had the character of a genocide. In addition to Switzerland, a multitude of third parties (Turkey, Armenia and France, the Switzerland-Armenia Association and the Turkish Associations of French-speaking Switzerland, the Coordinating Council of the Armenian Organisations in France, the Turkish Human Rights Association, Justice Memory Centre and the International Institute for Genocide and Human Rights Studies, the International Federation for Human Rights and others) have brought arguments to the judges of the Grand Chamber of ECtHR in favor of or against the approach taken by the Swiss courts in this case. The current study makes a radiography of the reasoning of various actants and European judges, not so much to give my own verdict, but to highlight the most important arguments in the Perinçek v. Switzerland case.

Sorin Antohi, *The Armenian Genocide: History, Memory, Responsibility*

More than a century after those tragic events, the Armenian Genocide does not have a standard international canon, despite significant progress in academic research and some legal, diplomatic and moral breakthroughs. Its history and its memory are still contested, between relativization and denial, between heroism and terrorism, between legitimate defense (or ‘mere’ retribution, however disproportionate and/or spiralling out of control) and carefully-planned mass murder (genocide). Responsibility is not clearly accepted by the relevant parties, or is even plainly rejected and dumped on those seeking retrospective justice, let alone reparations. The paper attempts to reflect on this situation, identify its various specific causes, and speculate on a possible way ahead.

Yair Auron, *Israel and the Recognition of the Armenian Genocide*

The state of Israel does not recognize the Armenian Genocide. Even more, it even denies it! How can we explain this immoral attitude that, in my opinion, betrays the memory and the legacy of our genocide (the Holocaust)? The civil society, when knowing about the Armenian genocide, supports the recognition. Unfortunately, based on my studies, I do not think that there will be an Israeli recognition in the near future. A very significant moral failure.

Halil Berktay, *Turkey’s Difficulties. Progress and Problems Over the Last Decade*

A combination of daring scholarship, civil society initiatives, and a more relaxed approach by AKP governments has done a great deal to eliminate the coarse denial-
ism of the Ataturkist past, lowering previous levels of intimidation and contributing to a partial emancipation of public space. Yet these gains remain unconsolidated, with the forces of nationalist reaction always lurking in the wings.

Gérard Dédéyan, *Arméniens et arménophiles à Montpellier (vers 1880-vers 1920)*

Pour ce qui concerne la France, les jeunes Arméniens – originaires principalement des Empires ottoman et russe – viennent étudier de préférence à Paris, Montpellier et Nancy, à la fin du XIXᵉ et au début du XXᵉ siècle: plusieurs noms arméniens sont mentionnés dans les Archives de la Faculté de médecine, en raison de l’attractivité de celle-ci, renommée depuis le XIIIᵉ siècle. Les étudiants arméniens sont présents également à l’École d’Agriculture de Montpellier. Parmi ces étudiants, on trouvait des membres de partis politiques arméniens qui cherchaient à rallier leurs compatriotes à leur mouvement.


Fernand Roque-Ferrier, véritable initiateur du « droit d’ingérence », après avoir exercé ses fonctions consulaires à Erzeroum (1895-1901), ne retourne dans l’Empire ottoman qu’en 1906, ayant été nommé consul de France à Alep. Son séjour coïncidait avec la révolution des Jeunes-Turcs (1908), groupe d’officiers progressistes, dont certains avaient étudié en France et qui, se dressant contre l’obscurantisme et l’absolutisme d’Abülhamid II, le contraignirent à rétablir la constitution ottomane de 1876; établissant un régime parlementaire, cette constitution affirmait l’égalité de tous les sujets devant la loi. Une contre-révolution s’étant produite au printemps 1909 et ayant redonné les pleins pouvoirs au sultan, les Arméniens d’Adana furent victimes de violentes représailles, puis sauvagement massacrés – ainsi que les habitants de nombreux villages de Cilicie, en avril 1909, les troupes envoyées par les Jeunes-Turcs - revenus entre-temps au pouvoir - s’étant jointes à la populace mobilisée par les réactionnaires. Le consul d’Alep effectue alors, avec
un détachement, une folle équipée à travers les montagnes de l’Amanus pour aller délivrer le couvent lazariste d’Akbès, rempli de réfugiés arméniens, et qu’assiègent les tribus kurdes. Roque-Ferrier, après avoir délivré le couvent en mai 1909 – avec le concours de soldats ottomans se conformant aux ordres de la fraction modérée du gouvernement jeune-turc –, gagne ensuite Adana, pour tenter de remédier à la situation sanitaire et matérielle de la population arménienne survivante. Épuisé par l’épidémie, Roque-Ferrier regagne Alep, où il meurt. La cérémonie célébrée dans la cathédrale arménienne d’Alep réunit la majorité des fidèles d’Alep relevant de cette confession. Le corps de Fernand Roque-Ferrier est rapatrié en 1910 à Marseille et repose au cimetière Saint-Lazare de Montpellier.

Un grand archéologue, ayant travaillé en Perse et au Caucase, Jacques de Morgan, retiré dans les Pyrénées en raison de problèmes de santé, et projetant néanmoins de finir sa vie dans une Arménie indépendante, entame une collaboration avec L’Eclair de Montpellier, journal auquel il envoie régulièrement, de 1915 à 1921, de remarquables articles, dans lesquels il embrasse les développements du problème arménien pendant cette période. Il insiste sur l’effort de guerre fourni par les Arméniens, en dépit du génocide. Cet effort pouvait faire considérer les Arméniens (volontaires de l’armée russe, armée de la République arménienne), légion arménienne en Cilicie (crée par un Montpelliérain le commandant Louis Romieu), comme des belligérant et permettant à Clemenceau de qualifier l’Arménie de « petite alliée ».

Armenuhi Ghambaryan, Reflections of the Armenian Genocide in US Congressmen’s Speeches and Statements (1918-1919)

I. World War I altered the political structures of the governments and the lives of the inhabitants of many countries. It brought a great opportunity to the Ottoman Empire - loosed pent-up passions and as a result the Christian minorities of the Ottoman Empire were subjected to a degree of persecution far exceeding the earlier incidents. For the Armenians the years of World War I became the most tragic in their history. Starting from the spring of 1915 the Young Turk regime systematically slaughtered or deported nearly the entire Armenian population of Ottoman Empire, resulting in the Genocide that estimated one and a half million Armenians.

II. In the first period of World War I, remaining a neutral state, the United States witnessed those atrocities – the genocidal acts committed against Armenians in the Ottoman Empire. American missionaries reported these horrifying events to American Ambassador Henry Morgenthau and to their connections in the United States. That tragic information reached the US Government. Starting from the autumn of 1915, the American press began to publicize the Armenian atrocities. The sufferings of Armenians became sufficiently well known to the USA. There was a tremendous growth of sympathy for the Armenian refugees who were barely surviving in the scorching deserts of Syria. The story of the persecutions was current, dramatic, newsworthy, and emotionally appealing to Americans.
III. During the years of the war, the US state officials, referring to general politics, touched upon the Armenians, particularly the Western Armenians, combining philanthropy and politics in their debates. It is noteworthy that even in the conditions of the unfolded war, the idea of the creation of the Armenian state was raised in discussions, speeches, presentations on the Armenian Question and Armenians.

Of course, the manifestations of the Armenian Question in the US foreign policy at the end of the war and just after that (1918-1919), as in the previous periods, were conditioned by their own interests. Interests that could be divided into state (official) and private (personal). And these interests that later led to the situation that US became responsible for delaying the solution of the Armenian question. Instead of immediate aid and protection, Americans wasted the time on speeches, statements, resolutions, discussions, inter-party reactions and quarrels, and, actually, as a consequence, betrayed the Armenians like the Allies.

IV. The information on the Armenian Genocide - presentations and descriptions of the horrifying events, sufferings of Armenians could not but get their reflection in the statements, plans, and projects of the American officials on behalf of the Armenians. In their speeches, introducing the developments regarding the granting of independence to Western Armenians, the desires of creating of sovereign statehood and establishment of the national government, they first spoke about slaughtering and atrocities that Armenians were subjected, and then only introduced their opinions and plans.

V. In 1918-1919 the Armenian problems were discussed on pages of American periodicals; at various meetings and gala evenings; at the sessions of the Senate and House of Representatives and at Hearings of Committees and Subcommittees. The President and State Secretary, Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, Lowers and Professors, representatives of the Relief organizations and other officials spoke in defense of Armenians. American philanthropists generally thought in terms of organizing the Armenians into a mandated state, but they did not agree on the specific form the mandate should take.

Despite their different views and convictions, they all recognized the great tragedy of the Armenians and that the Armenian people ought to have the right to dispose of their own destiny. Some congressmen introduced not only the Armenian Issue in details and called the American statesmen to help the ancient Christian people but also presented many excerpts from the history of the Armenian people. Many of those speeches are actual even today as the incontrovertible facts of the history of the Armenian people, they represented are nothing than a challenge - the answer against the falsifications of the Armenian history.

Bedros Horasangian, *The Gallipoli Campaign and the Armenian Genocide: History and Memory*

The Gallipoli Campaign has long been considered a defining moment in the making of Australian and New Zealand national identities. More recently, it has
started to play a similar role for Turkish national identity. The historical record is clear. After the Ottoman military disaster in the Caucasus, an undecided battle following an ill-prepared, long-postponed, poorly executed Anglo-French landing, has become a symbol of Turkish triumph, and an important part of Turkish national memory. At the time of its unfolding, back in 1915, the Gallipoli Campaign was already a decisive factor in the covering up of the Armenian Genocide. And more than a coincidence. This paper retraces these intricate connections of history and memory.

**Rolf Hosfeld, *Germany and the Armenian Genocide***

The debate about the involvement of the German Empire in the Armenian Genocide dates back to World War I accusations of the Entente as well as rumors spread by Young Turks in their own country from 1915 on. How far does German involvement in this crime reach? The issue is quite complex - and, by the way, it also touches the involvement of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. In his seminal 1968 book *Germany and the Ottoman Empire*, Ulrich Trumpener pointed out that, overall, the German Imperial Government neither supported nor welcomed the persecution of the Armenians during World War I. Yet it culpably displayed an extreme moral indifference and thoroughly failed to take any kind of action against the crimes of its ally, even within the confines of political opportunity.

Although there was no “complicity” in the form of active support, all options were put on the table of “Realpolitik”. Better knowledge notwithstanding, official Germany supported denialism and by this the crime of its war ally from the very beginning for egocentric reasons. Yet, according to historian Wolfgang J. Mommsen, German WWI mentality in itself was *borderline* in terms of violence against civilians. Roughly speaking, a strict distinction was still in place between temporary deportations as military security measures and genocide which is an extreme concept of radical domestic population policy. After the war there was an important public debate about genocide in Germany, following the publication of Johannes Lepsius’ foreign office documents *Deutschland und Armenien* ("Germany and Armenia") in 1919 and the assassination of the former Grand Vizier Talaat Pasha as well as the trial against his Armenian assassin Soghomon Tehlirjan in Berlin 1921. After this denialist voices more and more changed to justificationalism (“hard, but useful”). This backlash helped to prepare the ground for Nazi mentality, as shown by the reference of Adolf Hitler to Enver Pasha in the 1924 trial against him at the Munich People’s Court. Hitler’s “awaking” Germany welcomed the radically nationalist Young Turks as a congenial example.

**Carol Iancu, *Bernard Lazare, les Juifs et les Arméniens***

Cette communication se propose d’examiner les prises de position du journaliste et écrivain Bernard Lazare (1865-1903) à l’égard des Juifs et des Arméniens, affectés respectivement, à la fin du XIXe siècle, par toute une série de pogroms en Russie
tsariste et par la première vague des massacres des Arméniens dans les années 1894-1896, sous le règne d'Abdul Hamid.

Pour comprendre ses engagements dans la défense des Juifs et des Arméniens persécutés, nous sommes amené à tracer les grandes lignes d'une vie vouée à l'idéal de justice et de fraternité, en faisant ressortir l'évolution de sa pensée et ses principaux combats. Les différentes étapes de sa brève vie, marquées par le symbolisme, l'anarchisme et le sionisme, sont en étroite corrélation avec des événements aussi importants que le mouvement symboliste, la période des attentats anarchistes culminant avec le procès des Trente, l'affaire Dreyfus, la rencontre avec Theodore Herzl, l'exode des Juifs de Roumanie au tournant du XXe siècle, et la mobilisation des arménophiles français pour faire connaître à l'opinion publique les événements tragiques d'Arménie.

Bernard Lazare, de son vrai nom Lazare Bernard, est né à Nîmes, dans une famille juive assimilée, enracinée dans la terre du Midi depuis des siècles. En 1886, à l'âge de vingt et un ans, il vient à Paris et s'inscrit à l'Ecole pratique des hautes études, section des sciences religieuses. Très vite et grâce à son cousin toulousain, le poète Georges Michel, connu surtout sous le nom de plume d'Ephraïm Michaël, il fait son entrée dans l'école symboliste naissante et participe aux Mardis de Mallarmé. Du symbolisme à l'anarchisme et de l'anarchisme au symbolisme, tel est le flux et le reflux de sa pensée jusqu'à la grande crise de l'affaire Dreyfus. Hormis plusieurs recueils symbolistes et des portraits littéraires publiés surtout dans Le Figaro, il se fait connaître par sa collaboration aux Entretiens Politiques et littéraires, revue d'inspiration symboliste et libertaire, véritable tribune de propagande anarchiste. C'est dans cette revue qu'il aborde le « problème juif », sujet présent dans la presse surtout avec l'arrivée en France de nombreux immigrants juifs, chassés par les pogroms qui se sont multipliés en Russie, après l'assassinat du tsar Alexandre II en 1882, et les campagnes antisémites d'Édouard Drumont, auteur du pamphlet La France juive (1886). D'une façon étonnante, Bernard Lazare, ce jeune socialiste libertaire, exprime des sentiments hostiles à l'égard de ces immigrants, déclare qu'il n'a rien de commun avec eux, et conseille aux Israélites français d'endiguer « la perpétuelle immigration de ces Tatars prédateurs, grossiers et sales qui viennent indûment paître un pays qui n'est pas le leur ». Quant à l'antisémitisme, les Juifs porteraient eux-mêmes une responsabilité, en raison de leur volonté de séparatisme. C'est la campagne antisémite hystérique qui accompagne l'arrestation du capitaine Dreyfus (15 octobre 1894), sa condamnation (22 décembre 1894) et sa dégradation publique (5 janvier 1895), qui pousse Bernard Lazare à réagir. Il rédige le premier écrit en faveur du capitaine injustement condamné, intitulé Une erreur judiciaire. La vérité sur l'Affaire Dreyfus, (1896). À travers l'Affaire Dreyfus, il subit une transformation radicale : de l'ancien israélite assimilé et auteur de propos antisémites, il est désormais un Juif conscient et fier de son judaïsme, formulant la doctrine du «nationalisme juif» et, devenu sioniste, il participe au deuxième congrès sioniste de Bâle (1898) où il est ovationné.
Les débuts de l’Affaire Dreyfus coïncident avec les manifestations des Arméniens provoquées par le manque de réformes et la dureté du régime despotique et policier de l’Empire ottoman. Abdul Hamid II riposta violemment dès 1894, par un premier massacre des Arméniens planifié, dans le Sassoun, suivi en 1895 et 1896 par d’autres nombres massacres qui ont fait, d’après l’historien Yves Ternon, plus de 200.000 victimes, auxquelles il faut ajouter les conversions forcées qui ont concerné environ 100.000 personnes. À la différence de Charles Péguy, son ami, Bernard Lazare ne s’impliqua pas aussitôt dans la question arménienne, mais, comme lui, il s’y engagea à fond et publia des textes importants dénonçant les massacres à l’encontre des Arméniens et stigmatisant le silence des puissances à leur égard. Une référence explicite aux massacres des Arméniens, se trouve dans un article publié dans l’Aurore du 9 août 1900, intitulé «l’émigration juive de la Roumanie». Bien que sioniste ardent, Lazare démissionna du Comité d’action sioniste, car il n’acceptait pas la diplomatie de Herzl, ses interventions auprès de personnages contestés comme Guillaume II et surtout Abdul Hamid. En effet, Herzl espérait obtenir l’accord de ce sultan pour une immigration des Juifs en Palestine, souhait qui d’ailleurs ne s’est pas concrétisé. Indigné, Lazare déclara dans l’Aurore du 3 janvier 1902, que «sionistes et Arméniens dénoncent les avances faites à l’égorgeur», et une semaine plus tard, dans la revue de Pierre Quillard, Pro Armenia, il revient sur le même sujet, en condamnant le «sultan rouge», responsable du massacre des populations arméniennes. En 1902, les Juifs de Roumanie, sont menacés par la Loi sur les métiers qui stipulait que «Les étrangers [c'est-à-dire les Juifs] désireux d’exercer un métier devront prouver qu’il existe dans leur pays, le droit de reciprocité pour les Roumains…». Bernard Lazare réagit aussitôt en publiant dans les Cahiers de la Quinzaine de Charles Péguy, tout un cahier intitulé : L’Oppression des Juifs dans l’Europe orientale. Les Juifs de Roumanie, s’écriant en conclusion : «Demander aujourd’hui à l’Europe, qui, en violation du Traité de Berlin, a permis le massacre de milliers d’Arméniens chrétiens par des musulmans et n’a pas su arrêter le bras de l’Assassin, lui demander d’empêcher un peuple chrétien de faire périr de misère et de faim plus de cent mille Juifs, serait une ironie trop forte». Bernard Lazare qui lors d’un voyage en Roumanie du 17 au 22 mai 1902, fut accueilli par les Juifs roumains comme «le rédempteur du peuple juif», continua à exprimer sa solidarité avec les Arméniens, comme il ressort d’une lettre envoyée à Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu, quelques mois avant sa mort prématurée, et où il écrivait : «J’ai toujours été de ceux qui ont protesté contre l’oppression subie par l’Arménie et qui ont reprouvé les massacres.»

Raymond Kévorkian, Le Génocide des Arméniens : les grandes lignes d’un plan de destruction
Cette synthèse vise à identifier les grandes lignes du plan de destruction des Arméniens ottomans. Elle examine chacune des phases qui mènent le Comité Union et Progrès à se radicaliser pour passer, dans le contexte de guerre, à la mise en œuvre
Cătălin Mamali, *Sakharov’s Puzzle and Denial Levels of the Armenian Genocide*

The perpetration of large scale collective crimes is most of the time associated with processes of justification and denial by the perpetrators as shown by a large literature in various fields (history, political sciences, social psychology and sociology). The present research is focused on the denial levels of the Armenian genocide, the various forms of ignoring (from honest to willful) this genocide during a long time and the field forces that work to overcome the denial and to move toward recognition, reparations and reconciliation. The study explores only a few elements that could change the dynamics of the field forces that are implied in the dynamics of denial of Armenian genocide. The main elements are: the levels of denial during time, the nurturing of ignorance about the genocide and the attempts to increase the basic common knowledge on the Armenian genocide. The shared public knowledge on the genocide is assumed to increase during time and to reach a critical mass till this might become a significant contributor, in association with other major causes such as the official position of the main political actors, transforming the balance between the forces of denial an those of recognition in the favor of the historical truth and justice. The IGNORANCE (willfully, manipulated or unconscious) is a cognitive process dependent on the accessibility and spread of accurate knowledge. However, at the same time it implies motivational and moral dimensions that are only suggested in this approach. The research includes: a) surveys on national samples an convenience samples on the accuracy of basic knowledge on the Armenian genocide; b) comparative investigation of the accuracy of basic knowledge on Armenian genocide on one side and a tragic event produced close to the same period and produced due to human error and natural conditions (sinking/disaster of the Titanic ship in 1912) on convenience samples in a few countries); c) testimonies of the survivors of Armenian genocide and of people close related to them; d) the dynamic of public information (informational maps) on Armenian genocide, major political figures related to this, other major/unique genocides, and on fictive characters along the denial process. These big data data on cultural artifacts (books) as recorded, processed and displayed on Internet that are classified, analyzed and interpreted in function of critical historical moments and the ratio between the various forces (denial versus recognition) and on the balance between data on real historical figures an fiction.

Suren Manukyan, *The (Un)changing Nature of Victimisation of Ottoman Armenians in the Run-up to Genocide*

The impunity as an instrumental tool for the implementation of genocide is
commonplace in Armenian genocide scholarship. Ottoman Empire had a long tra-
dition of a settlement of internal problems through brutal methods and even mas-
cacres. This policy was rooted from the institutionalized inequality between Muslim
dominated population and Christian subjugated “infidels”.

However, before 1908 impunity was comprehensive and possible punishment
for the crimes committed against Christians even didn’t discuss as in the existing
system of relationships the extermination of Armenians was comprehended a right
and “normal” action. After the Young Turk revolution the issue of impunity became
subject for discussions. The subordinated Armenian community began actively
promote its rights proclaimed by the enforcement of the Constitution. My presen-
tation will focus on the debate over un/changing nature of impunity and victim-
ization in the Armenian provinces of Ottoman Empire that portrait the course of
victimization of the Armenian community, gives the true picture of everyday social
tension and feuds and narrates the whole perception of the imminent catastrophe
by Armenian population.

Hakob Matevosyan, Diaspora Revisited: Agential Forces and Structures of the
Armenian Presence in East Central Europe

The paper critically reconsiders the triadic tradition (homeland – diaspora –
host-land) of studying the processes of constructing and negotiating diasporic iden-
tities. One of the milestones of such a reconsideration is grounded in rethinking of
conceptualization of diaspora as an analytical category. The paper relies on Bour-
dieusian tradition and refers to diaspora as a transnational structured space. Within
this space the processes of diasporic identity construction and negotiation turn into
a struggle among the diasporans (agents) which are structurally reinforced. To this
point diaspora becomes a space (arena) of struggle. The struggle is among different
layers of diasporic communities and structures for various goals and reasons. The
paper refers to the general mosaic of the Armenian heterogeneous presence in East-
Central Europe that is integrated and linked to broader social settings and contexts.
To show how intra-communal struggles influence the processes of diasporic identity
reconsideration and refreshment, I will juxtapose the experiences of multi-layered
and multi-structured diasporic entities that comprises communities with different
migration and settlement histories (routes and roots) and internal developments
through historicizing the Armenian presence in East-Central Europe since the Ear-
ly Modern Period. One of the critical moments of reconsideration of diaspora as an
analytical category refers to the Genocide of 1915 and its role in communal life of
the established communities since the Early Modern Period and emergent diasporic
formations after 1915. Both the new diasporic layers and established communities
engage in the processes of constructing and negotiating their diasporic identities
and Armenianness. If the Genocide of 1915 and its memory, the preservation and
practical usage of ethnic attributes, such as the Armenian language, have become
vital for certain diasporic groups, the diasporic stance of other communities, especially those whose migration history dates back to the pre-genocide periods, is being constructed and negotiated often beyond ethnic “characteristics”.

Ashot Melkonian, *The International Recognition Process of the Armenian Genocide in the Context of the Reparation Issue*

I. The first genocide of the 20th century - Mets Yeghern of the Armenian people was not actually convicted at the international level, the perpetrators of this terrible crime were not punished, no serious efforts were made to eliminate the consequences of the Genocide. According to experts in the field of genocide, all this created a dangerous precedent. It is no accident that in 1933-1945 Fascist Germany committed genocid-Halacaust against the Jewish people. And only after the end of World War II, mankind came to its senses and condemned Nazi leaders in Nuremberg.

II. However, unfortunately, the issue of the Armenian Genocide continued to be beyond the attention of the international community. This is when the Armenian people were not only physically destroyed, but also lost their homeland - Western Armenia, where they lived for thousands of years.

Before the Second World War, the Armenians did not have a serious opportunity at the international level to raise the issue of condemnation of the Armenian Genocide. In Soviet Armenia during the times of the Stalinist regime, as well as Soviet-Turkish comparatively warm relations, this issue was actually closed. And the dispersed Armenian Diaspora around the world was not able to raise this issue, as it was itself at the stage of formation.

III. The situation around the Armenian issue changed after Soviet Armenia and the Armenian Diaspora officially celebrated the 50th anniversary of the genocide. In 1965, faraway Uruguay became the first country whose legislative body recognized the Armenian Genocide.

On June 18, 1987, the European Parliament adopted a resolution “On the Political Solution of the Armenian Question.” The preamble of the document notes that “the Turkish government, refusing to recognize the 1915 genocide to this day, continues to deprive the Armenian people of their own history ... that the historically proven genocide has not received any political condemnation or appropriate compensation ...”

Numerous attempts on the part of Turkey to prevent the process of international recognition of the Genocide, for example, 2001-2003, the activities of the so-called Armenian-Turkish reconciliation commission, etc., only temporarily delayed the process. Soon the tragedy of Armenians was condemned by the parliaments of Switzerland (December 2003), Canada, Poland, Slovakia (2004). 7. Until 2010, the number of these countries reached two and a half dozen. The situation was especially changed in 1998 when that issue became the component of the foreign policy of independent Armenia. More countries adopted parliamentary resolutions, deci-
sions and statements condemning the Armenian Genocide. The number of such countries exceeded two and a half decades.

IV. However, the Armenian side made a mistake during the struggle against the Turkish denial. On the way to bring the question to the international recognition the issue of compensation was forgotten and didn’t find place in the official documents of the countries that had recognized the Armenian genocide. More than 20 countries’ parliaments, avoiding the use of the phrase Western Armenia, didn’t want to take responsibility of the issue of the territorial compensation to Armenians by Turkey.

From all the adopted resolutions only the decisions of Cyprus (1974), Russia (1995) and Slovakia are distinguished. It was emphasized in the announcement of the state Duma of the Russian Federation on the 14th of April, 1995 that the Armenian Genocide had happened in the motherland of the Armenians – in Western Armenia, and that during the realizing the pan-Turkish policy the Young Turks put into practice the plan of depriving the Armenians of their motherland simultaneously with the process of destroying the Armenians physically.

Felicia Waldman, The Great Game (and Stakes) of Denial

It is quite well known that shortly before invading Poland Hitler gave a speech in which he said: “Who speaks today of the extermination of the Armenians?” Indeed, although the Armenian genocide was quite well documented as it happened, it was not long before the first attempts not just to forget it, but also to deny it ever took place, started emerging, much like in the case of the Holocaust 30 year later. The presentation traces how denial of the Armenian genocide and Holocaust denial influenced and fed each other along the time, by constantly borrowing and exchanging various elements, sometimes chronologically but sometimes also in reverse order (with Armenian genocide deniers using arguments taken from their Holocaust denying counterparts).