

DEATH AND EXILE

The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims 1821-1922

by Justin McCarthy

THE DARWIN PRESS, INC. PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

-iii-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: iii.

Copyright © 1995 by Justin McCarthy. All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form, by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations in critical articles or reviews.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

McCarthy, Justin.

Death and exile : the ethnic cleansing of Ottoman Muslims. 1821-1922 / by Justin McCarthy. P. cm. Includes bibliographical references and index. ISBN 0-87850-094-4: \$35.00 1. Muslims -- Relocation -- History. 2. Turks -- Relocation -- History. 3. Muslims -- Balkan Peninsula -- Relocation. 4. Muslims -- Caucasus-Relocation. 5. Muslims -- Ukraine -- Crimes -- Relocation. 6. Turkey-Emigration and immigration -- History -- 19th century. 7. Turkey-Emigration and immigration -- History -- 20th century. 8. Muslims --Crimes against. I. Title.

DR27.M87M33 1995

949.61'015-- dc20

The paper in this book is acid-free neutral pH stock and meets the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council on Library Resources.

∞

Printed in the United States of America.

Third printing, 1999

-iv-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: iv.

To Carolyn Beth

-v-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: v.

CONTENTS

Maps and Tables	<u>ix</u>
Spelling and Pronunciation	<u>xi</u>
Acknowledgments	<u>xiii</u>
Introduction	<u>xv</u>

Chapter One: The Land To Be Lost	<u>1</u>
Chapter Two: Eastern Anatolia and the Caucasus	<u>23</u>
Chapter Three: Bulgaria	<u>59</u>
Chapter Four: The East, 1878 to 1914	<u>109</u>
Chapter Five: The Balkan Wars	<u>135</u>
Chapter Six: The Final War in the East	<u>179</u>
Chapter Seven: The Final War in the West	<u>255</u>
Chapter Eight: The End of the Muslim Land	<u>333</u>
Appendix: Methodology and Calculations	<u>341</u>
Bibliography	<u>347</u>
Index	<u>359</u>

-vii-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: vii.

MAPS

Ottoman Europe and Anatolia in 1800	<u>4</u>
Ottoman Europe in 1800	<u>9</u>
Eastern Anatolia in 1856	<u>24</u>
Ottoman Europe in 1877	<u>63</u>
Ottoman Balkans in 1912	<u>137</u>
Eastern Anatolia and the Southern Caucasus in 1914	<u>181</u>
Cilicia	<u>203</u>

TABLES

1. Mortality Due to Disease in Trabzon, 1 December 1863 to 17 February 1864	<u>38</u>
2. Population of the Kaza of Çarşamba, ca. 1880	<u>48</u>
3. Turkish Refugees as Estimated in Various Sources (1877-80)	<u>88</u> -89
4. Muslim Population of Bulgaria, 1877	<u>89</u>
5. Surviving Turkish Refugees from Bulgaria in 1879	<u>90</u>
6. Calculation of Muslim Losses in Bulgaria, 1877-79	<u>91</u>
7. The Population of Ottoman Europe, 1911, by Province and Religion	<u>135</u>
8. Ottoman Europe in 1911. Percentage Population by Millet	<u>136</u>
9. Muslim Refugee Numbers	<u>159</u>
10. Muslim Refugees from the Balkans, 1912-20, with Areas of Settlement	<u>161</u>
11. Regions of the Ottoman Empire Taken by the Balkan Allies	<u>162</u>
12. Population after the Wars	<u>163</u>
13. Muslims in Ottoman Areas Taken by Greece, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia and Muslims Remaining in those Countries	<u>164</u>
14. Population of Kars Province in 1897, by Religion	<u>212</u>

Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press.
Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: ix.

15. Turks in Erivan Province, 1914 and 1926	<u>217</u>
16. Refugees in the Kars Area	<u>220</u>
17. Surviving Muslim Refugees from the Russian Empire in Northeastern and Eastern Anatolia in 1922	<u>221</u>
18. Eastern Anatolian Muslim Refugees Receiving Assistance, to October 1916	<u>223</u>
19. Destruction in the Cities of Van and Bitlis	<u>226</u>
20. Villages in Van Vilâyeti and Bayazıt Sancayı, Before and After the War and Armenian Occupation	<u>227</u>
21. Muslim Population loss in the Ottoman Eastern Provinces, 1912-22	<u>229</u>
22. Turkish and Muslim Population Loss in the Transcaucasian Region	<u>230</u>
23. The Population of Ottoman Western Anatolian Provinces, 1912	<u>256</u>
24. Jews in Western Anatolia, 1912 and 1922	<u>284</u>
25. Greek Refugees from Turkey	<u>287</u>
26. The Number of Animals Lost in the Occupied Territories	<u>295</u>
27. Buildings Destroyed in Western Anatolian Cities	<u>296</u> -97
28. Buildings Destroyed in the Countryside	<u>297</u>
29. Loss of Muslims in Western Anatolia, 1912-1922	<u>305</u>
30. Mortality and Migration of Muslims	<u>339</u>
31. Recorded Population of Bulgaria in 1285 (1868-1869) and 1288 (1871-1872)	<u>342</u>
32. The Population of Bulgaria in 1887, by Religious Groups	<u>342</u>

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: x.

SPELLING AND PRONUNCIATION

There are always difficulties in reproducing Turkish words in English. Some of the sounds, such as the undotted i (ı), are unknown in English, and some letters sound different, such as the c (hard j, as in "jump"). If the words are transliterated close to their English sounds, reference to Turkish works is difficult. Gümühane, for example, becomes Guemueshane. Therefore, most Turkish words have been reproduced here as they are written in modern Turkish. Ottoman Turkish, which was written with a modified Arabic script, has been transliterated into modern Turkish. The sounds are approximately as follows:

a as in father or hah e as in wait or great i as in beet or meet ı a soft i, as in cushion or curtain o as in home or bone ö as in German u as in moon or June ü as in German ay as in by or why ey as in may or pay c as in jam or jump ç as in child or chimney j as in the French gendarme or passage ş as in ship or shore ğ lengthens previous vowel only. For example, "ağaç" is pronounced "aa-ach."

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: xi.

Bs and Ps and Ts and Ds are not quite interchangeable in Turkish, but they often seem to be, so the same name often appears in sources spelled in two ways: İzmit and İzmid and Üsküb and Üsküp will both often be seen in print, as will Mehmed and Mehmet, Murat and Murad, and many other proper

names.

Names in quotations, archival references, and the like have been retained in their original form. Some proper names also appear as they are commonly used in English: "Ottoman Empire" not "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu," "Istanbul" not "İstanbul," "Cilicia" not "Kilikya," etc.

-xii-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: xii.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank the persons, agencies, and institutions whose support was essential to the writing of *Death and Exile*. Research on the book was funded by grants from the United States National Endowment for the Humanities (for research on World War I and its aftermath), the Institute of Turkish Studies (for research into mortality and migrations of the Turks), and the University of Louisville. Technical assistance was provided by the University of Louisville, particularly the overwhelmingly competent staffs of the Department of History and the Inter-Library Loan Office. Special thanks are due to Rita Hettinger, Rita Jones, Ljilja Kuftinec, Barbara Winsper, and Debbie Jordan. Librarians and archivists of the U.S. National Archives, the British Public Record Office, the Library of Congress, the British Library, and the Atatürk Kitaplığı were always helpful. Boşaziçi Üniversitesi and the School of Oriental and African Studies provided gracious support and affiliation while I undertook research in Istanbul and London, respectively.

The book was read in manuscript by Alan Fisher, Paul Henze, Heath Lowry, and Stanford Shaw, all of whom provided citations, copies of manuscripts, articles, and books, and sometimes painful, but accurate, corrections. Much of the book has benefitted from their wisdom. Of course, errors and opinions are my own.

-xiii-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: xiii.

INTRODUCTION

I came to this study of Muslim mortality and migration from research on the population of the Ottoman Empire in World War I. My interest at the time lay simply in ascertaining how many Muslims had lived in Anatolia and how their population had changed in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The results of the study amazed me, for nothing in my previous readings on Ottoman history had prepared me for the great mortality of the period. The statistics said that one-fourth of the Muslim population had been lost. I could not believe that such loss had been glossed over in the histories, but checking and rechecking the data left the same conclusion. Not only during World War I, but all through the nineteenth century, the Muslim peoples of Anatolia, the Crimea, the Balkans, and the Caucasus had suffered overwhelming mortality. Their losses were worthy of further research.

This volume is the result of that research -- a history of the mortality and forced migration of the Muslim peoples. It puts forward Muslim losses in detail, but it would be a mistake to treat Muslim losses as if they occurred in a vacuum. Past avoidance of any mention of Muslim losses in most histories does not excuse any corresponding pretense that Christians did not suffer as well. Many of the horrors and sufferings catalogued here took place in wars in which all sides suffered. The losses of Muslims were often accompanied by those of Christians. Whenever possible I have mentioned the fate of Christians who were in conflict with Muslims. This is not, however, a general history of the Ottoman peoples, nor even a history of all wartime mortality in one region. It is a history of Muslim suffering, not because Muslims alone suffered, but because a corrective is needed to the traditional one-sided view of the history of the Turks and the Muslims of these regions. I believe it is also a history that can legitimately stand alone. It is the story of massive mortality and one of history's great migrations.

-xv-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: xv.

CHAPTER ONE

THE LAND TO BE LOST

IN 1800, A VAST Muslim Land existed in Anatolia, the Balkans, and southern Russia. It was not only a land in which Muslims ruled, but a land in which Muslims were the majority or, in much of the Balkans and part of the Caucasus, a sizeable minority. It included the Crimea and its hinterlands, most of the Caucasus region, eastern as well as western Anatolia, and southeastern Europe from Albania and Bosnia to the Black Sea, almost all of which was within the Ottoman Empire. Attached to it geographically were regions in Romania and southern Russia in which Muslims were a plurality among different peoples. By 1923, only Anatolia, eastern Thrace, and a section of the southeastern Caucasus remained to the Muslim land. The Balkan Muslims were largely gone, dead or forced to migrate, the remainder living in pockets of settlement in Greece, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia. The same fate had overcome the Muslims of the Crimea, the northern Caucasus, and Russian Armenia -- they were simply gone. Millions of Muslims, most of them Turks, had died; millions more had fled to what is today Turkey. Between 1821 and 1922, more than five million Muslims were driven from their lands. Five and one-half million Muslims died, some of them killed in wars, others perishing as refugees from starvation and disease.

Much of the history of the Balkans, Anatolia, and the Caucasus cannot properly be understood without consideration of the Muslim refugees and the Muslim dead. This is particularly true of the history of nationalism and imperialism. The contemporary map of the Balkans and the southern Caucasus displays countries with fairly homogenous populations, countries that were created in the wars and revolutions that separated them from the Ottoman Empire. Their ethnic and religious unity was accomplished through the expulsion of their Muslim population. In other words, the new states were founded on the suffering of their departed inhabitants. Similarly, Russian imperialism, still too often portrayed as the

"civilizing" march of European culture, brought with it the deaths of millions of Circassians, Abkhazians, Laz, and Turks. Nationalism and imperialism appear in a much worse light when their victims take the stage.

The Muslim loss is an important part of the history of the Turks. It was they who most felt the consequences of nationalism and imperialism. At a time when the Ottoman Empire was struggling to reform itself and survive as a modern state, it was first forced to drain its limited resources to defend its people from slaughter by its enemies, then to try to care for the refugees who streamed into the empire when those enemies triumphed. After the Ottoman Empire was destroyed in World War I, the Turks of what today is Turkey faced the same problems -- invasion, refugees, and mortality. The Turks survived, but their nation was greatly affected by the events of the past century. The new Turkish Republic was a nation of immigrants whose citizens came from Bulgaria, Greece, Yugoslavia, Armenia, Georgia, Russia, Ukraine, and elsewhere. Like the Ottoman Empire before it, Turkey faced all the difficulties of integrating an immigrant population and coping with massive wartime destruction while it was trying to modernize and survive. The challenges of that struggle shaped the character of the Turkish Republic.

Despite the historical importance of Muslim losses, it is not to be found in textbooks. Textbooks and histories that describe massacres of Bulgarians, Armenians, and Greeks have not mentioned corresponding massacres of Turks. The **exile** and mortality of the Muslims is not known. This goes against modern practice in other areas of history. It has rightly become unthinkable today to write of American expansion without consideration of the brutality shown to Native Americans. The carnage of the Thirty Years' War must be a part of any history of religious change in Europe. Historians cannot write of imperialism without mention of slaughter of Africans in the Congo or of Chinese in the Opium Wars. Yet, in the West, the history of the suffering of the Balkan, Caucasian, and Anatolian Muslims has never been written or understood. The history of the Balkans, the Caucasus, and Anatolia has been written without mention of one of its main protagonists, the Muslim population.

The "traditional" view of the history of the Balkans, the Caucasus, and Anatolia is less than complete, if not misleading, because the histories of the Ottoman minority groups are taken out of context. A major part of that context is the suffering of Muslims,

Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 2.

which took place in the same regions and at the same time as the sufferings of Christians, and often transcended them. The few who have attempted to alter the traditional view have been derided as "revisionists," as if revision were an academic sin and contextual historical accuracy irrelevant. In fact, revising one-sided history and changing deficient traditional wisdom is the business of the historian, and in few areas of history is revision so needed as in the history of the Ottoman peoples. The history that results from the process of revision is an unsettling one, for it tells the story of Turks as victims, and this is not the role in which they are usually cast. It does not present the traditional image of the Turk as victimizer, never victim, that has continued in the histories of America and Europe long after it should have been discarded with other artifacts of nineteenth-century racism.

THE MUSLIMS

The subjects of this volume were of many ethnic groups, but they were joined together by religion, as Muslims. The majority were Turkish-speakers. However, it is often not possible to identify to which ethnic group many of the Muslims belonged. Ethnic divisions among its people were not officially recognized by the Ottoman Empire, and Ottoman nationals were listed in the census, subjected to military conscription, and taxed according to their religious group. An Ottoman Muslim might be a member of any one of many linguistic groups, but was officially identified only by his or her declaration that Muhammad was the Prophet of God. In the same way, a Greek was a member of the Greek Orthodox Church, no matter his ethnic or linguistic identity, as was an Armenian a Gregorian Armenian or a Catholic Armenian. Popular identification was also made according to religion. Until very recent times Turks, Albanians, Bosnians, and all other Muslim groups would call themselves simply "Muslims."

Because of this identification by religion, it is not at all unusual to write of Muslims as a cohesive group. The people under study here identified themselves as Muslims, were classified as "Muslim" by their government, and were persecuted because they were Muslim. Nevertheless, ethnic origin is not an unimportant consideration.

Muslim Turks and Muslim Albanians had different experiences in their wars with Greeks and Serbs. Pomaks, as Bulgarian-speaking Muslims are known, were subjected to special treatment by Bulgarian Christians. Exiled Circassians who were settled in Anatolia were ethnically different from the resident Turks. And Kurdish activities in the Ottoman East cannot be properly analyzed unless Kurds are considered as such. It is, therefore, necessary to identify the inhabitants of the Balkans, Anatolia, and the Caucasus as "Muslims," but sometimes to consider them by ethnic group as well.

Much nonsense has been written on the ethnic groups of the Middle East and the Balkans. The various ethnic groups have all too often been called "races," as if some mark in the blood or on the soul branded them forever as Greek, Albanian, Turkish, or Armenian. When these ethnic groups are considered here they are labelled by language. "Albanians" spoke Albanian. "Pomaks" were Bulgarian-speaking Muslims. "Turks," including those often called Tatars or Tartars, spoke Turkish. The only exception comes for those, such as Turkophone Armenians, who demonstrably identified themselves as part of another group.

CAUSES OF CHANGE

Like other historical events, the political causes of change among these Muslims were a combination of political processes. Three primary factors came together to decide the fate of the Muslims of Ottoman Europe, the Crimea, the Caucasus, and Anatolia: the military and economic weakness of the Ottoman Empire, nationalism among Ottoman Christian peoples, and Russian imperial expansion.

Ottoman Weakness. Had the Ottomans been able to properly defend their empire, the mortality and migration of the Muslims surely would not have occurred. There is no consensus among historians as to the causes of Ottoman weakness. The slow degradation of the traditional Ottoman administrative system surely contributed to internal weakness, just as market changes adversely affected the Ottoman economy. Like peoples in most of the world, the Ottomans participated only marginally in the intellectual, scientific, and industrial revolutions that reshaped and empowered

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 5.

Europe. When they perceived their weakness, the Ottomans were without the financial wherewithal and administrative power to change quickly. Although constant military pressure from their enemies made rapid change imperative, the Ottomans were unable to emulate in a few generations what had taken Europe five hundred years to achieve.

By 1800, the government of the Ottoman Empire was internally weak, unable to finance and control even the traditional Ottoman military system, much less a modern army and navy capable of standing against the empire's enemies. Nineteenth-century reforms built up the Ottoman forces to a level that enabled the Ottomans to subjugate internal enemies and expand centralized control of the empire, but the Ottomans could not stand against their external enemies. The armies of the European Powers were better trained, had better weapons, and in far greater numbers than the Ottoman forces. Beset by strong opponents, the Ottomans had no "breathing space" to put their house in order. Time was needed to build a modern state and army. Time was needed to create the industrialized economy that was the base of a strong state. The Ottomans' enemies, particularly Russia, allowed them no time. The Ottoman armies fought wars in 1806-12, 1828-29, 1832-33, 1839-40, 1853-56, 1877-78, 1897, 1911-13, 1914-18, and 1919-23, and in major insurrections in 1804, 1815-17, 1821-30, 1866-68, 1875, 1876, and 1896-97. Armies that should have been in training were continually forced to fight unprepared and were decimated again and again. State finances needed for modernization were expended in wars that ended in loss of territory and a corresponding loss of revenue. In short, Ottoman weakness caused Ottoman losses, and the losses kept the Ottomans too weak to rebound. It was Ottoman weakness that allowed the other two factors -- the nationalism of the Ottoman minority groups and Russian expansionism -- to come into play.

NATIONALISM AND REBELLION

Nationalism in the Ottoman Empire was unquestionably a philosophical import from Western Europe, but its development in the empire was unique.

Its first manifestations were more tied to the Ottoman idea of a religiously defined nation (millet) than to

-6-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 6.

ethnic nationalism as seen in the West. Since the beginning of their empire, the Ottomans had allowed the existence of Christian denominations and, through the millet system of limited self-government, had allowed and even fostered separateness based on religion. Each religious community, or millet, was allowed a great deal of autonomy. Courts, schools, and welfare systems were in the hands of religious officials. The legal separation was reflected in the daily life of members of the millets, who often lived and worked together to the exclusion of other religious groups. To the early Ottomans, this policy was not only an observance of the Prophet Muhammad's rule of tolerance for Christians and Jews -- it was a practical matter of "divide and rule." The result was an empire in which the rulers belonged to one religion, Islam, but in which other religions remained and retained a strong separate identity. No particular attempt was made to integrate the members of each religion into a "nation." Given the depth of religious feeling and the importance of religion to personal and group identity, it probably would have been impossible to unite the disparate groups without forced religious conversion, and the Ottomans did not pursue such a policy. Through the centuries of Ottoman rule many converted to Islam, but conversion was not fostered, and forced conversion was almost nonexistent (the special case of the Janissaries notwithstanding).

In the millet system, the Ottomans had accepted the existence of a subject class with no inherent loyalty to the state. Under the millet system, loyalty to the state was not expected and was usually not given. As long as civil order was kept and taxes paid, the Ottomans were little concerned with personal feelings toward the government. The real repository of loyalty was one's own religious community. "Ottoman" was traditionally a description of the rulers of the state -- a member of the bureaucracy or a military leader -- not a nationality. When latter-day reformers tried to create an Ottoman nationality, it was far too late. The old habits of primary identification as Greek or Armenian, now nationalities as well as religions, were frozen.

As the nineteenth century advanced and "national" consciousness grew

among Ottoman Christians, nationalism of the Ottoman minorities took on the "racial" character seen in Italian or German nationalism, but the strong tie to religion never died. Much, perhaps most, of the national consciousness of the Greeks, Bulgars, and Armenians was founded on religious identification. This was not

-7-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 7.

odd, since Christian churches had for centuries been the primary repository of the separate cultures of each Christian group. Christians might eat the same foods, live in the same-style dwellings, even speak the same language as the Muslim Turks, but they worshipped and believed separately.

The Ottomans received little credit for their long and unique tradition of religious toleration. Ironically, they paid a heavy price for it. Foreigners used the excuse of protection of the Christian millets and Christian brotherhoods as pretexts for intervention in Ottoman internal affairs. Members of Christian millets drew upon this sense of religious separation to create an anti-Ottoman nationalism.

Nineteenth-century economic and social change within the Ottoman Empire gave Christians a sense of superiority and deepened their resentment of their Muslim rulers. Bolstered by ties with the Christian powers of Europe and a superior educational system, Christians were able to gain disproportionate benefit from nineteenth-century economic advances. Missionaries and others taught them a sense of superiority and of community with the European imperial powers. As many Christians advanced economically, they naturally desired to match economic success with political power. This was denied them. The Ottoman Empire was a Muslim empire in which Christians were allowed to live. Demographically and politically, Muslims were dominant. Resentment of the political situation must have been a strong force in the nationalism of Christian ethnic groups. As Christians advanced economically, Christian pride met traditional Muslim pride, which also assumed superiority based on religion and centuries of dominance. When the chance arose to turn the tables, it was readily taken.

The religious element in the nationalism of the minorities was significant in two ways: First, it fed the uncompromising intensity and clearness of

purpose of the nationalists. Enemies riot only stood against national aspirations, they stood against God. This made attacks on those perceived as enemies of one's people all the easier. Religious nationalism also allowed easy identification of the enemy. As will be seen, Muslims as such were viewed as national enemies by each nationalist group. They were not to be tolerated as part of the nation, because they were not ethnic brothers, and, moreover, they were "infidels." This was one root cause of the forced expulsion of Muslims that accompanied each national revolution.

-8-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 8.



Ottoman Europe in 1800.

In the nineteenth century, the story of Muslim losses to the new nationalism began with the Greek Revolution of 1821. The Serbs had rebelled earlier, but their rebellion, which was primarily aimed at the misrule of the Janissaries in Serbia, had few of the marks of the national uprisings that were to occur for the next century. The Greek rebellion was the first of the movements that identified themselves by the murder and expulsion of Muslims from

-9-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 9.

their land. The Greek revolution set a pattern later followed by other national revolts against the Ottomans.

THE GREEK WAR OF

INDEPENDENCE

In 1861, the historian George Finlay wrote,

In the month of April 1821, a Muslim population, amounting to upwards of twenty thousand souls, was living, dispersed in Greece, employed in agriculture. Before two months had elapsed the greater part was slain -- men, women, and children were murdered without mercy or remorse. Old men still point to the heaps of stones, and tell the traveller, "There stood the pyrgos (tower) of Ali Aga, and there we slew him, his harem, and his slaves;" and the old man walks calmly on to plow the fields which once belonged to Ali Aga, without a thought that any vengeful fury can attend his path. The crime was a nation's crime, and whatever perturbations it may produce must be in a nation's conscience, as the deeds by which it can be expiated must be the acts of a nation. ¹

The Greek revolution against the Ottoman Empire began in March of 1821 with the murder of a number of Ottoman government officials, especially tax-collectors. A general attack on the Turks of the Morea in southern Greece followed in April, in which Greek guerrillas and villagers simply murdered every Turk they found. Turkish and Albanian Ottoman soldiers were set upon and killed. Some, such as the Muslims of Kalavryta and Kalamata, surrendered to the Greeks upon receiving promises of safety. They, too, were killed. Many who had fled, such as the Turks of Laconia, were massacred on the roads. ²

In the meantime the Christian population had attacked and murdered the Mussulman population in every part of the peninsula. The towers and country homes of the Mussulmans were burned down, and their property was destroyed, in order to render the return of those who had escaped into the fortresses hopeless. From the 26th of March until Easter Sunday, which fell, in the year 1821, on the 22nd of April, it is supposed that fifteen thousand [Muslim] souls perished in cold blood and that about three thousand farmhouses or Turkish dwellings were laid waste. ³

The patriotic cry of the revolution, proclaimed by the Greek Archbishop Germanos, was "Peace to the Christians! Respect to the Consuls! **Death** to the Turks!" ⁴ The only Turks who survived were those who were able to take refuge in strongholds. They fled with their families into the few areas, such as the Acropolis of Athens, which were held by Ottoman garrison troops. There they were either besieged and ultimately killed or, in rare cases, rescued by Ottoman forces. As the Greek Revolution continued, new areas came under attack and the massacres of Muslims were repeated. In Missolonghi, most Muslims were murdered quickly, but Turkish women were taken as slaves of rich Greek families. The Muslims of Vrachori were tortured to **death**. Jews, who were also perceived as infidels by the Greeks, were killed as readily as were Muslims. ⁵

Similar events had taken place in primarily Greek Orthodox Romania, where Greek rebels under Alexander Ypsilantes attempted to begin a revolt against the Ottomans that might spread throughout the Balkans (March 1821). Relying on presumed assistance from Russia, Ypsilantes and his supporters took Galatz and Yassy. In both places, "Turks of every rank, merchants, sailors, soldiers, were surprised and massacred in cold blood." ⁶ Murders of Ottoman officials, soldiers, and local Turks followed in cities and in the mountains. However, the Russians, perhaps motivated by the antirevolutionary spirit of the Congress of Vienna, refused to militarily support Ypsilantes, and the Ottomans quickly reacted to the massacres. Ypsilantes was forced to flee, his revolution a failure. ⁷ The only "success" of his uprising was the massacre of Turks.

The deaths of Turks in Greece were not the mortality of wartime casualties. All the Turks taken by Greek bands, including women and children, were killed, the only exception being small numbers of women and children taken into slavery. Sometimes the Turks were killed immediately, in the hot blood of revolt and the joy of seeing old masters lain low, but often the murders were calculated and in cold blood. Entire Turkish populations of cities and towns were collected and marched out of town to convenient places, where they were slaughtered. ⁸ For example, in Tripolitza:

For three days the miserable [Turkish] inhabitants were given over to the lust and cruelty of a mob of savages. Neither sex nor age was spared. Women and children were tortured before being put to **death**. So great was the slaughter that [guerrilla leader] Kolokotronis himself says that,

Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 11.

when he entered the town, from the gate of the citadel his horse's hoofs never touched the ground. His path of triumph was carpeted with corpses. At the end of two days, the wretched remnant of the Mussulmans were deliberately collected, to the number of some two thousand souls, of every age and sex, but principally women and children, were led out to a ravine in the neighboring mountains, and there butchered like cattle. ⁹

The murders were thus calculated political acts, not simply an outpouring of hatred. The Turks of Greece were seen as standing in the way of a purely Greek and independent Greece. The revolutionaries correctly assumed that the loyalties of the Turks of Greece were toward the Ottoman Empire, not to the "New Greece." A Turkish minority would always be a rallying point for future proOttoman sentiment and perhaps a future Ottoman attack to come to the aid of the Turks of Greece. The Turks would unquestionably be a fifth column against the Greek Revolution. The answer to these problems was extermination. When the European Powers finally forced the Ottomans to create a Greek kingdom in the Morea (the London Protocol of 1830), it was a Greek kingdom devoid of the Turks who had lived there for centuries. ¹⁰ Although estimates of mortality are imprecise, it seems that more than 25,000 Muslims had been killed by the Greek revolutionaries. ¹¹

The Greek revolution set a pattern for future revolutions in the Balkans. The policy of ridding regions of their Turkish population in the name of national independence was seen again in the wars of 1877-78, 1912-13, and 1919-23. In the later wars, the intention was the same as that of the Greek revolutionaries in 1821 -to create unified nations by destroying the ethnic and religious group that stood in the way. Hatred of the Turks was a real factor in the killings, but it was a factor channelled into the aims of independence and nationalism. The desire to take possession of Turkish farms and property was, of course, a factor not to be ignored.

NATIONALISM AND THE MUSLIMS

The initial motives of the Greek revolution cannot be called truly nationalistic. Already in 1821 and before, many Greeks considered themselves to be a "people." The history and greatness of

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 12.

the ancient Greeks uniquely taught the Greeks a sense of separateness. Most of the impetus behind the revolution, however, was religious. The revolutionaries felt that the Greek Orthodox Romanians would join in their rebellion and, presumably, their new state. Bishops and priests were at the forefront of the revolution, and it is doubtful if the revolt could have seen much success unless the common people felt that they were acting in the name of God. Nevertheless, the blood of the revolution and its ultimate success did act to create a Greek nationalism. Its guiding principles were redemption of the "unredeemed" territories still held by the Turks and the creation of a Greater Greece with its capital at Constantinople -- a rebirth of the Byzantine Empire. The majority of the inhabitants of much of the land claimed for the new empire were Muslims, particularly in Thrace and western Anatolia. The call of nationalism required that those Muslims be removed.

As will be seen, creating a nation by expelling Turks and other Muslims was a principle that was to be followed by Bulgarians, Russians, and Armenians. It was the misfortune of the Muslim communities of the Balkans, Anatolia, and the Caucasus that they lay in the path of the new nationalisms. Their misfortune was compounded by the fact that the power upon which they depended, the Ottoman Empire, did not have the strength to defend them. Their sufferings were ironic, because, had the Turks in their days of power been nationalists of the Greek sort, it would have been the Christians who were driven out, leaving lands that were purely Muslim Turkish. Instead, the Ottomans had suffered the Christians to remain. They had often treated the Christians well, often poorly, but they had allowed them to exist and to keep their languages, traditions, and religions. They were right to do so, but if fifteenth-century Turks had not been tolerant, nineteenth-century Turks might have survived in their homes.

RUSSIAN EXPANSION

Despite its weakness, the Ottoman Empire did not constrict or collapse from internal revolution. Whether it would have collapsed from such internal pressures as the desire for political reform or unaided nationalism of its

peoples may be an interesting specu-

-13-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 13.

lation, but the empire was in fact destroyed in international wars with militarily superior foes, primarily Russia. The same wars decided the fate of the Muslim peoples of the empire -- their suffering was attendant upon attacks on the empire and invasion of their homeland. In some areas, such as eastern Anatolia during the First World War, many Muslim deaths were the result of intercommunal conflicts, but those too occurred as a part of international war.

Russian expansion began in the fourteenth century when the Russians recovered native rule from the overlordship of the Golden Horde. By the end of the fifteenth century, Russian Tsar Ivan III (1462-1505) ruled over a kingdom freed from Muslim sovereignty. Then the process of subjection reversed. Ivan the Terrible (1533-84) began the conquest of lands north of the Black Sea, in which the population was predominantly Muslim and Turkish-speaking. During his reign and for a hundred years afterwards, wars with the Turkish-speaking Crimean Tatars and other Muslims continued. The wars were vicious, led by raiders on both sides. Like the earlier, somewhat similar wars of expansion in Spain, self-serving leaders and unstable alliances between Christians and Muslims played a part, and sides were not always clearly drawn. Yet, in the end, the Muslims were defeated. By the reign of Peter the Great (1689-1725), Tatar rule had been reduced to a small region consisting of the Crimea and its immediate hinterlands.

Under Peter and his successors, Russian expansion to the south continued. Perforce the expansion was at the expense of Muslim rulers and the conquest was the conquest of Muslim peoples. The difficulties inherent in this conquest were perhaps more evident to the Russians than they might have been to others. For two centuries the Russians had been under the rule of a people who were religiously and ethnically separate from the population they ruled. Eventually, they succeeded in overthrowing what was viewed as alien rule. The tsars were now undertaking a similar conquest of alien peoples and might ultimately expect the same sort of uprising against alien rulers themselves. The method adopted by the Russians to insure they would not suffer the same fate as the Golden Horde was effective, if

ruthless: they denuded the areas they conquered of Muslims and replaced them with Christians. This was not a policy unique to Russians; at the same time as the Russian actions against Muslims, for example, European settlers in North America were imposing a similar policy on the Native Americans. Nor was it a policy

-14-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 14.

applied by all the tsars and Russian governors. Russians who felt sympathy and respect for Muslim peoples were not lacking. Nevertheless, viewed as a historical phenomenon, Russian conquest of Muslims was a policy consistently and effectively applied for 150 years. The ethnological map of southern Russia, the Crimea, and the Caucasus today reflects the success of the Russian operations.

An investigation of the causes of Russian imperialism is beyond the purview of this study. Scholars have attributed the Russian drive for annexation to everything from paranoia (the result of remembered Mongol domination) to desire for warm-water ports; simpler explanations such as the demands of imperial prestige and the desire to pay supporters with conquered lands cannot be ignored. Imperialism was often its own justification. Whatever the root cause, much of Russian expansion was at the cost of Muslim peoples. The first major group of Muslims to suffer forced migration were the Crimean Tatars. Their experience is instructive not only because of their sufferings, but because the Tatar experience established a pattern for later Russian expansion.

EMIGRATION OF THE CRIMEAN TATARS

The Crimean Tatars are considered to have been descendants of Turkic tribes who came to the region between 1000 and 1300 in various waves of conquest. Although in fact largely independent under their own *khans*, the Crimeans were nominally vassals of the Ottoman sultan from the late fifteenth century onward. The Crimean khans both independently and as allies/vassals of the Ottomans battled the Russian tsars. As Russian power

increased, the power of the Tatars correspondingly decreased. After subverting the loyalties of the Nogay Tatars of Yedisán (northwest of the Crimea proper) from the Crimean khan in 1770, the Russians invaded the Crimea in 1771, forcing the Crimeans to accept Russian dominance. In 1774, in the treaty of K`k Kaynarca, the Ottomans accepted the reality of their loss of power over the Crimea and acknowledged it as an independent state, with diminished territory, under a khan acceptable to the Russians. The Russians began to settle Christians from the Ottoman Empire on the lands they had taken from the old Crimean territory. The new settlers were, in fact, military forces, organized by the Russians. When the Tatars

-15-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 15.

rebelled against the khan who had been installed by the Russians, the new Russian forces attacked the Tatars, burned Kefe and other Crimean cities, and slaughtered hundreds of the rebellious Tatars in the cities, along with their wives and children. Others were hunted down in the mountains and killed there. ¹²Crimean independence only lasted until 1783, when, following further Russian invasions, Tsarina Catherine the Great declared the Russian annexation of the Crimea. ¹³

The Tatar emigration from the Crimea and adjoining regions to the Ottoman Empire, inspired by a desire to evade Russian rule, began in 1772. Very little is known of the numbers of these early migrants, which may have been as high as 100,000. ¹⁴Similarly, little is known of the Russian pressures that caused them to flee. It is known that more stayed than left. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, Crimean and Nogay Tatars remained the dominant demographic element in their homelands. Ultimately, the remaining Tatars were also to be forced from their homes. Mark Pinson has made a convincing case that the primary pressure on the Tatars was administrative. ¹⁵Through measures both "legal" and illegal, Russian landlords and officials seized vast expanses of Tatar lands. Tatar peasants were routinely thrown off their ancestral lands. Moreover, the Tatars who remained to work the lands of their new lords were prey to added fees, confiscations, and forced labor. The Russian government continuously increased Tatar taxes, and illegal extra taxes were collected for the pockets of administrators. In addition to the exactions of the Russian administration, the army was used to harry them. For example, an entire Cossack army was

settled on the Crimean coast after the 1828-29 RussoTurkish War, and they plagued the Tatar villages in the region. ¹⁶

The Crimean War (1854-56) brought the Tatar situation to a head. The Russian government assumed, probably correctly, that Tatar sympathies lay with the Ottomans and their British and French allies rather than with Russia. In order to forestall any revolt, the Russians sent armed units among the Tatars. Cossacks and other soldiers raided Tatar villages and threatened their destruction. ¹⁷ Many were killed or forced to flee. ¹⁸ An unknown number were exiled to the Russian interior. ¹⁹ A Russian general who had seen the events commented:

From the start to the finish of the war, Cossacks patrolled the Crimean villages, continually accusing the Crimeans of helping the enemy, arrest-

-16-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 16.

ing them and setting them free after payment of bribes; others were killed or driven away. ²⁰

Crimean Tatar assistance to the Allies during the Crimean War was, in fact, minimal. The Tatars were a completely disarmed people with no hope of effective rebellion. ²¹ Nonetheless, immediately after the war, the Russian government made it plain that the Tatars were unwanted. In 1856, Tsar Alexander ordered that Tatar emigration be facilitated. Much of the pressure applied to the Tatars was what today might be called "psychological" - creation of societies to spread Christianity, rumors of planned mass deportations to the north, "Russification" measures in education and administrative language, and the like. More concretely, new taxes were put on Tatar lands, more lands were seized, and more Tatars were forced off the land. ²² For the Tatars of the Crimea, the most ominous sign was the presence in the Crimea of tens of thousands of Nogay Tatars who had been forced from their lands north and west of the Crimea and who were passing through the Crimea on their way to ports and to the Ottoman Empire. The Nogays had been offered the choice of leaving their lands for less desirable regions elsewhere in Russia or migrating to the Ottoman Empire. Their brother Tatars of the Crimea could only expect that their turn would soon

come. ²³

The emigration of Nogay Tatars continued through 1860. The Crimean Tatars joined the exodus. ²⁴They came to an Ottoman Empire ill-prepared to receive them. Observers of the mass emigration of the Crimeans stated that there was not enough money, not enough tents, not enough food, and not enough transport. ²⁵Health conditions among the closely packed refugees in their camps were deplorable. Perhaps 50 to 60 people a day were dying in Mecidiye, a major gathering and settling location for the exiled Tatars. ²⁶The situation was the same in the other areas that received the refugees. The Crimea was no longer a Muslim land. At least 300,000 Tatars ²⁷had emigrated, leaving their lands to be filled with Slavs and other Christians. The small rump of Tatars who remained lived on until after World War II, when Stalin ended the Tatar presence in the Crimea by deporting all those who remained. ²⁸

Incredibly, despite their extensive suffering, the Tatars fared best of the Muslim peoples forced from their homes by the Russians. What the Russians had begun with the Tatars, they were to continue with far greater brutality in the Caucasus and the Balkans. In order

-17-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 17.

to cause the Tatars to flee, administrative pressure, unfair treatment, and occasional physical violence were employed. The Tatars, unarmed and undefended and with reason to fear for their religion, culture, and lives, fled. The Russians seldom actually put bayonets to their backs and forced them out; there was no need. As events in the Caucasus were to prove, however, the Tatars were correct in assuming that the bayonets were ready and would be used if required.

THE WARS AND EXILES TO FOLLOW

The Russian rulers stumbled into the policy of emigration from the Crimea. In the mid-nineteenth century, some fostered it, as a final remedy to the

question of Muslims living under Russian rule and for obvious economic and strategic reasons. Others were unsure, primarily because of the short-term economic loss that accompanied the departure of the main agricultural element of the Crimea. However, after the Tatar migration, the loss was compensated and the Crimean lands became a valuable part of Slavic Russia, as vast estates were taken by the Russian nobility. The lesson was learned by Russian policymakers in the future. In conquests to come in the Caucasus, forced expulsion of peoples was an effective instrument of Russian policy. Unlike the Crimean Tatars, these Muslims were not willing to leave on account of mainly administrative pressures; for them, the pressures brought to bear were more violent -- massacre, pillage, and destruction of homes and villages.

The agency through which nationalism and imperialism led to the loss of the Muslims of the Balkans, Anatolia, and the Caucasus was war. In all but one case, the wars were wars with the Russian Empire, and in all the wars but the final one the Muslims were defeated. The wars in the West began with the Greek Revolution of 1821 and the Russo-Turkish War of 1828-29. They continued with the Crimean War of 1853-56, the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78, and the Balkan Wars of 1912-13. In the East, the wars under consideration here began with the Russo-Persian and Russo-Turkish Wars of 1827-29, then the Crimean War, the 1877-78 War and

-18-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 18.

World War I. In addition to the expulsions of Muslims due to these wars, the Russians fought and expelled from their lands Caucasian Muslims in the 1860s. The final war, the Turkish War of Independence (1919-23), was the only war won by Muslims.

In each of the nineteenth- and twentieth-century wars, Muslims were massacred and Muslims were forced from their homes. Millions of Muslims died and millions were exiled. Each war was quite different from the others, but the effect of the wars on the Muslims was consistent -- in great numbers they were killed or driven from their homes. Ottoman defeats were not only military and political matters; they were the occasion of massive population shifts and enormous mortality. In the process, Muslim deaths were not the only deaths, although the number of Muslim deaths dwarfed the numbers of

dead Greeks, Bulgarians, or Armenians. For all the peoples of the Balkans, Anatolia, and the Caucasus, the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were a time of horror. All groups suffered the horrors of war, the famine and disease that accompanied war, and the forced migration of the losers. The chapters that follow selectively tell the history of Muslim migration and mortality. The selective description of Muslim suffering is proper, because the compression of the Muslim Land and the expulsions were continuing historical events, presenting a coherent historical picture. Moreover, without an understanding of the fate of the Muslims, an understanding of the general history of the Ottoman Empire and Russia, as well as the histories of non-Muslim peoples of both empires, is impossible.

NOTES

1. George Finlay, *History of the Greek Revolution*, London, 1861, p. 172. (This is a reference to his original history of the revolution, not the later general history of Greece as edited by Tozer.) Many histories of the Greek Revolution do not mention massacres of Turks or they give them little attention (e.g., Eduard Blaquiére , *The Greek Revolution: its origin and progress*, London, 1824, and John Lee Comstock , *History of the Greek Revolution*, Hartford, 1851). One cannot help but feel that such matters did not fit the ideological stand of the authors. For an account that emphasizes the massacres of Muslims, see Alfred Lemaitre, *Musulmans et Chrétiens. Notes sur la guerre de l'indépendance greque*, Paris, 1895.

2. Finlay, pp. 179-86.

3. Finlay, p. 187.

-19-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 19.

4. Thomas Gordon, *History of the Greek Revolution*, Edinburgh and

London, 1832, p. 149. An example of the general feeling behind the sentiment "**Death** to the Turks" is to be found in W. Alison Phillips, *The War of Greek Independence, 1821 to 1833*, New York, 1897, p. 48:

. . . in April the insurrection was general. Everywhere, as though at a preconcerted signal, the peasantry rose, and massacred all the Turks -- men, women, and children -- on whom they could lay hands. In the Morea shall no Turk be left Nor in the whole wide world. Thus rang the song which, from mouth to mouth, announced the beginning of a war of extermination. The Mussulman population of the Morea had been reckoned at twenty-five thousand souls. Within three weeks of the outbreak of the revolt, not a Moslem was left, save those who had succeeded in escaping into the towns.

5. Finlay, pp. 201-03.

6. George Finlay, *A History of Greece* (edited by H. F. Tozer), vol. VI, Oxford, 1877, p. 119. See also, Phillips, pp. 32 and 33.

7. Finlay (1877), vol. VI, pp. 116-21, and Phillips, pp. 32-35.

8. C. M. Woodhouse, *The Greek War of Independence: Its Historical Setting*, London, 1952 (reissue, New York, 1975), p. 77. Even Woodhouse, who was usually at pains to avoid saying anything that could be called sympathetic toward the Turks, was forced to admit this.

9. Phillips, pp. 60-61.

10. The Ottoman government reacted to the massacres in Greece with a ferocity of its own. The Greek Patriarch and others were hanged in Istanbul, and uprisings in Aydin VilU+0E4yeti and the island of Chios were met with massacres of Greeks.

11. The estimates of Muslim mortality are generally in the 25,000 range, but in the absence of population registration no one can be sure of the actual numbers. A reading of the massacres as described indicates the magnitude of the mortality. For example, in the following selections from Finlay (1877), by no means inclusive: 26 March to 22 April 1921, 10-

15,000 Muslims "killed in cold blood" (p. 152), followed by all but 22 in Missolonghi (p. 163); 500 families in Vrachori (p. 165); almost all the men, women, and children in Navarino (p. 215); more than 2,000 in Tripolitza (p. 219), etc. Douglas Dakin (*The Greek Struggle for Independence, 1821-33*, London, 1973, p. 59) states that "15,000 out of 40,000 Turks perished," but gives no evidence on how so many Turks escaped, when earlier sources indicate that few did so. Dakin uniformly overestimates Greek deaths and underestimates Turkish deaths.

12. Alan W. Fisher, *The Russian Annexation of the Crimea, 1772-1783*, Cambridge, 1970, pp. 90-95.

13. This short section on the history of the Crimea is taken from Alan Fisher *The Crimean Tatars*, Stanford, California, 1978, pp. 1-69 and Russian Annexation of the Crimea.

14. See Alan Fisher, "Emigration of Muslims from the Russian Empire in the Years After the Crimean War", *Jahrbucher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, vol. 35, no. 3, 1987, pp. 356-71. Elsewhere, Fisher has estimated 20,000 to 30,000 Crimean emigrants before 1789 (*The Crimean Tatars*, p. 78).

-20-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 20.

15. Mark Pinson, "Russian Policy and the Emigration of the Crimean Tatars to the Ottoman Empire, 1854-1862, *Güney-Doüu Avrupa Arastirmalan Dergisi. I (1972)*, pp. 38-41.

16. Fisher, "Emigration of Muslims" and Djafer Seidahmet, *La Crimée*, Lausanne, 1921, pp. 47-50.

17. Pinson, pp. 42-43.

18. Fisher, "Emigration of Muslims".

19. Pinson, pp. 43 and 44.

20. Fisher, *Emigration of Muslims*.

21. General Totleben himself deprecated the effect of any Tatar feelings or action on the Russians, saying that the Tatars had not influenced Russian losses in the war (Pinson, p. 43).

22. *Atrocities Russes. Documents soumis a la Conference de Constantinople, Constantinople, 1877, esp. pp. 3, 4, and 36. Seidahmet, pp. 39-43.*

23. This is a valuable insight of Mark Pinson, who felt that the Nogay migration was "the last straw" for the Crimeans (Pinson, p. 46).

24. The Russian government, alarmed by the great extent of the migration, vacillated on whether or not to let so great a part of the productive population leave. Permission to leave was alternately granted and refused, the desire to see all Muslims gone warring with fear of a destroyed economy (see Pinson I, pp. 48-56). This is one of the reasons a Tatar community still existed in the Crimea until Stalin's expulsion. (Under more tolerant Soviet leaders, some returned.) See Alexandre Bennigsen and S. Enders Wimbush, *Muslims of the Soviet Empire: a Guide*, London, 1985, pp. 240-41.)

25. *F.O. 195-644, Suter to Bulwer, Varna, 23 July 1860.*

26. *F.O. 195-644, Suter to Bulwer, Kustendji, 22 October 1860.* Kemal Karpat has described the settlement of the Crimean refugees in interesting detail in "Ottoman Urbanism: the Crimean Emigration to Dobruca and the Founding of Mecidiye, 1856-1878", *International Journal of Turkish Studies* 3 (no. 1, 1981), pp. 1-25. The article is

valuable not only for its information on Mecidiye and the Dobruja, but for its view of Ottoman settlement policy and the concern given the refugees in Ottoman official policy.

27. For estimates of the numbers, see Fisher *Russian Annexation of the Crimea*, pp. 145 and 146 and "Emigration of Muslims". There is much disagreement on the numbers of Crimean emigrants. Kemal Karpat estimates 1,800,000 "between 1783 and 1922" (*Ottoman Population 1830-1914: Demographic and Social Characteristics*, Madison, Wisconsin, 1985, p. 66) and others give varying figures. When there is a question of which of a set of estimates to use, it is my policy here and elsewhere in this book to opt for lower figures on Muslim migration and mortality. The thesis of this work is that there was major **death** and forced migration of the Muslim population. By taking the lower figures for **death** and migration, therefore, I am perhaps underestimating, but by making the thesis harder to prove, I intend to make the proof all the more plausible.

28. Fisher, *Emigration of Muslims*. The Russians also gave lands in the Crimea to Moldavians, Bulgarians, Serbs, and Greeks -- migrants from the Ottoman Empire. A large number of Jews emigrated to the Crimea from elsewhere in the Russian dominions (Fisher, "Emigration of Muslims").

-21-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 21.

CHAPTER TWO

EASTERN ANATOLIA AND THE CAUCASUS

Russia is half an ape and half a bear. She apes Europe in foreign kingdoms,

but at home the bear's paw is felt everywhere. -- Ivan Golovin ¹

MOST OF WHAT HAS been called the history of the Caucasus and eastern Anatolia in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries has in fact been mostly propaganda from the ethnic groups that vied for control of the region. While more than willing to exaggerate the losses of their own groups, the authors of such histories seem to have been unaware that enemy groups suffered losses as well. This has led to a tendency to label battles as massacres and wars as "genocide." To do otherwise would be to admit that both sides were shooting and both sides died.

In the absence of accurate histories one is thrown back on original sources. Unfortunately, these are also greatly deficient for the study of the Muslims of eastern Anatolia and the Caucasus. Ottoman governmental records are only slowly and laboriously becoming available, and the situation with Russian records is similar. European consuls were few, were usually deeply prejudiced, and very seldom actually saw the events about which they reported. Therefore, evidence on the Ottoman East must be laboriously collected, and a researcher's emphasis must be on observed facts, not on the interpretations and analyses of contemporaries, which were often seriously flawed by prejudice.

The geographic area considered in this chapter began in the steppe north of the Caucasus mountain chain and extended in the south through all of eastern Anatolia, in the east through Persian Azerbaijan, and in the west at least through the vilâyet of Sivas. ²It was a vast and polyglot region. Christians were primarily represented by the Armenians, spread throughout the region, by Georgians in their homeland, and by Chaldeans and Nestorians in the southern mountains. Greeks were present in significant numbers

-23-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 23.

only on the coast of the Black Sea. From the southern Caucasus ("Transcaucasia," today the Armenian Republic, the Azerbaijan Republic, and part of Georgia) to the mountains of northern Iraq, the Muslims were Turks and Kurds. The Azeri Turks who lived in Azerbaijan (the southeastern Caucasus region and northwestern Iran) were primarily Shi'a Muslims. Sunnī

Turks were the majority of the population in the far southern Caucasus and in all eastern Anatolia except the southeast, with groups of Sunni Turks in the cities and some rural areas of the southeast. While the Kurds were primarily nomadic or seminomadic, settled agricultural and urban Kurds lived in the cities and villages of the southeast. Kurdish tribes ranged over the entire east of Anatolia, forming a compact mass in the Dersim region (southwest of Erzincan) and in the Van Vilâyeti, northern Iraq, and southwestern Persia.

The Muslim population of the Caucasus mountains, the eastern Black Sea littoral, and the northwest Caspian Sea littoral was made up of what are usually called the Caucasian tribes. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Circassians, who had once spread over greater territory, were the main population of the northwest Caucasus. Various tribes inhabited Dağstan (the mountains and coast of the west-central Caspian, often written Daghestan) -Chechens, Andis, Avars, as well as Azeri Turks. To the west, the Laz (of the Georgian language group) inhabited the coastal regions near Batum and south to Rize. The Abhazians (or Abhazs, also a Georgian linguistic group) inhabited the coastal region to the north, centered on Sukhumkale. A number of other tribes, many attached to the larger groups, were spread throughout the Caucasus. While migration was later greatly to change settlement patterns, in 1800 Muslims undoubtedly were the largest religious group. Only in Georgia and in small sections of Anatolia were Christians a majority.

In studying the Caucasus and eastern Anatolia, one becomes aware that they can and should be treated as one region, despite political boundaries. Throughout the 100-year period of this study, the histories and the peoples of the Caucasus and eastern Anatolia cannot be understood separately. Economically, socially, linguistically, and religiously the connections among the peoples of the region remained strong well into the 1920s, perhaps beyond.

To understand the closeness of the histories of the peoples of the "Russian South" and "Ottoman East" one has only to consider them by religious groups, rather than by political borders. It is

impossible to consider the Anatolian Armenians as if they were not intimately connected to the Armenians of Erivan. Too many migrants crossed from the Ottoman Empire to Russia, too many bishops from the jurisdiction of Istanbul to that of Echmiadzin and back, too many revolutionaries crossed and recrossed the borders for the Armenians to be accurately styled as Turkish Armenians and Russian Armenians in any but a political sense. The same was true of Muslims, especially the Turks and Kurds of the southern Caucasus and eastern Anatolia. Although most Muslim migration was outmigration from the southern Caucasus to eastern Anatolia, there was considerable ongoing migration for purposes of trade, employment, and family. Muslim nomads crossed the political borders freely. New infusions of forced migrants brought news of the Caucasus to their fellow Muslims in the east.

Armenians under Russian and Ottoman rule obviously viewed each other as brothers, no matter their citizenship. The same was true of Muslims. It is doubtful if the concept of citizenship, as opposed to religious affiliation, had taken any great hold in either the Caucasus or eastern Anatolia before the 1920s. In the east, a Caucasian Muslim felt closer to an Anatolian Muslim than to a Caucasian Armenian, just as an eastern Anatolian Armenian affiliated himself with Armenians of the Caucasus, not Anatolian Muslims. For this reason, it is ridiculous to speak of a large group of loyal Muslim subjects of Russia in the Caucasus or loyal Armenian subjects of the Ottoman Empire in eastern Anatolia. Both regions had Muslims and Armenians who were integrated into the political system and could be considered as loyal, even patriotic subjects. Most Armenians and Muslims, however, were peasants or nomads who knew no real affiliation above tribe or village, except their religious affiliation. Their primary loyalty to their own religious groups was proven again and again in the Caucasian and eastern Anatolian wars.

In time of war, the sympathies of Armenians and Muslims emerged openly. There was no doubt as to the loyalty of either group. Despite the fact that some Muslims fought on the side of the Russians, particularly in the Crimean War,³ and many middleclass Armenians supported the Ottoman government, both Armenians and Muslims in the east generally assumed that their place was alongside their coreligionists. This was true in both the Caucasus and eastern Anatolia. In the Caucasus, Muslims re-

sponded to Ottoman calls for rebellion against their Russian masters in time of war and fought as guerrillas and regular troops against their Russian masters, as stated by W. E. D. Allen:

[In World War I] In the Valleys of the Çoruh and the Oltu-çay there were very mixed elements: Christians (Armenians) predominated in the towns of Artvin, Ardanuch, Ardahan and Oltu, while Muslims were in the majority in the countryside; these Muslims included Groups of Georgian origin, like the Laz and Acars, Turks, remnants of the old Tatar hordes, and Cherkesses who had settled, after 1864, on what was then the Turkish side of the border. Irrespective of their racial origins, all the Muslims proved more or less ready to help the Turks, particularly when they came as an invading army. Thus the Cherkesses of Upper Sarikamiş stubbornly defended their stone saklyas by the side of the Turkish askers, and the needy inhabitants of the uplands provided scanty food to the divisions of Hafiz Hakki during their desperate march across the Allahuekber Mountains [in the ill-fated invasion of the southern Caucasus].⁴

Some Armenians began to act as adjuncts of Russian policy and the Russian army as early as the early 1700s, in the time of Peter the Great. The dependence of Armenians on Russia and their expectations of assistance from that quarter had begun to grow from the first incursions of the Russians into the Caucasus. As far back as the reign of Peter the Great, when they organized a military force to assist the Tsar's invasion of the region,⁵ Caucasian Armenians had promised loyalty and support to the Russian tsars. During the 1700s and 1800s, Armenian secular and religious officials supported the Russian invasion of the Muslim khanates in the Caucasus and the overthrow of their Muslim rulers. At the same time, Armenians first acted as spies for the Russians against their Muslim overlords, in this case the Persian Empire.⁶ When the city of Derbend was under siege by the Russians in 1796, its Armenian residents sent the invaders information on the town's water supply, allowing the Russians to defeat the Khan of Derbend.⁷ An Armenian Archbishop, Argutinskii-Dolgorukov, proclaimed publicly (1790s) his hope and belief that the Russians "would free the Armenians from Muslim rule."⁸ Armenian subjects of the Persian and Ottoman empires, as well as Armenians living in the Russian Empire, fought on the side of the Russians against Persia and the Ottoman Empire in the 1827-29 wars and the Crimean War.⁹

For their part, Armenians in Ottoman Anatolia also first showed their loyalty to the Russian cause by acting as spies for the Russians. Armenians from Anatolia crossed the lines and reported on Ottoman troop movements in all the east Anatolian wars. Anatolian Armenians assisted invading Russian armies in 1827; many thousands followed the Russian army out of Anatolia when they left. During the Crimean War, Armenians brought intelligence out of besieged Kars to the Russians. Armenian guides from Ottoman Anatolia led the Russian invaders in 1877. The Armenians of the Eleşkirt Valley welcomed the invading Russian armies in 1877 and, when the Russians retreated, left en masse with them.¹⁰ In the First World War, as will be seen, the Armenians in eastern Anatolia and the Caucasus were, as a group, allied to the Russians.

In Anatolia, the reliance of Armenian revolutionaries on the Russians began to be evident by mid-century in the revolution at Zeytun. When funds were needed to strengthen the defenses of Zeytun against the Ottomans in 1854, while the Ottomans fought the Russians in the Crimean War, Armenian rebels attempted to get financial assistance from the Russians.¹¹ In 1872, the Armenians of Van wrote as a "community" to the Russian Viceroy for the Caucasus asking for assistance against their own government. They asked to become Russian subjects and, more concretely, began to collect arms.¹² The connections of Ottoman Armenians with the Russian Empire carried on in the activities of the main Armenian revolutionary groups, especially the Dashnaks (Dashnaktsuthiun). Russian Armenia was a center for arms collection and revolutionary organization aimed at the Ottomans.¹³ The activities of the revolutionaries were greatly facilitated by their relationship to the Armenian Church. As a body, the Church naturally crossed the Ottoman-Russian border, because its two centers were in Echmiadzin, in Russian Armenia, and in Istanbul; and clerics, bishops, and ideas freely crossed between the two ecclesiastical jurisdictions. Using the facilities of the Church, revolutionary clerics easily kept up communication between revolutionaries in the southern Caucasus and Anatolia and between the Russian government and the revolutionaries. The presence in the Armenian revolutionary movement of priests and bishops¹⁴ brought together the two foci of Armenian identity -- the Church and modern nationalism. It also gave religious blessing to secular nationalism and presented Armenian nationalism in a religious context easily understood by eastern Anatolian Arme-

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 28.

nian villagers. Moreover, church officials also gave practical assistance to the revolution. For example, the monastery of Derik, on the Persian side of the Ottoman-Persian border, was organized by its revolutionary abbot (Bagrat Vardapet Tavaklian, or "Akki") into an arsenal and infiltration point for Armenian revolutionaries acting in the Ottoman Empire. ¹⁵

The continuity of eastern Anatolia and the Caucasus explains much about seemingly spontaneous violence that erupted in both regions. Traditional histories have treated each outburst of eastern Anatolian or Caucasian intercommunal violence as an isolated instance. Divorced of their historical and geographic context, the conflicts have only been explainable as outpourings of irrational feelings. Because Armenian attacks on Muslims have seldom been considered (only Muslim attacks on Armenians), it has been easy for commentators to portray the Muslims as savages who occasionally felt the need to kill Christians. In fact, Armenians attacked Muslims just as Muslims attacked Armenians, sometimes without apparent provocation or immediate justification. At times this was an outpouring of irrational hatred, but more usually it arose from an awareness on both sides of their history. Because of that history and because of knowledge of events in the Caucasus and Anatolia, Armenians and Muslims both knew that their fellows had been killing each other in great numbers. They knew that both sides had been forced to flee from the other or die, again in great numbers, and they knew that if intercommunal war came to them, they would suffer the same fate as their coreligionists, unless they defeated their enemies. This is a classic self-fulfilling prophecy -- both sides killed because they knew the other side would kill them -- and makes perfect sense within this context.

In sum, to understand the history of the enmity between Armenians and Muslims, one must view the Caucasus and eastern Anatolia as a whole, an entire region in which Armenians and Muslims fought for supremacy for 100 years.

RUSSIAN EXPANSION

In many ways, the enmity between Armenians and Muslims had at its base

Russian expansion into the Caucasus. In this, as in

-29-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 29.

many other ways, the Caucasus region and eastern Anatolia were tied together, for both were steps in the piece-by-piece expansion of the Russian Empire. From a relatively early period in the Russian conquests, Georgians and Armenians appeared as natural allies in the Russian expansion. The Georgians, an Orthodox Christian people in the south-central Caucasus, feared dominance by the Persian or Ottoman empires. This fear and natural religious affinity with Russian Orthodox Christians led Georgian rulers to become first the allies and then the subjects of the tsar. The Armenian situation was different: Scattered throughout the southern Caucasus and eastern Anatolia, they were in a clear majority in no large region in 1800. The Armenians lived in and claimed as theirs the same land as the Muslims. It was this fact that allied them with the Russians, for without Russian assistance an Armenian homeland was unattainable.

With hindsight, one can construct a model of the Russian conquest of the Caucasus. The seeming intent was to replace Muslim demographic and political domination in the Caucasus with Christian demographic and Russian political preponderance as in the Crimea. Their demographic policy had two pillars -- the exodus of Muslims and the immigration of Christian elements, Slavs in the north Caucasus, Armenians in the south Caucasus and later in Anatolia. As is the case in most such models, the reality was much more complex. As in the Crimea, the tsars were not unified in purpose, and Armenian hopes for independence sometimes made them unreliable tools of Russian imperial ambitions. Like other imperial powers, the Russians at first seemed to have actually expanded through a desire to protect traders and settlers who moved into foreign territories, rather than through a coordinated plan of expansion. There can be no question, however, that the expulsion of Muslims ultimately became a feature of Russian expansion in the Caucasus. Where Muslim majorities strongly opposed Russian conquest and rule, they were forced out by means of government pressure and exemplary violence. In areas conquered by the Russians, mosques were confiscated, and *vakifs* (pious foundations), which had supported the Muslim religion and Muslim charities and schools, were also taken. ¹⁶

A good example of early Russian policy is afforded by the Russian conquest of the khanate of Ganja (renamed Elizavetpol). In 1803, the Russians attacked Ganja and defeated its khan. Geor-

-30-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 30.

gian auxiliaries in the Russian Army as well as Russians themselves were allowed or encouraged ¹⁷to massacre Muslims in Ganja Province. ¹⁸After the conquest, every effort was made to demean the Islamic way of life, so that the Muslims felt they had no alternative but to flee. ¹⁹Armenians were then encouraged to move into Russianheld territory. For example, after the Russian conquest of Georgia, Tsar Paul attracted Armenians to Georgia by offering Armenian leaders very attractive terms to come into Russian territory in 1800. ²⁰Armenians also came into the khanate of Karabagh after its conquest by the Russians. ²¹

THE 1820s

The century-long struggle between Muslims and Armenians began in earnest in the Russo-Persian and Russo-Turkish wars of 1827-29. The basic features of that long battle were all seen in those first wars -- Russian invasion of Ottoman territory, Armenians siding with the invader, great Muslim mortality, forced migration of Muslims and a de facto population exchange of Muslims and Armenians.

In the 1827-29 wars in the east, a massive population exchange began, sparked by Russian expulsion of Muslims of the Erivan region. George Bournoutian has made use of Persian and Russian sources to estimate the population change in the Khanate of Erivan due to Russian conquest. He concludes that approximately 26,000 (30 percent) of the Muslims of the khanate either died or emigrated, based on a Russian population survey. ²² Bournoutian further states that 45,000 Armenians had newly arrived in Erivan by 1832, "but it was not until the last quarter of the nineteenth century -- after the Russo-Turkish Wars of 1855-56 and 1877-78 brought more Armenians in from the Ottoman Empire -- that the Armenians established a solid majority in the region." ²³ Thus an Armenian majority came to pass in what today is the republic of Armenia, a majority created by

the Russians. Erivan, approximately the area of the present Armenian Republic, was until 1827 an Iranian province with a Muslim (primarily Turkish) majority. The destruction or forced migration of the Muslim population allowed the Russians to repopulate the region with Armenians from Iran and the Ottoman Empire.

-31-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 31.

A large number of Armenian residents of Anatolia followed the Russians when they left Anatolia in 1829. One estimate listed 90,000 as having left,²⁴ perhaps a slight exaggeration, but indicative of a large movement of Christians to the Russian Caucasus. H. F. B. Lynch stated that 10,000 Armenian families from Erzurum Province "followed the Russians out of Turkey in 1829" to join the 40,000 Armenians who had recently come from Persia.²⁵ After the Crimean War another large number of Armenians left eastern Anatolia. The European Commission that was delegated by treaty to fix the boundary between Russia and the Ottoman Empire found Armenian villages "half inhabited" and stated that the Muslims regarded the Armenians as partisans of the Russian invaders.²⁶

The events in Erivan cannot have escaped the attention of the Muslims in what remained of the eastern Ottoman Empire. Even had they not themselves been affected by the wars, eastern Anatolian villagers and city dwellers would have noticed the influx of refugees and heard their stories of Russian activities in the wars. To the Turks and the Kurds of eastern Anatolia, as well as those of the Caucasus, Russian intentions would have been clear.

FORCED MIGRATION FROM THE CAUCASUS

Before the Russian invasion, the Muslim population of the Caucasus region was primarily made up of Turks in Azerbaijan and Erivan and Muslim tribes in the rest of the region. The largest groups of tribesmen were the Circassians (Çerkes), the Abhazians, the Chechen-Ingush, and the Daghestanis.²⁷ Smaller groups were usually tied to larger ones, and the

Circassians, in particular, were divided into smaller tribes. All had been largely independent throughout history, occasionally accepting the nominal overlordship of Ottomans or Persians, but never relinquishing their independence. Ottoman or Persian rule had never acutally penetrated beyond the coasts and the southern khanates or kingdoms (such as Georgia or Erivan).

Russia had shown an interest in conquering the Caucasus from the time of Peter the Great, who seized Derbend and Baku in 1722-23. Peter's successes, however, were short-lived, and the Russians were forced from the region by Nadir Shah of Persia, who regained Derbend and Baku by the Treaty of Ganja in 1735. Not

-32-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 32.

until 1812 were the two cities definitively captured by the Russians, ²⁸ along with the city and region of Ganja (Elizavetpol). Georgia had become a Russian tributary in 1783. ²⁹ After defeating Persia (1828) and the Ottoman Empire (1829), Russia forced Ottoman and Persian acceptance of its conquest of Akhalkalak and the province of Erivan.

With the exception of the cities of Batum and Poti and their hinterlands, all the Caucasian possessions of the former U.S.S.R. were nominally in the hands of the Russian Empire by 1829, ³⁰ but much of the territory was not under Russian control. The great mountainous interior of Caucasia was populated by tribes that had never been defeated, nor had they ever accepted Russian rule. The Russians had seized northern border areas of tribal lands in the 1830s, but were unable to counter fierce Caucasian resistance and conquer the interior. After 1836, the Russian presence in the Caucasus was threatened by the brilliant leader Shamil and his fanatically loyal Chechen and Daghestani followers. ³¹ Shamil managed to meld together followers from disparate tribes with a combination of Islamic revivalism and the subjugation of traditional aristocracies who opposed him. He was a gifted and ruthless leader, but much of his support depended on the resolve of the Caucasian tribes to resist Russian control. Through the 1840s, the Muslim mountaineers, though sometimes defeated in battle, held their own against the Russians. The Caucasians were fierce fighters, especially as they were fighting in defense of their homes and families. They

gave no quarter, nor did the Russian invaders. However, the Russians were warring on entire peoples, women and children as well as male fighters, whereas the Caucasian Muslims were fighting against an organized army. ³²

Count Leo Tolstoy, who himself saw the carnage in the Caucasus, described the Russian conquest of Caucasian Muslim villages:

It had been the custom to rush the aouls [villages] by night, when, taken by surprise, the women and children had no time to escape, and the horrors that ensued under the cover of darkness when the Russian soldiers made their way by twos and threes into the houses were such as no official narrator dared describe. ³³

It was only after Ottoman defeats in the east in the Crimean War had removed any threat from that quarter that the Russians

-33-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 33.

were able to set upon the final reduction of the Caucasian mountaineers. In 1857, they began their final attack on Shamil. The exhausted Chechen and Daghestani tribes were finally defeated and Shamil forced to surrender (25 August 1859). The Circassians were then in turn defeated.

By May of 1864, Russian control of the Caucasus was complete. With victory came the implementation of a Russian policy of forced migration, much more vicious than anything seen in the Crimea. While a number of Chechens migrated to the Ottoman Empire as well, it was the fertile lands of the Circassians that most tempted the Russians, who resolved to turn the western and northern Caucasus into a Christian land, loyal to their empire. The Russians adopted a system of attack and repression that made it impossible for the Circassians to remain in their homes. Villages were plundered, then destroyed. Cattle and anything else necessary to survival were taken. The Russian method was a classic system of forced migration that would later be repeated again and again in the Caucasus and the Balkans -- destroy homes and fields and leave no choice but flight or starvation. ³⁴

The Caucasian Muslims were sometimes given the choice of either migrating elsewhere in the Russian Empire and remaining under Russian domination or

leaving for the Ottoman Empire:

A Russian detachment having captured the village of Toobah on the Soobashi river, inhabited by about a hundred Abadzekh [a tribe of Circassians], and after these had surrendered themselves prisoners, they were all massacred by the Russian Troops. Among the victims were two women in an advanced state of pregnancy and five children. The detachment in question belongs to Count Evdokimoff's Army, and is said to have advanced from the Pshish valley.

As the Russian troops gain ground on the Coast, the natives are not allowed to remain there on any terms, but are compelled either to transfer themselves to the plains of the Kouban or emigrate to Turkey. ³⁵

The Circassians were, in effect, herded to Black Sea ports. They waited amidst dismal conditions, with great loss of life, for Ottoman boats to transfer them to Trabzon or Samsun. ³⁶ Their former homeland was depopulated, later to be filled with immigrants from Slavic Russia. It was reported that one could walk a whole day in formerly inhabited parts of the Caucasus and not meet a living person. ³⁷ The

-34-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 34.

Russians made no secret of their plan and its techniques of implementation. As Lord Napier, British Ambassador in St. Petersburg, reported, "The language of the official journals in Russia on this subject has been the language of triumph not of conscience." ³⁸ Ultimately, much of the Circassian lands were settled by Slavs and other Christians. ³⁹

THE ABHAZIANS

The expulsion of Muslim tribesmen from the Caucasus slowed while the Russians considered their gains and cemented their military control over the Caucasian highlands. Then, three years after the main Circassian flight, the Abhazians, whose settlements were centered on the Sukhum Kale region, were in turn expelled from their homes. The methods of forced migration visited upon the Abhazians in 1867 were essentially the same that had been

used earlier. Russian soldiers came to Abhazian villages, burned down the houses, stole the cattle and other belongings, and left the Abhazians with barely enough to live. ⁴⁰The Abhazians were not in a position to offer effective resistance and all attempts at it failed quickly. Russian intentions toward them were the same as their intentions toward all Muslims of the Caucasus, as demonstrated by British Consul Gifford Palgrave, who rode through the region of Abhazia by horseback to collect the information. Palgrave found that threefourths of the Muslims of Abhazia and surrounding districts would emigrate. He was convinced that the Russians intended to force the migration not only to rid valuable territories of their Muslim population but also "to embarrass the Turkish Government, on whose coasts a still larger number of starving and penniless co-religionists would thus be thrown." ⁴¹

The Russians forced the flight of many thousands of Abhazians, but kept many behind. They seem to have learned from their experiences with the Crimean Tatars and the Circassians that wholesale deportations had an adverse effect on the economy of the region. While old men, women, and children were encouraged or forced to emigrate, able-bodied men necessary to the economy were kept behind and used as forced labor. The exact number of those who were left behind is unknown. Abhazian leaders claimed many

-35-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 35.

thousands had been forced to remain, while their families were forced to leave. ⁴²Entire families were sometimes expelled; in others the males who could work were forced to remain while their families left. In either case, the Abhazian families in the Caucasus were gone and the Abhazian nation had virtually ceased to exist. Only a small portion remained. As Palgrave noted, "It is very painful to witness the extinction, as such, of a nation whose only crime was not being Russian." ⁴³

There is much debate over the numbers of Circassians and others evicted from their lands in the Caucasus. No accurate counts were made of the Tatar or Circassian Muslims, so one cannot say how many set out. Upon analysis of various estimates, ⁴⁴it seems reasonable to state that approximately 1.2 million Caucasians emigrated from Russian-conquered

lands; 800,000 of them lived to settle in the Ottoman domains. ⁴⁵

The Russian Empire saw to it that the conquered Muslim lands were settled with what they considered to be more congenial populations. Just as Russians and Ukrainians had become the main populations of the Crimea, Russians, other Slavs, and Cossacks took most of the old Circassian and Abhazian lands. ⁴⁶The first truly reliable Russian census, taken in 1897, recorded the transformation; Christians now outnumbered Muslims by more than ten to one. ⁴⁷

DISEASE

The worst enemy of the Circassians and other Caucasians who were forced from their homes was disease, abetted by malnutrition. The Circassians were literally stuffed into boats at Russian-controlled ports. They were given neither assistance nor supplies, ⁴⁸and at the first Ottoman port of call, Trabzon, they died in great numbers of smallpox, typhus, and scurvy. In the winter of 1863, twenty to fifty Circassians were dying each day in Trabzon. ⁴⁹By the worst days of the next spring, 500 a day were dying; ⁵⁰and 30,000 may have died at Trabzon alone. ⁵¹Those who landed at other ports, such as Samsun and Sinop, shared similar mortality. At the height of the immigration, 50 refugees a day were dying in Samsun. ⁵²

The Ottoman Empire was completely unprepared for the forced immigration of Circassians. Sanitary conditions in the empire were

-36-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 36.

none too good in the best of times, ⁵³and the general poverty of the empire allowed for little in the way of relief payments or supplies. ⁵⁴

Other than sending what few doctors and what medicine was available, the Ottomans could do little else. There were, in any case, no cures for smallpox or typhus. The only remedy was to remove the migrants from their Black Sea camps and scatter them throughout the empire. ⁵⁵The mortality of the Circassians continued unabated as the Ottomans sent them on from the Black Sea ports to other areas of the empire for resettlement. Mortality

records showed disease **death** rates of up to one-third, sometimes more, on the transport ships. According to one report, a group of 2,718 Circassians was put on ship at Samsun for Cyprus; 202 died between Samsun and Istanbul, where 528 left the ship; and 1,988 continued on to Cyprus, 637 more dying on the journey. ⁵⁶ Another report from Cyprus further described the fate of the aforementioned shipload of Circassians: "Of those landed, more than half are expected to die, and in fact the deaths daily have ranged from thirty to fifty." ⁵⁷

By the time the Abhazians arrived at the Black Sea ports, the Ottoman government was better prepared. Despite continuing financial troubles, the Ottomans were able to treat the Abhazians with more care, and disease mortality among them was minor. Refugee numbers were quite a bit smaller than in the earlier migration, and this surely had a salutary effect. ⁵⁸

EFFECTS OF IMMIGRATION ON THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

The influx of hundreds of thousands of Caucasian immigrants naturally had a great effect on the lives of those already resident in the empire. The most immediate effect was the spread of disease in the Black Sea ports of the empire. In Trabzon, the Circassians brought with them typhus, and conditions became so bad that for a time the entire population fled the city. ⁵⁹ Commerce was completely paralyzed and bread was in short supply. There was even less bread than in normal times in Samsun, where all the bakers closed their ovens and fled the typhus and smallpox brought by the Circassians. ⁶⁰

Mortality due to disease in Trabzon between December and the middle of February 1864 (Table 1) shows that local inhabitants, though not experiencing as great a mortality as the immigrants, still had much to fear.

-37-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 37.

TABLE 1. ⁶¹

*MORTALITY DUE TO DISEASE IN TRABZON 1 DECEMBER 1863 TO 17
FEBRUARY 1864.*

Immigrants	3,000
Local Turks	470
Local Greeks	36
Local Armenians	17
Local Catholics	9
Europeans	6

Similar mortality of native Muslim residents was seen wherever Circassians were resettled. At first, the refugees were lodged together in camps and public and commercial buildings. Later, they were distributed throughout the countryside, spreading disease contracted in the camps:

In the month of June 2000 Circassian Emigrants (amongst whom Diarrhoea [*sic*] and typhus prevailed) arrived at Ushak. They were at first lodged in khans and in the crowded habitations of the natives, but were afterwards distributed amongst the villages situated to the N.E. of the town. Their contact with the inhabitants gave rise to bowel complaint soon after by Typhus. In the space of six months (June to November) there were 500 Mahomedans taken ill, of whom two hundred died; and 100 Christians of whom only 20 died. ⁶²

The effects of the Circassian immigration were felt in villages all over the empire. The Ottomans had neither finances nor administrative manpower to oversee the settlement of the newcomers; therefore, it was left to the localities to which the Circassians were sent to provide for them. Houses were built and grain provided, through the work and expense of the villagers, and it must have seemed to them that they were being asked to pay for their own suffering, for word of plundering by the Circassians had spread rapidly. Any extra payments exacted from the peasantry were naturally resented, but paying for those whom they had cause to fear, who were being settled next to them, must have appeared excessive even to the long-suffering Anatolian, Bulgarian, and Syrian villagers upon whom the Circassians were resettled. ⁶³

Russian capture of Caucasian ports and replacement of Muslims with Christians in cities and hinterlands caused great economic

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 38.

disruption. Much of the traditional trade of the eastern Black Sea was in the hands of Muslim merchants, and Russia did all it could to see that this Muslim trade ceased. Russian actions were often forceful and murderous. Ottoman coastal boats were destroyed by Russians, harming traditional fishing and trade patterns.⁶⁴ But most Russian actions against Muslim commerce were administrative. At the time of the Abhazian migration, illegal taxes were levied on Turkish tradesmen dwelling in cities along the Black Sea coast. The merchants were told that if the levies were not paid, they would be expelled along with the Abhazians.⁶⁵

CIRCASSIANS IN THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

The Crimean Tatars had quickly settled into the ordinary life of the Ottoman Empire. Once their initial trauma was over, they went to farms provided by the Ottoman government and once again took up their agricultural existence. Their language and customs were little different than those of the other Turks around them, and they became assimilated. The only differences between them and their fellow Turks were the memories taught to their children. This was not so for the Circassians.

The Circassians were not Turkish-speakers, nor were they primarily agricultural. Unlike the Tatars, they were linguistic outsiders who needed to be assimilated into the language and customs of the empire. Most settled down to a constructive existence, especially those granted fertile lands in the Balkans and Western Anatolia. Some others, who were settled where they could barely survive, took to raiding as a means of livelihood, and all those around them, Christians and Muslims alike, suffered their depredations. Whereas the Tatars were a positive contribution to the empire, the Circassian contribution was, at least in the beginning of their life in the empire, a mixed one. Not for some time could they be said to have "settled down" as a normal part of Turkish community life.

MEMORY OF RUSSIAN IMPERIALISM

One of the greatest effects of Russian actions in the Caucasus was to put Muslim inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire on guard.

-39-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 39.

The Russians had forcibly removed Muslim peoples in order to replace them with Christians. This policy cannot help but have impressed itself upon Muslims who were themselves in the path of future Russian expansion. They would soon see that the policy was ongoing. Ottoman Christian revolutionaries would also see that the Russian policy potentially worked in their favor. As will be seen in later chapters, this realization on the part of both Ottoman Muslims and Ottoman Christians became an important part of the bloody history of intercommunal warfare that was to come.

THE SITUATION IN THE OTTOMAN EAST

The Ottoman Empire did not actually rule in much of eastern Anatolia. The state was an important and intrusive factor in the lives of only a portion of the eastern population, primarily the inhabitants of cities, rural areas close to cities, and border regions. In most rural areas, the Ottomans functioned as tax-collectors whenever possible and as an ultimate military force whenever absolutely necessary.

The main danger, and thus the main political factor in the Ottoman East, was the constant presence of marauding elements that lay in wait for situations that allowed them to operate with impunity. These were especially nomadic or seminomadic Kurdish tribes, and the main public security activity of the Ottoman government was to control these tribes. The Ottomans had neither the manpower nor the finances to constantly oversee the activities of the Kurds, so they controlled them by a typically Ottoman system of bribes coupled with force. Tribal chiefs were coopted to the Ottoman system with honors, posts, and money. During relatively quiescent times, Kurdish tribes were allowed to treat their own affairs by themselves. They kept lands farmed by Muslim and Christian tenant farmers, operated market "industries" in handicrafts and foodstuffs, kept extensive herds of

animals -- all without the intervention of the state. Only when the Kurdish tribes actually revolted or engaged in marauding campaigns did the Ottomans send troops. ⁶⁶ When successful, such expeditions sometimes resulted in the hang-

-40-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 40.

ing of a rebellious tribal *sheyh*. More often they resulted in the sheyh's being forcibly transferred to Istanbul or elsewhere with a sizeable pension, so that the Ottomans' troubles would not be complicated by an ongoing blood feud. The organic situation in the east remained unchanged. For real changes to have transpired, the army would have had to remain in the eastern provinces, constantly keeping the Kurds in check.

One must be careful when identifying the Kurds as a disruptive element. Those who were a disruptive force were tribal groups, and their loyalties were tribal. It would be an error to infer any "Kurdish" identification among them. If tribes cooperated, it was out of mutual benefit, not ethnic loyalty, for which there is no evidence. Also, most Kurdish-speakers were not at any time in rebellion. They were farmers and herdsman with basically the same feelings toward religion and state as ethnic Turkish farmers and herdsman. The rebellious tribes were as much an enemy to their lives and livelihoods as they were to those of Turkish-speakers. When disruptive Kurdish tribesmen are discussed here it is not these Kurds, surely the majority, who are being described.

While the Armenians of the east were often subject to Kurdish rule in the countryside and the Ottoman government in the cities, they also took advantage of Ottoman weakness to gain practical autonomy. Armenian villages in the mountainous regions of the southeast were often actually free of external control. This was particularly true in the Zeytun region. In Zeytun, Armenians sometimes grudgingly paid tribute to the Ottomans, as they had to the Arabs, Byzantines, and others before, but they ruled themselves. Throughout the nineteenth century, tension between the Zeytunlis and the Ottomans over tribute payments remained high. In armed confrontations, the Ottomans were only partially successful in gaining assessed taxes or tribute. ⁶⁷

Ottoman tolerance of Kurdish and Armenian quasiautonomy was symptomatic of the weakness of the Ottoman state. Occupied by life-threatening wars in the north and the west, the Ottomans were forced to be satisfied with relative calm in the east.

The defects in the system of government in the Ottoman East became especially obvious in times of war. During peacetime, Ottoman garrison soldiers and gendarmes were usually sufficient to guarantee something approximating civil order. They could enforce their authority because behind them ultimately stood the Ottoman

-41-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 41.

army. With war, the situation was radically altered. Gendarmes (the police of the Ottoman East) were withdrawn to provide the backbone of the Ottoman armies battling the Russians. Thus the day-to-day security of the region was threatened. Moreover, there was now no army available to threaten ultimate force. Into this power vacuum came first Kurdish tribes and later Armenian revolutionaries.

Kurdish tribes contested with the Ottomans for control whenever they felt they had a chance of success. They battled Ottoman troops in major wars in 1834, 1836, 1847, and 1879, and in minor conflicts throughout the nineteenth century. Their intention was not to set up a state, but simply to be free of central authority. At times, only the hostilities the Kurdish clans showed toward each other allowed the Ottomans to impress their authority by a policy of divide and conquer. During the Crimean War, Kurds of Mosul revolted against the government precisely because the Ottoman troops were at the front and unable to step in,⁶⁸ and in the later Ottoman-Russian wars the position of the Kurds was at best ambivalent. Some indeed fought on the Ottoman side, although they were of limited military benefit.⁶⁹ Others simply "sat out" the wars. Some even attacked and robbed Ottoman troops when the opportunity arose. Throughout the period, the Kurdish tribes as a group showed that their loyalties were to their tribes, not to any government, nor even to their brother Muslims.

The Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 was a watershed in eastern Anatolia. Its effect on both Muslims and Christians was great. Armenian aspirations of

living under Christian sovereignty, and possibly even Armenian autonomy, were heightened. Part of what the Armenians considered to be their homeland, the Kars-Ardahan region, had been taken from the Ottomans, and there was good reason to expect that the rest of Armenia would soon be in Russian hands. There also was a deterioration in the Ottoman government's control of its eastern provinces. This was a direct result of the war, which broke the balance of power in the east. The Ottoman government, impoverished and now without many revenue-producing European provinces, found it impossible to pay for the security needs of the east. Many of the soldiers and gendarmes, who normally would have provided public security, had died in the war.

The following descriptions by an American missionary and a British consul of the city of Bitlis before and after the war describe

-42-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 42.

the situation. In both circumstances the representatives of the Ottoman government intended to protect their people and did what they could toward that end. Before the war, they were successful; after the war, they failed:

[Bitlis in 1876, before the war] At the commencement of this month, there was a plot maturing to massacre the Christians . . . some of the conspirators applied to a resident Sheigh [*sic*] for his approval and aid. The latter set his face against the scheme; and declared that, if they attempted to carry it out he would show his indignation by burning his house and leaving the city! This meant a great deal for he is held in reverent esteem by the Mussulmans. Then the plot was presented before another distinguished Turk -- Ali Agha, who also showed his decided disapproval, and declared that, if they attempted to carry it into effect, he would call to his house five hundred of his vassals and arm them with guns and require the conspirators to confront them in deadly conflict.

Then the conspirators informed the Mufti of it, who showed as decided opposition to the scheme as the two I have mentioned.

At length the affair reached the ears of Avedis Effendi, the ex-azkabad of the Armenians who, accompanied by the governmental treasurer presented

the case before the Caimakam, and threw upon him the consequences of such a massacre if it should be allowed to take place. The Caimakam assured them that they need not entertain any fear; that he should see that no such plot be consummated.

My informant, Johannes Agha, Protestant Member of the Mejlis, tells me that the Caimakam patrols the streets, nights, with his armed bodyguard, to guard the city against plunderers and assassins. ⁷⁰

[Bitlis in 1879, immediately after the war] Everyone, Mussulman as well as Christian, spoke well of the Kaimakam, Raschid Effendi, and said that he was always anxious to do what was right, to repress disorder and to have impartial justice administered. He is seconded in well-doing by Ahmed Effendi, a member of the Mejlis. But unfortunately he is able to effect very little. The force at his command is very small. He has only forty zaptiehs [gendarmes] with whom to escort travellers and the mails, collect the taxes and keep order. The result is that the Kurds commit crimes of robbery even within the limits of the town itself and the Kaimakam is unable either to prevent or punish them. ⁷¹

The Ottoman government found it difficult to police the east and southeast of Anatolia even in good times. During good times, the Ottomans were able to garrison regions threatened by Kurdish

-43-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 43.

nomads with regular army troops and gendarmerie. In times of internal crisis and, especially, war with Russia, however, the Ottomans troops were drawn off and the civilian population was to a greater or lesser degree subjected to Kurdish raids and exactions.

As the Ottoman troops were drawn from the eastern provinces to fight the 1877-78 war, the force of Ottoman civil government in the east began to vanish. ⁷² Even in major towns such as Bitlis, as seen before, the Kurds had their way. In Bitlis, in 1877, the Motkanli Kurds simply marched to prison and released one of their own who had been awaiting sentence for killing an Armenian. They would have plundered the town, as well, but another tribe of Kurds rode in to rescue the townspeople. The rescuers acted because the

town was the only outlet for the produce the tribe sold to the city merchants. ⁷³ Tribal Kurds were an armed and mobile force, well-hidden in the mountains. They moved from one Ottoman provincial jurisdiction to another with ease, as well as across the border and into Persia. ⁷⁴ Later, after World War I, the British in northern Iraq, armed with planes and other modern military equipment, also found subduing the Kurds almost impossible. ⁷⁵

A good example of the situation all over eastern Anatolia is found in the Midyat region during and after the war of 1877-78, which was described by British Consul Trotter immediately after the war. According to him, before the war, the government had been able to keep the Kurdish chiefs in check. During the war, with the regular troops off at the front, there was no means of enforcing order. ⁷⁶ Indeed, there was fear that the Kurdish tribes would rebel. The upshot was continual raid and counterraid among Kurdish tribes and a general state of anarchy in the region. The region of Midyat was divided into various armed camps. Each village, including Christian villages, defended itself. No one was considered safe very far from his village. Christians and Muslims alike were armed and all defended themselves. Trotter mentioned particularly Tellerman, an Armenian village "of about 100 houses lying in the plain to the southwest of Mardin." The village was described as "wellarmed and holding their own amongst their Arab, Kurdish, and Circassian neighbors." ⁷⁷ Villages of settled Kurds were exactly the same, i.e., "well-armed and holding their own," and, of course, the continual state of readiness for battle led to battles between Muslim and Muslim and Muslim and Christian. Defending the need for arming themselves, the Kurdish aghas of one village declared "the

-44-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 44.

whole police force for the protection of the district consisted of 4 men, a number manifestly ridiculously insufficient considering that they march with [adjoin] the Aleppo Vilayet, and are in contact with Arabs, Kurds and Circassians." ⁷⁸

With the gall typical of a British Consul, undoubtedly assuming that Ottoman officials had no idea of the state of things, Trotter brought the situation in Midyat to the attention of the Governor of Diyarbakir Vilâyeti. The governor

notified him bluntly that he had no men to send. Half of his already small force had deserted when they were paid in worthless paper currency, and "there will be found none foolish enough [to take] the place of those that are gone." ⁷⁹ And this was the crux of the problem. There was no money to pay the police, no money to pay the soldiers. The situation was the same all over the east. ⁸⁰ For example, there was so little money in the coffers of the vilâyet of Erzurum that the vali (governor) was forced to borrow funds from wealthy Erzurum citizens to give the garrison troops their traditional bayram (holiday) gift. The gift he gave them was one month's pay, part of the four-years' pay that was in arrears. ⁸¹ It should be no surprise that soldiers so paid were inefficient and that there were few of them.

British ambassador Layard correctly stated that the Ottomans could not hope to improve the situation when all government funds were taken up by defense against "the still menacing attitude of Russia." ⁸² Little could be done as long as the Russians took Ottoman lands, caused great losses to the Ottomans in war, and made the upkeep of a large army essential.

Although all sections of the population suffered, many of the raids fell particularly hard on Armenians. For example, the Ottomans had always stationed a battalion of regular troops in Çemişkezek (near Harput) before the 1877-78 war. During the war, they could not do so. As a result, Kurdish tribes entered the area and plundered villages, primarily Armenian villages. ⁸³ However, it would be a mistake to think that Armenians were the sole targets of Kurdish marauders; they were not so selective in choosing victims. As a British consular agent who was sent to investigate the Kurds reported:

From all I have heard and seen, all the highland Kurdish tribes, from Diarbekir to Solaimania, are more or less unmanageable. They not only refuse to pay any taxes, or conform to the law of conscription, but

-45-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 45.

they plunder and kill at their pleasure, and anyone who dares to deny them anything, he is sure to lose his life and property. I must, however, not omit to mention that, in many instances which came to my notice during my travels, Mahommedans suffered as well as Christians from the ravages of

the Kurds. The Rushkootan, Sheikh Dodan, the Sasoun and Mooktu tribes, who inhabit the mountains between Diarbekir and Moosh, spare neither Christian nor Mahomedan; and while I was in the Pashalic of Diarbekir, no less than three Mahomedan Chiefs were murdered by these robbers for the sake of their property. ⁸⁴

There is only small evidence at this point to indicate that the Kurds preferred to attack Christians over Muslims, although it is obvious that they preferred the pickings from the rich to those from the poor and preferred to attack the weak. The relative wealth of the Armenian community may explain why the Armenians seem to have been more often their targets. The Ottoman army and gendarmerie were not in the east solely to protect the Armenians from the Kurds. They were present, as is any police force, to protect citizens from each other. And the Armenians were not the only ones to be protected from the tribes. Turkish peasants and even other Kurds were the prey of Kurdish tribes. ⁸⁵

Before the 1880s, Kurdish tribes were actually a much greater military threat to the civil order of the Ottoman Empire than were Armenian rebels. During the Crimean War, for example, a Kurdish tribal chieftain in the Mosul Vilâyeti volunteered to collect a large force of Kurds to fight against the Russians. He was given 50,000 kuruş to pay and outfit his men. Once gathered together, his 1,500 men revolted, attacked Ottoman government officials in Jezireh, and raided throughout the region. Their revolt was not put down until after the war. ⁸⁶ In 1878, during wartime, the Dersim Kurds revolted as well. ⁸⁷

In 1879, Kurdish revolts spread all over southeastern Anatolia and were a major threat to an empire weakened by the recent Russian War. The rebels showed little loyalty to anyone but members of their own tribes. Most of the villages destroyed by the rebels were Kurdish villages, which were loyal to the sultan or attached to rival tribes. ⁸⁸ Kurds even raided rafts bringing food downriver to famine-stricken areas in southeastern Anatolia in 1879, causing starvation among untold numbers of Kurds (who were to receive the grain). ⁸⁹

The Ottomans, aided by loyal Kurdish tribes, were always able eventually to deal with the Kurds militarily, ⁹⁰ something they were often denied, because of European pressures, when Armenians revolted. The same Europeans who complained bitterly whenever the Ottomans imprisoned Armenian rebels ⁹¹ voiced constant complaints that the Ottomans were not forceful enough in dealing with Kurdish tribes.

One should not think that only Muslims took part in robberies and civil disruption. British consul Biliotti, on an investigative trip in 1879, reported that Armenian attacks on Muslims were not unknown. ⁹² The Armenian community of Zeytun was particularly known for its raids.

THE CIRCASSIANS

The presence of Circassians in eastern Anatolia was obviously disruptive. Where a rough modus vivendi had been reached among Kurds, Armenians, and the Ottoman government, now a new element entered, unable to be easily assimilated into the traditional social and economic system. ⁹³ The Circassians who arrived in the Ottoman East were the remnant of their people, toughened by their wars with the Russians. They were horribly destitute, and it is no surprise that they were driven to marauding for their very survival. Evidence of their more normal lives in their homeland identifies them as a principled people, living by their own codes, perhaps, but not engaging in the sort of activities they were forced to undertake after their expulsion. In eastern Anatolia, however, largely in the name of survival, some Circassian refugees attacked and pillaged both Muslim and Christian villages. Even the Kurds were reported to fear the Circassians, ⁹⁴ and Ottoman soldiers were sent out to disarm marauding Circassians, with limited success. ⁹⁵ Of course, it is probably true, given the nature of rumor, that the reputation of the Circassians was much worse than the reality, and only the troublemakers were mentioned in consular dispatches. Europeans were not prone to consider their history nor to sympathize with their destitution.

Circassians who were given good land surely settled down and were not heard from. Nevertheless, the reputation of those who were marauders was enough to cause fear in the villages. No one,

Muslim or Christian, wanted a Circassian settlement in their district. When one was planned, or even rumored, Muslim village leaders protested to local officials. Armenians more usually protested to European consuls and even to foreign embassies.⁹⁶

The translation of large numbers of Circassians into eastern Anatolia undoubtedly upset traditional ethnic equilibriums in the region. Some districts even became "Circassian," in that the largest single group in the population were Circassians.⁹⁷ The British consul

TABLE 2.⁹⁸

*POPULATION OF THE KAZA OF ÇARŞAMBA CA. 1880, AS ESTIMATED BY
BRITISH CONSUL BILIOTTI.*

Families	
Muslims (native)	3,000
Greek	716
Armenian	1,828
Circassian	5,000
Abhazian	130
Laz	149
	<hr/>
	10,823

in Trabzon, Biliotti, estimated the population numbers for regions that had been settled by Muslim immigrants from the Caucasus. While his figures were little more than rough guesses, they do point to the relative demographic changes caused by the migrants. Table 2 gives Biliotti's estimates for the kaza (district) of Çarsamba.

SUMMARY

In the nineteenth century, the equilibrium in the Caucasus and the Ottoman East was upset by Russian invasions and the forced **exile** of Caucasian Muslims. By the standards of the late twentieth century, this equilibrium was

not satisfactory. Beset by

-48-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 48.

external enemies and a poor economy, the Ottoman government was not capable of properly policing its own people. But the evil that replaced the traditional equilibrium was far worse. Whole peoples were forced from their homes into refugee camps, where they died in great numbers, and ultimately into regions where the inhabitants had no wish to receive them. Rather than aiding the situation, Russian attacks on the Ottomans contributed to further deterioration of civil order by removing the Ottoman Army, the one force that had, however deficiently, kept the peace. Perhaps the worst effect of the Russian invasions was the creation of a Muslim-Armenian polarity, a tradition of mutual distrust and animosity that was eventually to doom both groups.

NOTES

1. Ivan Golovin, *The Caucasus*, London, 1854.

2. On the geography of the Caucasus and Eastern Anatolia, see: W. E. D. Allen and Paul Muratoff, *Caucasian Battlefields*, Cambridge, 1953; J. C. Dewdney, *Turkey: An Introductory Geography*, New York, 1971; W. B. Fisher, *The Middle East*, London, 1950, 1978; John F. Baddeley, *The Rugged Flanks of the Caucasus*, London, 1940; Al-Kabk in *E.I.*² vol. IV, pp. 350-51 (D. N. MacKenzie).

3. Muslim irregular cavalry, including Kurds and mountaineers, served with the Russians in the east in the Crimean War. See *Caucasian Battlefields*, pp. 60, 67, 72, and 83.

4. *Caucasian Battlefields*, p. 293.

5. Muriel Ann Atkin, *The Khanates of the eastern Caucasus and the Origins of the First Russo-Iranian War*, unpublished *Ph.D. dissertation*, Yale University, 1978, p. 7.

6. Atkin, pp. 25-27. Atkin also notes (pp. 199-200) other examples of Armenian clerical support for the Russians in the early 1800s:

Armenians and Georgians, especially those who had relatives in Iran or did business there, continued to be valuable sources of information for Russian officials and so had an effect on Russia's political and tactical decisions. Daniel, the Russian-backed candidate for Catholicos of the Armenian Church (after Argutinskii-Dolgorukov's **death**), provided the Russians with information. [Tsar] Alexander specifically instructed Tsitsianov to seek out Catholicos Daniel and his followers for information and to rely on Daniel's advice. In 1808, Alexander rewarded Daniel with the Order of St. Anne, First Class, for his services in providing the Russians with information. Over

-49-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 49.

the next few years, as Russia fought to extend its frontier to the Kur and the Aras, Armenians continued to send Russian officials messages encouraging them to conquer Muslim-ruled khanates and save the Armenians from Muslim oppression.

The Russians may have been the only Christian power upon whom the Armenians could depend, but Russian actions were completely self-serving and their concern for Christianity questionable. For example, see the development of early Russian policy and Russian conquest in the Caucasus in Atkin, particularly pp. 30 and 37.

7. Atkin, p. 139.

8. Atkin, p. 144. See also pp. 210, 219.

9. H. P. Pasdermadjian, *Histoire de l'Arménie, Paris, 1971, pp. 307 and 309. Some Armenians themselves obviously felt that their support was decisive to the Russian conquests in the Caucasus. See G. Pasdermadjian, Why Armenia Should Be Free, Boston, 1918, p. 16.*

10. See *Caucasian Battlefields*, pp. 148 and 149.

Not all the Armenians who went to Russia were happy there. British Consul Taylor in Erzurum reported that "several hundred families" of Armenians had returned to Erzurum Vilâyeti from Russia (F.O.195-799, no. 2, Taylor to Lyons, Erzurum, 19 May 1866). This was almost surely an exaggeration of the numbers of migrants. See also F.O.195-1237, no. 2, Everett to Trotter, Erzerum, 4 November 1879 on later reverse migrations.

For an interesting story on Armenian villagers' attachment to Russia, see SS no. 54. Bilâl N. Şimşir, *British Documents on Ottoman Armenians*, Ankara, 1983 Volume I (-1880).

11. Louise Nalbandian, *The Armenian Revolutionary Movement: The Development of Armenian Political Parties through the Nineteenth Century*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1963, p. 68.

12. Nalbandian, pp. 81-82.

13. Nalbandian, pp. 173-76.

14. For example, Nalbandian interviewed one revolutionary bishop "the late Mushegh Seropian, former Armenian Archbishop of Cilicia, and one of the first members of the Hunchakian Revolutionary Party," Nalbandian, p. 208. See also *Documents sur les Atrocités Arméno-Russes*, pp. 22-24.

The significant place of American Protestant missionaries in the development of Armenian nationalism and Armenian expectations cannot be considered here, but those interested should consult Joseph L. Grabill, Protestant Diplomacy and the Near East, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1971, especially pp. 46-53.

15. Nalbandian, p. 174.

16. Atkin, p. 144. See also pp. 82, 242.

17. "If Russian authorities had any desire to stop the carnage, they made no attempt to do so." Atkin, p. 259.

18. Atkin, pp. 257-59.

19. Atkin, pp. 263-64.

20. Atkin, pp. 173-75.

21. Atkin, pp. 111-12, note 254.

-50-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 50.

Sizeable population movements were not as unusual as might be expected. Numbers of Caucasian Muslims and Armenians had for centuries moved about to escape famine, disease, or bad government or just to find better conditions. The evidence on such movements is scanty, and, because it comes primarily from Russian chronicles, it is necessarily biased.

22. George A. Bournoutian, *Eastern Armenia in the Last Decades of Persian Rule, 1807-1828 (A Political and Socioeconomic Study of the Khanate of Erivan on the Eve of the Russian Conquest)*, Malibu, California, 1982, p.

69.

23. Bournoutian, p. 74. See also pp. 39 and 40. Bournoutian's study is an excellent, carefully documented examination of the situation in the Erivan Khanate up to and including the period of the Russian conquest. It also contains a useful brief survey of the history of Armenian-Russian relations in the period. See especially pp. 27-29 and 38-40 on Armenian military aid to the Russians and pp. 41 and 42 on Armenian ambivalence toward the Russians.

24. Four thousand Christian families, to whom a grant of 40,0001[sic] was made, were permitted to accompany the [Russian] army, and 10,000 other families followed the same course, making an emigration of 90,000 souls who fled from the tyranny of their Mahomedan masters (Lieut.-General W. Monteith, *Kars and Erzeroum: with the Campaign of Prince Paskiewitch in 1828 and 1829*, London, 1856). Monteith was anything but an objective witness, as his last sentence attests. For other estimates, see John F. Baddeley, *The Russian Conquest of the Caucasus*, London, 1908, pp. 222 and 223.

25. H. F. B. Lynch, *Armenia: Travels and Studies*, Beirut, Khayats Reprint, 1965, vol. I. Pasdermadjian listed (pp. 308 and 310), without source, an estimate of 35,000 Armenians from "Salmas and Urmiah" in Persia and said that 100,000 Armenians came from the Ottoman Empire after the 1828-29 war -- from Eleşkirt, Bayazit, Kars, and Van. The latter were settled in Akhalkalaki (40,000), Şirak (12,000), Erivan and Sevan (25,000), and elsewhere.

26. F.O.195-562, no. 37, Report on the Political and Military State of the Turkish Frontier in Asia by J. I. A. Simmons, 16 November 1857.

27. For a short summary of the peoples, see Harry H. Walsh, Ibero-Caucasian in Richard Weekes, ed., *Muslim Peoples: A World Ethnographic Survey*, Westport, Connecticut, 1978, pp. 174-80. See also, Cerkes in *E.I.*², vol. II, pp. 21-23 (Ch. Quelquejay) and the sources in note 2.

28. Awarded in the Treaty of Gulistan of 1813.

29. Although it cannot be said to have been actually ruled by Russia until the early 1800s.

30. *The treaties of Turkmançay, 1828, and Edirne, 1829.*

31. W. E. D. Allen called Shamil the greatest guerilla leader in the history of war (*Caucasian Battlefields*, p. 107).

On the history of Shamil and the early Russian conquests in the Caucasus, see John F. Baddeley, *The Russian Conquest of the Caucasus*, London, 1908, which is still the best treatment of the military history of the time. Readers of the book must make allowance for Baddeley's manifest prejudices. No one who could describe the major Muslim powers of the Caucasus region as "the unspeakable Turk, and still more unspeakable Persian" (p. 18) can be relied upon for objective analysis. See also Leslie Blanch popular account, *The Sabres of Paradise*, London

-51-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 51.

1960. The best modern analysis of Shamil's revolt, and an excellent bibliographic source, is Paul B. Henze, "Fire and Sword in the Caucasus: the 19th Century Resistance of the North Caucasian Mountaineers", in *Central Asian Survey*, vol. 2, no. 1 (July 1983), pp. 5-44.

32. On the type of treatment meted out to actual armies who resisted the Russians (i.e., slaughter), see Baddeley, *Conquest*, especially pp. 55, 67, 89, and 98.

33. Count Leo Tolstoy, paraphrased by Baddeley, p. 446. Tolstoy went on to declare that after 1852 the Russians "humanely" changed tactics, bombarding the villages first with artillery and, after the Caucasian

males were defeated, taking the women and children as captives, rather than killing them outright. Later evidence indicates that Tolstoy's impressions of a change in policy were not always correct, as whole villages were destroyed well into the 1860s. See also *Atrocités Russes. Documents soumis á la Conférence de Constantinople*, Constantinople, 1877, pp. 12-35.

34. *F.O.97-424*, no. 29, Stevens to Russell, Trebizond, 10 October 1863. See also the petition from the Circassians, transmitted in *F.O.881-1259*, Bulwer to Russell, Constantinople, 12 April 1864, and *F.O.257-11*, no. 8, Dickson to Eyre, Soukoum-kale, 29 June 1864.

35. *F.O.97-424*, no. 2, Dickson to Russell, Soukoum-Kale, 17 March 1864. Consul Dickson and others reported many examples of migration to the Ottoman Empire (*F.O.881-1259*, Dickson to Russell, Soukoum-Kale, 13 April 1864).

36. Comité de bienfaisances des Emigrés Politiques de la Ciscauciens en Turquie, *AperÇu historique sur les Ciscauciens pendant la Guerre Mondiale*, Constantinople, 1918, p. 10.

37. *F.O.881-1259*, Dickson to Russell, Soukoum-Kale, 22 February 1864.

38. *F.O.97-424*, no. 260, Napier to Russell, St. Petersburg, 19 May 1864.

On the Russian claims of good treatment for the Circassians, see *F.O.97-424*, no. 260, Napier to Russell, St. Petersburg, 19 May 1864. Napier was extremely kind to the Russians, but doubted their stories. His statement on the morality of the Russian conquest was simple and precise: "Of the theoretical injustice of the proceedings of the Russian Government in this matter it is perhaps vain to speak. The Russians had no right to conquer the Circassian tribes and no right to deprive them of their property as well as of their independence. There is a double wrong" (*F.O.97-421*, no. 260, Napier to Russell, St. Petersburg, 19 May 1864).

39. German, Greek, and Bulgarian colonists were settled on the coasts, as well. See Alan Fisher, *Emigration of Muslims from the Russian Empire in the Years After the Crimean War*, *Jahrbucher für Geschichte Osteuropas*,

vol. 35, no. 3, 1987, pp. 356-71.

40. *F.O.97-424*, no. 13, Palgrave to Stanley, Trebizond, 16 May 1867.

41. *F.O.97-424*, no. 6, Palgrave to Russell, Trebizond, 17 April 1867.

42. *F.O.97-424*, Palgrave to Barron, Trebizond, 26 September 1867. *F.O.97-424*, Palgrave to Lyons, Trebizond, 14 July 1867.

"All accounts are confirmed regarding the violence with which the Abkhasians have been stripped and driven out of their country. Details of gratuitous barbarity are added; and it is asserted by the exiles themselves that several of their countrymen, after having been forced into Russian ships, under the pretext of embarking them for Turkey, have been instead conveyed to Kertch or Novorusiska [*sic*], and

-52-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 52.

thence to inner Russia. Past analogy renders the main of these assertions very probable" (*F.O.97-424*, no. 18, Palgrave to Stanley, 28 May 1867).

43. *F.O.97-424*, no. 13, Palgrave to Stanley, Trebizond, 16 May 1867.

44. McCarthy, *Bulletin of the Turkish Studies Association*. Fisher ("Emigration of Muslims") states that between 17 and 28 percent of the population of the affected sections of the Caucasus became migrants, "if the tenth all-Russian census (1857) is to be trusted." He is right to question the census. I very much doubt if the Russians could have accurately counted the Muslim tribes. A sizeable undercount was likely. Fisher lists a number of other estimates and Ahmet Cevat Eren quotes many estimates of the numbers of Circassian migrants in *Türkiye'de Gü*

ve Gçmen Meselesi, Istanbul, 1966, pp. 68-75. Kemal Karpat gives consistently higher figures in *Ottoman Population 1830-1914: Demographic and Social Characteristics*, Madison, Wisconsin, 1985, pp. 27 and 67.

45. Figures for the numbers of Caucasian Muslim emigrants are, like those for the Crimean Tatars, conjectural. Exact counts were nonexistent and evaluation of estimates rests largely on the reliability of the one making the original estimation, not statistical analysis. For my own estimates, I have relied on the data given by three historians -- Kemal Karpat, Alan Fisher, and Mark Pinson. It seems that there were probably approximately 600,000 migrants between 1856 and 1864 and 200,000 after 1864. However, these were surviving refugees. The record of awful Caucasian mortality indicates that deaths of approximately one-third is not an exaggeration. Therefore, an estimate of 1.2 million setting out and 800,000 actually settling in the Ottoman Empire seems reasonable. These figures, it should be understood, are not in any sense firm. (Fisher, *Emigration of Muslims*; Pinson, *Ottoman Colonization of the Circassians in Rumili after the Crimean War*, *Études Balkaniques*, no 3, Sofia, 1973, p. 72; and Karpat, *Ottoman Population*, pp. 68-79 and "The Status of the Muslim under European Rule: the Eviction and Settlement of the Cerkes", *Journal of the Institute of Muslim Minority Affairs* I[2], 1972, p. 11. See also, *Comité de Bienfaisances des Emigrés Politiques de la Cis caucasie en Turquie, Aperfu Historique sur les Ciscaucasiens pendant la Guerre Mondiale*, Constantinople, 1918, pp. 9-13.)

46. Neither the Circassians nor the Abhazians were completely gone. Smallscale rebellions against the Russians took place in the war of 1877-78, followed by further migrations to the Ottoman Empire, particularly migrations of the Abhazians. (See *Caucasian Battlefields*, pp. 126-31.)

47. Russia, *Premier Récensement General de la Population de l'Empire de Russie, 1897* (redigé par Nicolas Trointisky), St. Petersburg, 1905, pp. 256-59.

48. On the Russian lack of assistance or consideration to the embarking Circassians, see *F.O.97-424*, no. 287, Napier to Russell, St. Petersburg, 1 June 1864.

49. *F.O.97-424*, Stevens to Russell, Trebizond, 21 December 1863. *F.O.195-812*, Stevens to Erskine, Trebizond, 26 February 1864. *F.O.195-812*, no. 8, Stevens to Bulwer, Trebizond, 7 April 1864.

50. *F.O.97-424*, Stevens to Russell, Trebizond, 19 May 1864.

51. *Aperfu historique sur les Ciscauciens*, p. 10.

52. *F.O.195-812*, no. 10, Stevens to Bulwer, Trebizond, 19 May 1864. See also: *F.O.195-812*, Stevens to Erskine, Trebizond, 13 February 1864, and *F.O. 97-424*, no. 9, Stevens to Bulwer, Trebizond, 15 April 1864.

-53-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 53.

53. "The quarters in the vicinity of cemeteries are rendered uninhabitable owing to the careless manner in which the dead are buried, and the offensive consequences thereof; and whole families are abandoning their dwellings. The chief aqueduct which feeds the fountains of the town is tainted, a Circassian corpse having been found floating therein a few days ago. The streets and squares are in a wretched filthy condition; provisions are getting scarce and dear, and fuel is completely wanting, all of which augments the misery and tends to the spread of disease" (*F.O.881-1259*, Stevens to Russell, Trebizond, 17 February 1864).

54. "You are aware of the large and sudden immigration of Circassians into the Ottoman domains.

"The Russian Government has now acquired the territory of that brave and devoted race, who have only prized one thing more than country -- liberty, or at least the life that is free from the domination of a foreign foe. They are flying the shores immortalized by their defense and seeking an asylum in a neighboring empire. In short, Circassia is gone;

what yet remains is to save the Circassians. The Ottoman Government is willing to afford the refuge they desire. But its means for doing this are, as your Lordship knows, scanty; what it has already done -- and this, comparatively speaking, is little -- has been at a cost of 200,000" (F.O.8811259, Bulwer to Russell, Constantinople, 3 May 1864).

55. The Ottoman Empire most probably did its utmost for the refugees, although it had little to give. The Ottoman Archives are full of catalogued references to government decisions to contribute to the migrants' welfare. Councils of State were greatly involved with deliberations on aid to the refugees. The following are a few examples of the documents:

On the general situation of the refugees: Cevdet Dahiliye; 1280-#2157. (All of the following are from the İrade Collection, given in the form sub-group, year, catalogue number) Meclis-i Mahsus 1280 -- #1220 and 1279- 80 -- #837. Dahiliye 1281 -- #36490 and #37096. Meclis-i Vala 1281 -- #23041, #23524, and #23323. Meclis-i Vala 1282 -- #23885, #24004, and #24269. Meclis-i Mahsus 1283 -#25094. Meclis-i Vala 1284 -- #26193.

On medicine, doctors, etc. sent to the refugees: Meclis-i Vala 1281 -- #23171 and #23392. Meclis-i Mahsus 1283 -- #24898. Dahiliye 1285 -- #40688.

On police (*zaptieh*) and other government officials sent to the refugees: Meclis-i Vala 1281 -- #23263. Meclis-i Vala 1282 -- #24727. Meclis-i Mahsus 1283 -#25052.

On mosques built for the refugees, hocas sent to them, etc.: Meclis-i Vala 1281 -- #23217, #23518, #23617. Meclis-i Vala 1282 -- #24322. Meclis-i Mahsus 1283 -- #24791 and #24886.

These are just a small selection of the documents on the Ottoman response to the Caucasian migration. Unfortunately, the Ottoman documents tell us little beyond the fact of Ottoman concern and expenditure. They name officials and set sums, but provide little description of the refugees' plight. The Ottomans attempted to keep accurate records of the numbers of refugees they settled on the land in various provinces (see İrade, Meclis-i Vala 1281 -- #23167 on the Ottoman government's arrangements for population enumeration of the emigrants), and many of these records are available in the Ottoman Archives. (See "general situation of the refugees," above, for examples.) However, no summary registers

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 54.

for the Circassian refugees have yet been found and catalogued. Even if such records were found, they would only be records of those who finally arrived in the various Ottoman provinces, not the much greater numbers who set out. (See Fisher, "Emigration of Muslims" on the possible numbers of the refugees.)

56. *F.O. 97-424, Dickson to Stuart, Pera, 5 December 1864. See also Dickson's dispatch of 9 October 1864 in the same series, which listed 74,206 Circassians and their place of destination.*
57. *Report of R. H. Lang, Acting Consul, in F.O. 97-424, no. 81, Stuart to Russell, Therapia, 30 October 1864.*
58. *See F.O. 97-424, no. 9, Palgrave to Stanley, Trebizond, 26 April 1867, and F.O. 97-424, no. 13, Palgrave to Stanley, Trebizond, 16 May 1867.*
59. *F.O. 195-812, no. 9, Stevens to Bulwer, Trebizond, 15 April 1864.*
60. *F.O. 195-812, no. 10, Stevens to Bulwer, Trebizond, 19 May 1864.*
61. *F.O. 195-812, no. 4, Stevens to Erskine, Trebizond, 17 February 1864, and F.O. 97-424, no. 3, Stevens to Russell, Trebizond, 17 February 1864.*
62. *F.O. 97-424, Dickson to Stuart, Pera, 14 December 1864.*

63. On the problems raised by Circassian settlement in Ottoman Europe, see Mark Pinson, "Ottoman Colonization", pp. 78-82.

64. *F.O. 195-762, Stevens to Russell, Trebizond, 10 October 1863.*

65. *F.O. 97-424, no. 6, Palgrave to Russell, Trebizond, 17 April 1867.*

66. For example, on the rebellion of Kurds in Hakkâri in 1879, see *F.O. 195-1237, no. 80, Trotter to Layard, Erzeroum, 5 September 1879*. Also, *F.O. 195 -- 1237, Clayton to Trotter, Van, 19 August 1879, F.O. 195-1237, no. 83, Trotter to Layard, 12 September 1879*, especially the two enclosures from Captain Clayton in Diyarbakir. *F.O. 195-1238, no. 45, Biliotti to Mallet, Trebizond, 2 April 1878. F.O. 195-1237, no. 89, Trotter to Layard, Erzeroum, 17 September 1879 and 27 September* including enclosures from Captain Clayton. *F.O. 195 -- 1237* contains many other communications on the Kurdish Revolt, which effectively ended when the Kurds were defeated by regular Ottoman troops and their leaders were exiled to Albania.

The position of the Kurds vis-à-vis the Ottoman Army and local Muslim and Christian populations is covered extensively by C. B. Norman in *Armenia and the Campaign of 1877*, London, 1878. However, one must allow for Norman's vehement anti-Turkish and pro-Russian sympathies, which cloud all he wrote. He believed, for example, that the Turks were guilty of starting the war of 1877-78. Norman particularly searched out examples of Kurdish depredations.

Occasionally, villagers took things into their own hands and planned and took revenge on their oppressors. (See *F.O. 78 -- 2992, no. 3, Biliotti to Salisbury, Trebizond, 18 January 1879.*)

One of the best sources on the Ottoman East to 1890, and on the Kurds and the Armenians, is the first two-volumes of the work by Bilâl N. Şimşir, *British Documents on Ottoman Armenians*, Ankara, 1983, Vol. I (- 1880) and Vol. II (1880-1890), hereafter *British Documents I and British Documents II*. References here are to document numbers, not pages.

67. On the revolts, see Hassan Arfa, *The Kurds: An Historical and Political Study*, London, 1966, pp. 23-25, and Arshak Safrastian, *Kurds and Kurdistan*, London, 1948, pp. 45-62. Unfortunately, there is no adequate

history of the Kurds. Arfa's

-55-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 55.

short book often borders on the ridiculous, with many factual errors, and Safrastian's is distinctly anti-Turkish in orientation. Safrastian, for example, *blames* the Ottomans for stopping Kurdish raids on civilians. He sees such hindrance of Kurdish actions as an unjust assertion of Turkish authority.

68. Lynch (vol. II, p. 421) stated that the Kurds "played one Power against another" in the 1829 and 1854 wars.

69. Charles Williams was absurdly wrong, as he often was, on the events of the retaking of Bayazit by Ottoman forces. (For the actual history, see *Caucasian Battlefields*, p. 148, and *F.O. 65-978, no. 121, Ricketts to Derby*, Tiflis, 2 October 1877.) However, his analysis of the position of the Kurds and Circassians is worthy of note. He described the Circassians and Kurds in the Ottoman army as disruptive of soldierly discipline, but essential to the army, because they in effect provided the only cavalry available. (Charles Williams, "one of the special correspondents attached to the staff of Ghazi Ahmed Mukhtar Pacha," *The Armenian Campaign*, London, 1878, pp. 129-30.)

70. *F.O. 195-1100, no. 46, Zohrab to Derby*, Erzeroum, 8 August 1876, enclosure, "Extract from a letter from the Reverend George Knapp to Consul Zohrab, dated Bitlis 25th July 1876."

71. *F.O. 195-1237, Clayton to Trotter*, Van, 19 August 1879.

72. To a certain extent this happens in any country at war. The Russian Caucasus showed a considerable increase in crime at the same time, although not approaching the gravity of the situation in the Ottoman Empire. See *F.O. 65-928, Ricketts to Derby*, Tiflis, 26 August 1877.

Even before the 1877-78 war, troops were far too scarce to properly protect the east. British consul Zohrab in Erzurum, who was solely concerned with the problems of the Armenian population, constantly complained of the poor situation there. In one exchange with the Ottoman Governor of Erzurum, he received a completely frank answer:

Samih Pasha told me very candidly that he could not spare troops to be stationed at Bitlis, for, he said if he gave soldiers to protect every town which was now menaced by Koords he would be left without an army to protect the frontier or garrison the fortresses. . . .

(*F.O. 195-1140, no. 13, Zohrab to Layard*, Erzeroum, 3 January 1877.)

See also *F.O. 195-1187, no. 109, Biliotti to Layard*, Trebizond, 30 July 1878.

73. The rescuing Kurds said they had acted because the citizens of the town were "their customers." *F.O. 78-2623, no. 58, Zohrab to Derby*, Erzeroum, 12 July 1877, enclosure, "Extract from a letter from the Reverend G. Knapp, American Missionary at Bitlis." In tales such as this, the Reverend Knapp was a fairly reliable source, because Christians did not enter into the story. Where Armenians appeared, his prejudices stood in the way of his observational veracity.

See also: *F.O. 195-1211, no. 33, Trotter (relaying letter of Captain Clay from Van) to Layard*, Erzurum, 30 August 1879; *F.O. 195-1140, Zohrab to Elliot*, Erzurum, 30 January 1877; and other documents in *F.O. 195-1140*, in which wartime reports from the American missionaries in Van, Bitlis, and elsewhere are included. Interestingly, the missionaries' solution to the problems in the east, brought upon by the Russian invasion, was that the Russian should win! They openly stated their hopes that the Ottomans would be quickly defeated. (One

73. wonders if they had any idea of how poorly the Russians traditionally received Protestant missionaries.)
74. Kurds often crossed across the Persian border in both directions to raid or to escape punishment. On at least one occasion, Ottoman gendarmes followed them across the border "to remonstrate with some of the more audacious Kurdish tribes" (*F.O. 424-169, no. 2/1, Devey to Lloyd, Van, 6 December 1890, in British Documents II, no. 383*).
75. The British, recently victorious in World War I, attempted to subdue the Kurds of southeast Anatolia so that they could take over the area as part of their Iraqi Mandate. They failed badly. (Paul C. Helmreich, *From Paris to Sevres*, Columbus, Ohio, 1974, pp. 26, 27, and 203-5.) The fact that the Ottomans and later the Turkish Republic managed to govern there shows a higher degree of loyalty than might be expected.
76. *F.O. 195-1237, no. 22, Trotter to Malet, Diarbekir, 22 March 1879.*
77. *F.O. 195-1237, no. 22, Trotter to Malet, Diarbekir, 22 March 1879.*
78. *F.O. 195-1237, no. 22, Trotter to Malet, Diarbekir, 22 March 1879.*
79. *F.O. 195-1237, no. 22, Trotter to Malet, Diarbekir, 22 March 1879.*
Trotter had high hopes for the beneficent effects of a European presence: "The news of the arrival and location of a British consul in Diarbekir has done much to quiet these lawless tribes." No doubt.
80. On the financial condition of the empire, see Şevket Pamuk, "Foreign Trade, Foreign Capital, and the Peripheralization of the Ottoman Empire", Ph.D dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1978; Charles Issawi, *An Economic History of the Middle East and North Africa*, New York, 1982, chapter 1; Roger Owen, *The Middle East in the World Economy, 1800-1914*, London, 1981; and the bibliographies in each.

81. *F.O. 195-1237, Trotter to Layard, Erzeroum, 16 September 1879. See also F.O. 195-1237, no. 14, Trotter to Salisbury, Diarbekir, 28 December 1878.*

82. Turkey No. 51 (1878), p. 12-16, no. 4, *Layard to Salisbury, Therapia, 30 October 1878* in *British Documents I*, no. 111. Only 11.4 percent of the annual Ottoman budget was available for all the work of the Interior Ministry ca 1875. That ministry was responsible for all civil order and administration in the provinces (Shaw, p. 155).

83. *F.O. 78-2844, no. 29, Biliotti to Derby, Trebizond, 25 February 1878.* When reading European reports of Kurdish attacks, it is often difficult to tell whether Armenians were particularly picked out for Kurdish depredations or if the Europeans only reported on Armenian losses. For example, in the previous report, Consul Biliotti states that "there is panic among the Armenians" and cites numbers of deaths in various villages. He does not actually indicate that the deaths were deaths of *Armenians*. The only person selectively identified as being killed by the Kurds is described as a "philo-Armenian Mussulman." The truth probably is that all the sedentary population suffered, the Armenians perhaps worse than the others. Because the main activity of the marauding Kurds was robbery and the Armenians were by all accounts richer than the other groups, it would be odd if they did not suffer greater losses. Hatred against non-Muslims would have been a secondary cause for discrimination against Armenians, and a far lesser cause.

On relations between Armenians and Kurds, see Lynch, vol. II, pp. 431-33.

84. *Rassam to Layard, Van, 15 October 1877, in British Documents I*, no. 43.

85. On the "normal" activities of the tribes against Muslims and Armenians, see *Turkey No. 23 (1880), no. 147, Clayton to Trotter, Van, 25 May 1880*, in *British Documents II*, no. 9.
86. *F.O. 78-1017, no. 2, Holmes to de Redcliffe, Diarbekir, 7 November 1854.*
87. *F.O. 195-1187, no. 168, Biliotti to Layard, Trebizond, 25 October 1878.* On other Kurdish revolts in the 1877-78 war, see *F.O. 195-1237, no. 6, Trotter to Salisbury, Erzeroum, 28 November 1878.*
88. *F.O. 195-1237, Trotter to Layard, Erzeroum, 19 September 1879.*
89. *F.O. 78-3132, no. 7, Trotter to Salisbury, Diarbekir, 3 March 1879* and *no. 9, 17 March 1879.*
90. Consular records are full of the military moves against the Kurdish rebels. The Ottomans sent battalions of troops from all over the east to put down the 1879 revolts. Loyal Kurdish tribes were even used to fight disloyal ones. (See *F.O. 195-1237, Trotter to Layard, Erzeroum, 2 October 1879.*)
91. The reports of British diplomats contain numerous examples of European complaints over the imprisonment of Armenians convicted of treason, especially of convicted Armenian bishops and clergy.
92. *F.O. 78-3137, Biliotti to Salisbury, Tripoli, 1 October 1880.*
93. See *F.O. 195-1237, no. 22, Trotter to Malet, Diarbekir, 22 March 1879.*
94. *F.O. 195-799, no. 1, Taylor to Lyons, Erzerum, 3 November 1865.*
95. *F.O. 195-799, Taylor to Lyons, Erzerum, 25 November 1865.*

96. *F.O. 195-1237, no. 3, Trotter to Salisbury, Diarbekir, 17 June 1879. See also F.O. 222-1, Kitchener to Wilson, Ada Bazar, 29 August 1879; F.O. 222-1, Layard to Kitchener, Therapia, 23 August 1879; F.O. 195-1141, no. 59, Biliotti to Layard, Trebizond, 8 August 1877; F.O. 78-2987, no. 26, Wilson to Layard, Sivas, 7 October 1879; and F.O. 78-2987, Stewart to Wilson, Konieh, 31 July 1879.*

The Circassian problems have often been approached from the strange viewpoint that Circassians were settled in the Ottoman Empire as an anti-Armenian measure. A. O. Sarkissian, for example, believed that Circassians "were especially encouraged to proceed to the Armenian Provinces," which is, judging by settlement patterns, nonsense. (A. O. Sarkissian, *History of the Armenian Question to 1885, Urbana, Illinois, 1938.*)

97. For example, see *F.O. 78-3137, Biliotti to Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Tcharchamba, 23 August 1880. Biliotti, the British consul at Trabzon, embarked on an extended tour of his consular district in 1880, probably as soon as it was practicable to do so after the war. He was particularly interested in the status of villages in which Muslim emigrants had been settled and of plans for Christians to migrate to Russia. He forwarded detailed reports on both phenomena to London.*

98. *F.O. 78-3137, Biliotti to Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Samsoon, 31 August 1880.*

CHAPTER THREE

BULGARIA

I can come to no other conclusion but that the Russians are carrying out a fixed policy of exterminating the Moslem race. ¹

THE BULGARIAN REVOLUTIONARY movement, which was to end with the creation of a Bulgarian state and the **death** or expulsion of a majority of the Bulgarian Muslims, began with isolated actions against the Ottoman government. Small groups of Bulgarians fought against the Ottomans in the Serbian and Greek revolutions. Bulgarian volunteers joined the Russians when they invaded the Balkans in 1806, 1811, and 1829 and fought alongside the Russians in the Crimean War. At various times in the nineteenth century, small revolts against Ottoman authority broke out in Bulgaria. However, it was not until the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 that the revolutionaries, through the agency of Russia, were successful in gaining Bulgarian independence.

The war of 1877-78 can be said to have started with the famous "Bulgarian Horrors" of 1876, which in fact began with the massacre of Bulgarian Muslims. On 2 May 1876, Bulgarian revolutionaries, who had failed badly in previous attempts to foment successful revolution against the Ottoman Empire, took advantage of Ottoman military weakness and Ottoman involvement in an insurrection in Bosnia to revolt once again. They raised the revolutionary banner in central Bulgaria in the towns of Koprivshtitsa, Panagjurishte, and Klisura. ²The organizers of the revolution may not have counted on the Turkish reprisals that followed. Nevertheless, the Bulgarian revolutionary action was from the start primarily a slaughter of Muslims. In Panagjurishte, "the excited populace assembled in the square, sang revolutionary songs, heard flaming speeches from

-59-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 59.

[rebel leader] Benkovski, and then scattered to kill peaceable Turks wherever they could be found." ³Approximately 1,000 Muslim villagers were killed. ⁴

At the time of the Bulgarian revolt, few regular troops were available to put it down, and the Ottomans feared it would spread if not quelled quickly. They decided, therefore, to arm Circassians and indigenous, mainly Turkish, Muslims and use them as irregular troops (called *başı bozüks*) against the

rebels. This proved to be a great mistake. The Circassians were an especially untrustworthy element. They could be counted on to provide military force against the insurgents, but they could not be adequately controlled. Drawing on centuries of tradition in the Caucasus, the Circassians seldom followed any orders but those of their tribal leaders. Moreover, they must have developed a distrust, perhaps hatred, of Christians because of their experiences in the Caucasian wars and their forced **exile** from their homeland. Circassians had also been subjected to torture and other atrocities by Bulgarians fighting in Serbia and Bosnia. ⁵To them, the enemy was easily identified. The Russians, whom they had long known and hated, and the Bulgarians must have appeared little different from each other. The Circassians were also a people whose recent history had accustomed them to a warlike, raiding life. ⁶The Ottoman enrollment of Circassians in the fight against the Bulgarian rebels was taken by the Circassians as a license to act according to traditions built up during their wars with the Russians. ⁷

The Bulgarian insurgents may have realized that letting loose the Circassians was a step that would eventually work to their own benefit. By always burning at least one Circassian village, they insured that the Circassians would commit atrocities in reprisal. ⁸In areas of Bulgaria where the revolution took hold, the insurgents committed acts of violence, particularly against Muslim women, ⁹with the obvious intent of sparking a retaliation. ¹⁰

The başı bozüks, who were usually Turks who resided in districts in which Bulgarians were rebelling, saw a present danger in the Bulgarian revolt. It was Turkish Muslims such as themselves who had been massacred by Bulgarian revolutionaries. Their feelings of revenge must have mixed with their fear of what would happen to them and their families if the Bulgarian revolution succeeded. It would probably be a mistake, however, to assume too much considered reflection on their part. Wars in the Balkans had

-60-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 60.

never been fought according to the laws of "civilized warfare." Many of those who enrolled in the başı bozüks, like their counterparts among the Bulgarian insurgents, would have been the sort who felt that plundering and outraging

civilian populations was a natural part of warfare. Indeed, both Bulgarian Christian insurgents and *başı bozüks* seem to have considered such acts a desirable perquisite of war. The activities of the *başı bozüks* followed the usual pattern of any wartime plundering; i.e., once in charge, they stole from their enemies. Near Burgas, for example, *başı bozüks* were called up to defeat 2,000 to 3,000 insurgents. Once this was done, they also plundered five Bulgarian villages. ¹¹

While the Bulgarian massacres were mainly the work of Circassians and other Ottoman irregulars, the Ottoman army command was not above ordering the destruction of villages and the murder of innocents to "teach a lesson" to the Bulgarians. Such atrocities were in the nature of exemplary terror -- Bulgarians were expected to see what awaited those who rebelled or supported the rebels and thus do neither, themselves, out of fear. The best known massacre was the attack on the town of Boyacik in May of 1876 by the Ottoman general Şevket Paşa, ¹² in which 166 men, 8 women, and 12 children reportedly died (186 out of about 1,300 people in the town). ¹³ Şevket Paşa had been sent out from Edirne to put down rebels in the region of Boyacik, and the massacre was obviously intended to be an example to those rebels from the area. ¹⁴

Despite such instances of exemplary violence, the Ottoman government and its regular troops seem generally to have done their best to limit the damage done to civilian populations. On reflection, this is reasonable. If the insurgents realized that Muslim massacres of Christians might bring European intervention, the Ottomans could not have helped but realize it as well. They would have had no desire for European, especially Russian, intervention. Ottoman governors and generals arrested offending irregulars. Derviş Paşa, for example, arrested irregulars who had plundered a Christian village, publicly executed five of the culprits, and bastinadoed 65 others. ¹⁵ In various parts of Bulgaria, murderous *başı bozüks* were tried and hanged by the Ottoman government. ¹⁶ Ottoman regular forces and police often prevented Circassians from plundering peaceful Bulgarian villages, and the Ottoman *zaptiehs* (gendarmes) even armed Bulgarian villagers to allow them to protect themselves. ¹⁷ In one instance, a detachment of 300 Ottoman

soldiers was sent out from Karnabad to protect Bulgarians from Circassians who were plundering their village. The soldiers were forced to fire on the Circassians, who would not otherwise cease their plundering. ¹⁸

The soldiers who were sent from Karnabad against the Circassians happened to be passing through Karnabad on their way to the front in Bosnia and thus were available for the kaymakam (district governor) to send them against the Circassians. This was a fortuitous situation; such soldiers were seldom present to carry out the will of the government. The local Ottoman governors were often left with good intentions alone. ¹⁹ Orders on paper for the collection of arms from başı bozüks and Circassians and for the punishment of offenders were a far different thing than actually dispatching men to do the job. This illustrates the basic problem of the Ottomans in Bulgaria and elsewhere: They simply did not have the military manpower to protect their country or its citizens. ²⁰ For example, the important town of Burgas, close to the area in which the rebellion began, was in effect defenseless during the insurrection of 1876. The troops that should have been defending it were fighting elsewhere. The British Vice-Consul in Burgas, Brophy, stated that "if Circassians, bachibozouks, or insurgents conceived the idea of exterminating the Christians or the Musselmans, and of firing and plundering the town," the town could not defend itself. ²¹

Hoping to take advantage of the Ottoman problems with the revolts in Bosnia and Bulgaria, Serbia and Montenegro invaded the Ottoman Empire in July of 1876. ²² While the Montenegrans were successful, the Serbs and the Russian and Bulgarian volunteers who fought by their side were quickly defeated by the Ottomans. Regular Ottoman troops were once again kept busy, this time fighting the Serbs. By September of 1876, with the war with Serbia in effect won, the Ottomans began to send regular troops to the areas that had suffered the worst Circassian and başı bozuk depredations. It was too late to affect European public opinion.

The Bulgarian "Horrors" were in fact a real and horrible Muslim reaction to insurrection and the murder of Muslim civilians. However, reports of "horrors" reached England and the rest of Europe in a much sensationalized and exaggerated fashion. Much of what was reported was untrue. ²³ For example, one of the stories that most titillated British readers was the tale of Christian girls sold into slavery or their forcible inclusion into Muslim harems.

Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 62.

What fantasies such accounts engendered in the minds of citizens of Manchester and Birmingham can only be guessed. Indignation ran high. However, no sales of women had taken place. European consuls, who searched at length for such sales and abductions, found nothing. ²⁴The dictates of politics and newspaper circulation had, however, made such stories attractive, and they were widely believed. They were well-publicized in Europe, especially in England, and touched a great vein of sympathy for Bulgarian Christians among the English. ²⁵

Had the Bulgarian Horrors not engaged the sympathies of the British, the war would probably not have taken place. The Russians would have realized that they would not have won against an Ottoman-British alliance. However, such an alliance, the natural outcome of British policy toward the Ottomans since the Crimean War, was doomed by British public indignation over the massacres of Bulgarians by Turks. Whipped up by religious sympathy and prejudice and the political opportunism of Gladstone and the Liberal press, public opinion in England made it impossible for Disraeli to come to the aid of the Turks, despite his own wish to do so. The final result was a massacre of Muslims in 1877-79 much greater than any massacre of Bulgarians in 1876.

When the insurrection was over, between 3,000 ²⁶and 12,000 ²⁷Bulgarian Christians were dead, as were more than 1,000 Bulgarian Muslims. ²⁸The Bulgarian revolutionaries had not been immediately successful. However, Ottoman mistakes and misdeeds and the European Press had set the stage for ultimate Ottoman defeat and an independent Bulgaria.

The immediate cause of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 was the defeat of Serbia by the Ottomans. Although the Russians had attempted to dissuade the Serbians from going to war, Russian Pan-Slavist support for the Serbs was strong. In addition, Russian intentions for the future of the Balkans did not include a resurgent Ottoman Empire made stronger by the defeat of a Slavic state. More friendly and tractable Balkan states fit Russian aims better. Russia managed, therefore, to force the Ottomans to accept a disadvantageous armistice with Serbia on 31 October 1876, before Serbian forces could be completely routed. However, Russia could not convince the Ottoman government to accept the Russian plan of dividing much of Ottoman Europe into small autonomous, Christian states. ²⁹The Ottoman Empire, disastrously overconfident of

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 64.

the support of Disraeli and the British, felt itself to be strong enough to resist Russian demands. Negotiations dragged on until March of 1877, but the Ottomans refused to capitulate. Russia planned for war. On 15 July, the Russians negotiated with Austria the Budapest Convention, in which the Austrians agreed to be neutral in a Russian-Turkish war in return for Russian acquiescence in the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina by Austria. The Russian flank was thus protected.

Russia declared war on 24 April 1877. Despite the pro-Turkish sentiments of Disraeli and Queen Victoria, public opinion prevented the British government from coming to the aid of the Ottomans. The Ottomans were left to fight alone. The Russian army crossed the Danube near Galatz on 22 June 1877. On 27 June, greater Russian forces crossed the river in force at Sistova and began (30 June) an advance on Tirnova. Tirnova fell on 7 July. The Shipka Pass over the Balkan Mountains was taken on 19 July. In the north, Niğbolu (Nicompolis) surrendered on 16 July, after its men had escaped to Plevna. The fortress at Plevna resisted the first Russian attack on 20 July and was to withstand subsequent attacks until 10 December, but the countryside of north central Bulgaria was held by the Russians from the middle of July.

From July to December 1877, the occupation of Bulgaria was stalemated. The Russians advanced through the Dobruja, but the northeast of Bulgaria was held by the Ottomans from Silistria south. The Ottomans held the southern defensive line of the Balkan Mountains. With the fall of Plevna on 10 December, the entire position changed. Sophia fell on 4 January, Tatar Pazarcik on 14 January, Filibe (Philippopolis) on 17 January, and Edirne on 20 January. The fortresses and detachments of Şumla, Varna, and Burgas, although unable to affect the outcome of the war, did not surrender until long after the armistice.

THE MUSLIMS OF BULGARIA - - FORCED MIGRATION AND DEATH

In most wars, a quick victory by one side has meant a minimum loss of civilian lives. This was not the case in the Russo-Turkish

-65-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 65.

War of 1877-78. The war aims of the Russian conquerors of Bulgaria insured massive Muslim civilian casualties. The deaths of Bulgarian Muslims fell into four categories -- battle casualties; murder by Bulgarians and by Russian troops; denial of the necessities of life, leading to starvation and death from disease; and deaths caused by the refugee status of the Bulgarian Muslims.

CIVILIAN CASUALTIES OF BATTLE

Battle casualties among civilians contributed little to the overall Muslim mortality in the 1877-78 war. In nineteenth-century warfare, when civilians suffered greatly through direct warfare, it was usually in cases of siege and bombardment of cities. The siege of Richmond in 1864-65 and of Paris in 1870-71 are classic examples. Siege and the bombardment of cities were relatively rare in the 1877-78 war. Niğbolu was briefly bombarded by the Russians, as were some smaller towns, but only in the cities of Rusçuk and Plevna were there lengthy sieges that entailed high civilian mortality.³⁰ The cities of Sofia, Tirnova, Filibe, Tatar Pazarcik, Orhaniye, and Edirne fell easily, without large civilian loss. Silistria and Pazarcik were occupied by the Russians after the armistice, without battle, and the cities of Şumla, Burgas, and Varna were not surrendered by the Ottomans until long after the war's end. In the countryside, the Muslim population, while often not able to flee far, was at least able to flee the immediate sites of battle. The speed with which the Russian armies overwhelmed the Ottomans also meant that there were relatively few battles in which civilians could come to harm; therefore, Muslim civilian loss due to battle was slight. None of the contemporary sources speaks of civilian battle casualties as being high.

ATTACKS ON MUSLIM CIVILIANS

From the first days of the Russian invasion of Ottoman Europe, Russian troops killed defenseless Turkish civilians. Were the evidence of Russian atrocities solely based on the reports of Turkish refugees, it might perhaps be contested, although the thousands of accounts do have weight as evidence. Much of the evidence of

-66-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 66.

slaughter of civilians by the Russian military, however, comes from accounts of neutrals (by no means all of whom were well-disposed toward the Ottomans ³¹) who observed the fighting and interrogated the refugees of the 1877-78 War, as well as from official Ottoman reports. Not only did those who had survived the attacks identify their attackers, but the type of wounds labelled the attackers as Russian soldiers. Members of the European press who observed the war reported the actions of the Russian military against Muslim villagers and refugees. The reporters' observations were such that they could easily agree on the Russian guilt:

Schumla, 20 July 1877

The signatories, representing the foreign press, have gathered together at Schumla. They believe it their duty to affix their signatures to a collective summary of the accounts sent to their newspapers of inhumane acts perpetrated on the innocent Muslim population in Bulgaria. They declare that they have seen with their own eyes, in Razgrad and in Schumla, children, women, and the elderly who had been wounded by lances and sabres. They were not wounds that could be attributed to the hazards of battle. The victims gave accounts of horrible treatment inflicted by Russian troops and, quite often, by Bulgars, as well. They declared that the entire Muslim population of many villages had been massacred either as they fled or in their pillaged villages. Many newly wounded have arrived each day. The undersigned state that the greatest number of the victims are women and children who have been wounded by the lance.

(Signed by the representatives of the *Manchester Guardian*, *Kölnische Zeitung*, *Standard*, *Frankfurter Zeitung*, *Journal des Debats*, *Morning Post*, *République Française*, *Pester Lloyd*, *Wiener Tagsblatt*, *Illustrated London News*, *Neue Freie Presse*, *Times*, *Morning Advertiser*, *New York Herald*,

Scotsman, Egypeterczy Graphie, Wiener Worstadt Zeitung, Daily Telegraph, Manchester Examiner.) ³²

From this and many similar accounts it is obvious that the murderers of Muslim civilians were often Russian troops. Wounds that could not have been inflicted by weapons other than cavalry lances gave witness to the truth of the assertions of refugees. With exceptions, those responsible were Cossacks ³³ who attacked villages and murdered *as units*. The murders, rapes, and destruction perpetrated by the Russian units seem on the whole to have been ordered by the Russian command. While documentary evidence of these orders has not yet been discovered, circumstantial evidence indi-

-67-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 67.

cates that Russian actions were too orderly to have been simply the type of individually motivated atrocities seen in all wars. They were not the work of poorly officered soldiers independently running amuck. ³⁴

The primary purpose behind the slaughter of civilians by Russian troops was to spread fear among Turkish villagers, which would cause them to flee the advancing Russian armies. They would thus become an encumbrance to the Ottoman army. In this, the Russians were very successful. Hordes of Turkish refugees occupied roads and interfered with troop movements. Muslim refugees took over railroad cars that should have transported troops and supplies to the front. ³⁵At Plevna, Osman Paş's last sortie and last chance for escape were ended when the presence of Muslim refugees on the battlefield kept reinforcements from reaching the troops spearheading the breakout. ³⁶In addition to hindering the Ottoman armies, the flight of the Muslims secured the rear and the supply lines of the Russians from Ottoman partisans. More importantly, clearing the land of Turks insured the existence of an overwhelmingly Slavic Bulgaria after the war. ³⁷Attacking the Turks of Bulgaria was a practical, considered, and ruthless end of Russian military policy.

The methods used to end Muslim presence in Bulgaria had been developed millennia before the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78. What was needed was a combination of murder and fear that would either kill the Muslims outright or

cause them to flee from impending murder. To accomplish this, the most suitable force in the Russian army was the Cossacks. The Cossack methods had been perfected in the Caucasian wars. They had been fighting "dirty wars" for centuries and had all the benefits of an extremely mobile cavalry for actions against civilians. This made them an effective tool in carrying out Russian aims in the Balkans. Soon after they began to destroy villages and cut down refugees, their name "Cossack" was said in fear by Turkish villagers. Rumors of their approach were enough to set Turkish refugees upon the road, as planned.

Had the Russians possessed unlimited time and manpower to carry out their aims, there would have been no need to give specific orders to the Cossacks concerning Turkish refugees and Turkish villages. The Cossacks could simply have been given leave to do what they wished with the Turks, but this would have been an inefficient use of military manpower, allowing Cossacks to roam

-68-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 68.

and raid at will when they were needed for battle. In fact, there appears to have been method and consistency in the Cossack attacks, and this implies planning from a central authority. Cossack attacks on Turkish villages were often coordinated with local Bulgarian villagers, with both Cossacks and Bulgarians taking part in a common plan in which Cossacks surrounded villages so that none could escape, then Bulgarians went in to plunder and kill. ³⁸For example, in the village of Hidibey, Cossacks peacefully took the arms of the Turkish villagers and gave them to the Bulgarians, who then killed all but 15 of the 70 Turkish males of the village, while the Cossacks made sure that none escaped. The 15 who did escape had fled as soon as the Russians were sighted. In Büklümlük, the Cossacks again took the Turk's weapons and gave them to the Bulgarians. The Cossacks "cordoned off the town" to prevent escape. The Bulgarians put all the men in a straw barn and all the women and children in houses. The barn and the houses were piled with straw and set afire. Those who ran from the buildings were shot by the Bulgarians. ³⁹Very few escaped from the attacks, but those few were enough to spread the word to their fellow Turks. Indeed, it was in the Russian interest that some escape to tell the tale.

The destruction of the Turks of the city of Eski Zagra provides a clear example of the Russian part in the pillage and massacre of the Turks and other Muslims of Bulgaria. As usual, the Russians collected the arms of the Turks when they entered the town. They were distributed to the Bulgarians in town. As reported by the British consul Dupuis, "This was followed by the arrival of 400 armed Bulgarians from the villages of Derbent and Yeni Mahalle, when a general assault was made on the houses and shops of the Jews and Turks. Later on the same day, Russians and Bulgarians went to the surrounding villages and farm houses and set them on fire; a Russian officer looking on the while, and watching operations through a field glass."

40

THE COSSACKS

Unless researchers find the war orders for the 1877-78 war in Russian archives, there will be no way to see what specific orders were given to the Cossacks. One can infer that Cossack activities, as observed, were not consistent with those of irregular units on

-69-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 69.

their own. In the joint actions with Bulgarians, what was stolen from the Turks was left in the hands of Bulgarians. Had such activities not been under higher authority, it is doubtful that the Cossacks would have stood by to keep the Turks in check and protect the Bulgarians, rather than take the loot for themselves. The Cossacks could not have been raiders on their own, looking for booty. If they had been on their own, can one imagine them, again and again, surrounding villages in proper military fashion and calmly waiting while Bulgarians, not the Cossacks themselves, raped, pillaged, and killed? Such was not the way of Cossacks, unless they were under military discipline.

Cossacks often worked in collusion with local Bulgarians. This is not to say, of course, that Cossacks did not ever act on their own. As noted above, Cossacks killed Turks in villages and killed Turkish refugees. In the village of Mderrisli, 150 Cossacks themselves did the killing of 35 Turks, whom they first gathered together in the village square, then shot. Bulgarians from

Müderrisli and other villages only robbed the Turkish houses. ⁴¹The same occurred in the villages of Yeni Mahalle, ⁴²Ustruca, Kadisle, Binbunar, ⁴³and many others. British consul Blunt at Edirne saw surviving refugees who had been saved from the Cossacks by Circassians and Turkish troops. They included a large number of women and children wounded by cavalry sabres and lances, including children of 1, 2, and 3 years of age. ⁴⁴Archival records are full of reports from consular officials, newspapermen, and the Ottoman government of villages destroyed and murders committed by the Cossacks. ⁴⁵

THE RUSSIAN REGULAR ARMY

It is often difficult to identify whether regular army units, as opposed to Cossacks, were responsible for many of the assaults upon peaceful Muslims. There is no lack of information on attacks on villagers and refugees by "the Russians." ⁴⁶For example, the Ottomans reported the massacre of 400 Muslims in the village of Hidr Bey in Eski Zagra Kaza by Russians. ⁴⁷In many instances, "the Russian vanguard" was named as responsible for burning, pillage, and massacres of Turkish villages. For example, "the vanguard of a Russian column" destroyed villages in Kizanlik and Yeni Zagra kazas, including Balvan, Malkoç, Yeni Mahalle, and Eşekçi

-70-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 70.

[*sic*], and murdered the inhabitants. ⁴⁸It is usually difficult to label the perpetrators as regular army units, however. Only in some cases can one be sure of regular army actions. For example, the Stafford House Hospital in Rusçuk, which was staffed by British neutrals and which treated Muslims, was quite deliberately destroyed by Russian cannon. ⁴⁹The Ottoman government also reported that Russian artillery bombarded and thus caused the burning of Turkish villages near Tirnova ⁵⁰and that Russian cavalry overtook refugee columns, killing and raping. ⁵¹The latter could have been Cossack cavalry. The Russian regular army definitely burned Muslim villages in their path, ⁵²and Russian artillery bombarded inhabited Muslim villages of no military importance. ⁵³In some instances, regular army units functioned in much the same way as the Cossacks mentioned before, surrounding Turkish villages while Bulgarians pillaged and killed. Regular soldiers and

artillery were used, for example, to isolate the village of Bolvan in Northern Bulgaria so that Bulgarians could kill all the villagers. Similar occurrences were recorded by the British in five other villages in the same area at the same time (July 1877). ⁵⁴In December 1878, well after the war was over, Russian infantry sacked the Turkish village of Buruncuk. ⁵⁵Russian soldiers in the same area took Turks from other villages away for corveé labor, and the Turks never returned. ⁵⁶

Long after battle had ended and the Muslims of Bulgaria could in no sense be considered a military threat, Russian soldiers were still assaulting Turks with the object of forcing their departure. For example, the armistice was signed on 31 January 1878, but three months later, on 2 May 1878, 150 Russian soldiers came to the village of Kara Aiaç, took the villagers' weapons without resistance, then arrested and incarcerated all adult males, raped the women, and pillaged the village. The men were marched off to a neighboring village, where they were tortured and the pillaged goods sold. ⁵⁷

THE BULGARIANS

Bulgarian revolutionaries were the natural allies of the Russians. They formed a natural fifth column behind Ottoman lines, damaging supply lines and killing retreating Ottoman soldiers. ⁵⁸Their main benefit to the Russians, however, lay in their goals of exterminating and expelling the Muslim population -- goals they

-71-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 71.

shared with the Russians. Specific orders seldom would have been needed. The Russians simply needed to distribute arms to the Bulgarians and then turn away. ⁵⁹By avoiding the exercise of any police function in the occupied territories, the Russians insured that Muslims would be attacked and oppressed. This is not to say that all Bulgarians treated Muslims badly. The majority of Bulgarians could not have participated in the massacres, rapes, and other atrocities that accompanied the Russian conquest. However, the neutrality of these Bulgarians did nothing to help the Muslims. Could Bulgarian peasants have been expected often to risk their lives to save Muslims from other Bulgarians, especially when those Bulgarians enjoyed

the blessing of the occupying Russian army? Moreover, it was the Bulgarians who would gain most if all Muslims left their villages. They would reap Muslim harvests and take over Muslim lands. ⁶⁰ Nevertheless, it would be improper to label Bulgarians, as a group, as murderers of the Turks. Archival documents may speak only of "the Bulgarians" as oppressors of the Turks, but it was most likely only two groups of Bulgarians were most responsible revolutionaries, whose hatred for Muslims had been proven previously, and those individuals and villages who saw economic advantage in seizing Muslim fields and property.

Examples of Bulgarian atrocities on Turks fill the diplomatic literature with graphic details of mass murders, rape, and pillage. After commenting on despoliation and nightly outrages in one village, one British representative commented, "Such cases as these are the rule, not the exception." ⁶¹ European observers (reporters from the *Morning Post*, the *Times*, and the *Daily Telegraph*) saw 120 Turkish bodies lying in the open in the village of Oklanli (Lagahanli), where Turkish women had been locked up in houses, raped over a period of ten days, then burned alive. ⁶² In some cases, Bulgarians were, in effect, taken into the Russian army, given uniforms and weapons, and used to persecute Turks. ⁶³

In most cases, the Bulgarians who persecuted Muslims were simply villagers, sometimes villagers whose ancestors had lived side by side with Muslims in mixed villages for hundreds of years. Their motive was probably more greed than hatred or nationalism. The usual pattern of purely Bulgarian attacks on Muslims, as opposed to the already mentioned Bulgarian-Cossack collaborations, began with theft of cattle. ⁶⁴ As if the success of their operations and lack of punishment gave them courage, they progressed to extortion and

-72-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 72.

theft of personal goods and money. The final act was a combination of beatings, rape, and murder, almost invariably leading to Muslims taking flight. ⁶⁵

[Consul Calvert at Edirne to Ambassador Layard, 19 November 1878] The Mussulman peasantry, despoiled of lands, houses, cattle, and other property

(a process which has been carried on from day to day and month to month), made to live for the most part in stables, outhouses, and hovels, and now reduced as they are to utter beggary, are exposed to repeated and more and more searching spoliation, sometimes carried out by means of torture and application of heated iron to the victims (as in the recent cases of Khidirdja and Turkmenler), or of beating to the point of **death** (as in that of Keustik, where the deed was committed by an officer of the Russo-Bulgarian gendarmerie). The Bulgarian hatchet, knife, and club are meanwhile busy everywhere. It is a literal fact that every Christian is free to violate any Turkish girl or woman at will, and that the Christians exercise to the full the license accorded them, adding, in the recent case of Slimnia (where there is a Russian garrison) insult and derision to outrage, by publicly parading the victims of their brutality to the sound of the bagpipe. The repatriated, and now enslaved, Turkish refugees, in the recent and probably still existing case of Souflar, are held to labor in making bricks for Bulgarian masters by overseers armed with the lash. All this with absolute impunity to the offenders (not one Christian has yet been punished and hardly one Bulgarian arrested for any offence committed against a Turk), and with an indifference on the part of the Russian Authorities which it is no injustice to describe as complacent. ⁶⁶

The actions of Bulgarians against Turks should be viewed in the context of the revolt of 1876 and the subsequent Bulgarian Horrors. The tradition of attacks on helpless villagers had begun with attacks on Muslims in the revolution and continued with attacks on Bulgarians in the Horrors. It is difficult to speculate on the psychology of men caught up in such inhuman intercommunal wars, because evidence is lacking. Few would leave memoirs describing their mindset as they killed innocent victims. One can theorize that Bulgarian attacks on Muslims were fed, at least in part, by the fear that one had to destroy one's enemies before they destroyed him. Also, the frenzy of war has turned otherwise pacific persons into butchers in many lands beside Bulgaria. The negative effects of radical nationalism cannot be ignored; if one's own people are better than others and destined for greatness, then what position

-73-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 73.

must be assigned to others who stand in the way of national success? In

such a context it may, in times of perceived danger, seem right, or at least expedient, to remove those who are not of the nation. In this approach to nationalism the Bulgarians were surely not alone.

THEFT AND DESTRUCTION AS POLITICAL TOOLS

The Russians used plunder and the destruction of civilian property as tools of war. Their intent was to insure that Bulgarian Turks would have nothing to which they could return. From the beginning of their occupation, the Russians destroyed Turkish villages in a fashion "that appeared to be systematically pursued by the invaders."⁶⁷ In this, as in other matters, they were aided by Bulgarians, who burned down what they could not use themselves.⁶⁸ The deliberate burning of villages abandoned by their inhabitants makes no military or economic sense, except as insurance that those inhabitants would not be able to return.⁶⁹ Thus, houses and whole villages were destroyed by Russians and Bulgarians, cattle and all moveable objects taken, and the Turkish presence, in effect, erased. In cities, shops and homes were stripped. Turkish-owned buildings were often destroyed. In Yeni Zagra, 50 Turkish houses were burned, as were the mosque and government buildings.⁷⁰ Many of the shops and houses of Turks and Jews in Eski Zagra were burned.⁷¹ All the Turkish homes that had not been occupied by Bulgarians were burned to the ground.⁷² In both the cities and the countryside, however, property was more often taken by Bulgarians. This was accomplished by fait accompli. Upon the arrival of Russian forces, Muslims fled. In areas where Muslims had not initially fled, Bulgarian bands killed owners or terrorized them into leaving. Their Bulgarian neighbors, or Bulgarians from other villages or cities, took over their homes and shops. The same was done with farm lands. What had been Turkish was now Bulgarian.⁷³ The only possible Turkish hope for justice came from newly created Bulgarian tribunals or from a sympathetic hearing from the Russians. They received neither justice nor sympathy.⁷⁴

Although it is difficult to separate deliberate policy from simple absence of military discipline, the activities of the Russian soldiery seem to have been part of the Russian policy of erasing the Turkish

and Muslim presence in Bulgaria. The soldiers and their Bulgarian allies took all portable Turkish property and often destroyed what remained. Only property that was taken over by Bulgarians was spared. Cities such as Filibe, which had a large Turkish population, were sacked: "The Greek Vice-Consul at Philippopolis, M. Metalas, . . . states that the Russian troops and the Bulgarians have completely pillaged the town and are committing all sorts of atrocities." ⁷⁵After the Russians took Filibe, "every Turkish house in the town was completely plundered -- even to the doors and window frames; the mosques were turned into public latrines." ⁷⁶The Russian soldiers continued to pillage Edirne for weeks after its fall, "especially the Turkish Quarter." ⁷⁷

REPRISALS

Although the Bulgarians were much more often the perpetrators of massacres than the victims, there were massacres of Bulgarians by Muslims in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78. These were relatively few, and there were more reports of atrocities in the European press than there were atrocities, ⁷⁸but Muslims did attack Bulgarians. Christian villages, both Greek and Bulgarian, were plundered by Muslim troops. As in the Bulgarian Horrors, most of the offenders seem to have been Circassians. The Circassians most often attacked villages as they, along with the Ottoman regular army, were in retreat. Both Muslim and Christian villages were pillaged by Circassians, ⁷⁹and most Circassian activity seems to have been in the nature of plundering. ⁸⁰Undoubtedly, more massacres of Christians would have taken place had there been time and occasion. Due to the rapid retreat of the Ottoman forces, the Circassians had little time for anything but flight. However, when the occasion presented itself, Bulgarians were killed. Perhaps 400 Bulgarians were killed in Osman Pazari and Curna. ⁸¹When the Russians temporarily retreated from Kizanlik, an unknown number of Bulgarians were massacred in reprisal for the previous wholesale massacre of Muslims and Jews in the City. ⁸²Although relatively few atrocities of this nature during the Ottoman retreat were reported, there must have been atrocities that remained unknown to European consular observers. ⁸³

Some reports of massacres by Muslims were either untrue or greatly exaggerated, ⁸⁴as had been the case with the Bulgarian Horrors. British Consul Blunt investigated one such report and found that only male revolutionaries, no women and children, had died in the alleged massacre, which he believed was in reality a battle between Ottoman soldiers and insurgents. ⁸⁵Unlike the unanimity of the reports of massacres of Muslims, there was disagreement concerning attacks against Bulgarians, which mainly were reported by Bulgarians who had not been at the scene. ⁸⁶The actual massacres of Bulgarians were normally in the nature of reprisals. As is often the case with reprisals, innocents, rather than the perpetrators of the original crimes, were the victims. A total of 135 Bulgarian men, women, and children were killed by Circassians in Günetli Mahallesi. ⁸⁷As the Ottoman army and Muslim population of Yeni Zagra abandoned the town, "men of bad character" killed Bulgarians and burned the bazaar. ⁸⁸

Two qualities separate the murders of Bulgarians from the murders of Muslims. First is the sheer number of dead. There were few recorded accounts of Muslim atrocities, but thousands of Bulgarian atrocities. Second is the type of crime involved. Unlike the Russian units, who had official "blessings," if not orders to proceed, offending Muslim soldiers and civilians were acting out of personal greed and hatred. The Ottoman government not only did not sanction their actions, but punished them severely. ⁸⁹In the case of the massacre at Gf inetli Mahallesi, noted before, 15 Circassian ringleaders were caught and tried publicly. Their punishments included **death**, imprisonment, and public flogging (for lesser offenses). ⁹⁰The Ottomans seem to have tried to protect the Bulgarians of Giinetli Mahallesi, and the village was only attacked after regular army units that had been protecting it had been withdrawn to the front. ⁹¹There are numerous other examples of Ottoman efforts to protect Christians, ⁹²as well as of punishments given to those who attacked Bulgarians and Greeks. The record of the Ottomans and Muslims of Bulgaria, while far from perfect, shines in comparison with the Russian record of government-sponsored mass murder, forced migration, and support for atrocities committed by Bulgarians.

REFUGEES

The movement of Muslim refugees began even before the Russians crossed the Danube. Citizens in key areas of the northern

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 76.

frontier had been instructed by the Ottoman government to leave war zones and burn war materiel, including food and fodder that could be used by the invading Russians. ⁹³Very few, however, seemed to have moved at this time. In the period before the battles actually began, Muslims seem to have resisted such orders, because of the great personal losses involved. The Russian invasion ended all delay. When Muslims realized the dangers to themselves and their families, they left in haste. ⁹⁴

The refugees first fled toward major cities and Ottoman military bases, where they hoped to be safe and to be fed by the authorities. As the Ottoman armies rapidly lost to the Russians in the first months of 1878 and retreated, the refugees set off again. Refugees from Tirnova went south, across the Balkan Mountains. Those from the Dobruja and northeast Bulgaria fled to the region of Şumla-Varna, where the Ottoman army held out until after the war. Turkish refugees in western Bulgaria went to Sofia or into Bosnia and Üsküp. Central Bulgarian Turkish refugees went to Eski Zagra and Filibe. Many refugees never reached the cities, and many of the sheltering cities did not long remain safe. The Russian army moved quickly through the Balkans, forcing the refugees to flee in front of it and sometimes outpacing the refugee columns. Often the refugees settled in one place but left when part of their number was massacred. ⁹⁵As each city fell, many of the refugees moved on to what they hoped would be safer areas. In addition to refugees from areas first conquered, refugees from newly conquered territories, forced from their villages by Bulgarian and Russian massacres and ill treatment, joined the exodus. By March of 1878, when the Treaty of San Stephano ended the war, refugees were clustered in a few areas: Şumla-Varna (approximately 230,000), Burgas (20,000), the Rhodope Mountains (100,000), Gümülcine (50,000), and Istanbul (200,000). ⁹⁶Many of them had moved a number of times. The refugees in and near Gfimiilcine, for example, had generally followed a path from their villages to Eski Zagra, Tatar Pazarcik, or other cities, then to Filibe, then to the Rhodope Mountains, and finally over the mountains to western Thrace (Gümülcine and the Aegean coast). When Sofia fell, the refugees who had gathered there, along with the Turkish residents of the city, escaped to Üsküp, to Tatar Pazarcik, and to Salonica by way of Kustendil. ⁹⁷The Turks of Kustendil were eventually forced to leave, but many of them delayed too long and were massacred by Bulgarian insurgents on the roads to Üsküp

and Kumanova.⁹⁸

-77-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 77.

In addition to refugees in the major centers at the end of the war, many more were scattered across Bulgaria and western Thrace. They had not been able to go on, or perhaps had found shelter with other Muslims in areas that were at least temporarily safe. Tens of thousands had been evacuated by sea to Anatolia, Cyprus, and Syria by the Ottoman government. Others had passed through Istanbul by land to Anatolia.

In terms of loss of life and general suffering, the Muslim refugee migration from Bulgaria was one of the most terrible in history. Compounding the typical sufferings accompanying any refugee migration were factors unique to Bulgaria in 1877 and 1878: the vicious treatment of refugees by the Russian and Bulgarians, the fact that the migration was mainly undertaken in winter, and the inability of the Ottoman Empire to provide the refugees with adequate aid.

Massacres by Russians and Bulgarians were the main impetus behind the flight of the Turks. Justified fear forced them to leave quickly, taking only what they could carry or load on carts. Since harvesting was often over when they left, large stores of grain were available, but the refugees could only take what little they could carry. There was no efficient escape route. The refugees walked, drove ox-carts, and, whenever possible, clambered onto trains to escape south. Those who were unable to walk further gathered at railroad stations and waited. At Hassköy, northwest of Edirne, more than 8,000 refugees gathered in January, waiting without shelter for trains to take them away.⁹⁹ At the Filibe station, 15,000 waited;¹⁰⁰ at Çorlu, 20,000;¹⁰¹ etc. As the countryside became more unsafe and the winter of 1877 deepened, refugees moved along the train tracks to the relative safety of stations guarded by Ottoman soldiers. Many froze to death along the tracks, and observers grew used to seeing heaps of bodies along the lines.¹⁰² Refugees had huddled together for warmth and frozen together in death. Still others froze outside the station buildings.¹⁰³ When trains arrived, they climbed aboard box cars, car roofs, and open flat cars.¹⁰⁴ Their only concern was escape:

The discomfort of these poor people can be somewhat imagined when I inform you that at each station crowds were waiting with their orders signed, ready to jump into any nook or corner they could find. On this account women and children were afraid to leave the carriages, lest they should lose their places, even for the calls of nature. The air, therefore, in some of the closed wagons, was beyond conception and

-78-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 78.

probably was the cause of much of the mortality that occurred and the sickness now existing. Nearly every disease was represented from smallpox downwards. ¹⁰⁵

Large numbers of Turkish refugees were caught behind the rapidly advancing Russian lines. These refugees were often attacked on the road by Cossacks and Bulgarians. ¹⁰⁶ Robbery and rape were common. There was little for them in occupied Bulgaria. If they stopped in villages, away from the sight of European observers, ¹⁰⁷ the refugees suffered all the terrors described before. If they stopped in large towns, their fate was often starvation and disease. For example, by July of 1877, 5,000 refugees had gathered in Filibe: "Many of them have been thoroughly plundered by the [Bulgarian] insurgents, very few have the means of subsistence." ¹⁰⁸ After July, more refugees came to Filibe, but many left again when the Russians approached. In January, an estimated 15,000 waited in the snow for trains at the Filibe station. ¹⁰⁹ Some 2,000 Turkish refugees remained in Filibe in May of 1878 and "lived in ruins of houses destroyed by the Bulgarians." ¹¹⁰ The Filibe refugees were assaulted and murdered, forced into unpaid corvée labor, and young Turkish girls were raped and abducted. Typhus was rampant, and the Russians forced typhus victims into a camp in a swamp outside of the city, where they died. The general situation was the same in other cities.

The sufferings and mortality of the Bulgarian Muslim refugees were chronicled in gruesome detail by European consuls and reporters. ¹¹¹ When the refugees fled, their enemies (in addition to the Russians and the Bulgarians) were cold and starvation. They fled in the middle of the Balkan winter, often without food, and starved or were frozen to death: "One little girl was found by a German railway official amongst a heap of 400 men,

women, and children who had frozen to **death** on the hills near Tatar Bazardjik, and of whom she was the only survivor." ¹¹² What clothing the refugees possessed was often seized by Russian troops and Bulgarians. The consuls continually remarked on the number of naked refugees, including women and children.

At Gumurdjina upwards of 50,000 refugees are inscribed in the books of the Konak, besides some thousands not so inscribed, whom he [British representative Cullen, as quoted by Consul-General Fawcett] found in the mountains, too exhausted to walk several hours to the town to get

-79-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 79.

the miserable pittance which the Government doles out. Many of these were dying of typhoid fever and dysentery, and thousands were sleeping in the open streets of the town in an indescribable state of misery, filth, and disease. But if the conditions of those in Gumurdjina was bad, he found that of the unhappy wretches in the mountains was infinitely worse. Out of reach of help, thousands of women and children were dying a lingering **death** of famine. In one place alone he found women and girls, from 14 to 65 ¹¹³ years of age, huddled together as naked as they were born, their wretched rags having entirely fallen off of them.

. . . Many arrive daily from villages either plundered or burnt by the Russians and Bulgarians and complain (to use Mr. Cullen's own words) "of the treatment they receive from those savages." He further says "that the constant accounts I receive of Russian and Bulgarian cruelty were almost beyond anything I have ever heard of or seen in this dreadful war, although, as you know, I have seen much, and I can come to no other conclusion but that the Russians are carrying out a fixed policy of exterminating the Moslem race." ¹¹⁴

Although perhaps difficult to retrace, some consideration must be given to the mental state of the refugees. No one at the time considered what we today would call the psychological implications of their predicament. Yet, contemporary reports did comment on their much-changed attitude. They were observed to be listless and sometimes even placid, as if they were passive observers at their own executions. European consuls especially

remarked upon the effects of destitution upon them. Again and again, they remarked, amazedly, on the presence of naked Muslim women on the roads, or huddled in streets and alleys, because even their clothes had been taken from them. They explained to their European readers what an incredible thing it was to see Muslim women uncovered at all, much less publicly naked. The psychological effect of such degradation cannot be overemphasized. The effect of the differential loss of Muslim males must have been great, as well. Reports of refugee groups in which 60 to 70 percent were widows were not uncommon. ¹¹⁵In a society where the authority of men was strong, families must have been affected by the loss of males. Refugee survival is much due to the strength of the Bulgarian Muslim women.

Undoubtedly, more refugees died of disease than were murdered by Russians or Bulgarians. Typhus, typhoid, and often smallpox were seen wherever the refugees huddled together. Of the 45,000 refugees in Edirne, 16,000 had typhus and 100 to 120 died each day. ¹¹⁶The hundreds of thousands who came to Istanbul suf-

-80-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 80.

ferred fearfully. European doctors who, at the request of the Sublime Porte, evaluated the situation, stated that by April of 1878 160,000 refugees had come to Istanbul, 60,000 had been removed to other areas, and 18,000 had died. ¹¹⁷Twenty-one refugees a day died on the Asiatic shore of the city alone. ¹¹⁸Of the 4,000 sheltered in the Ayasofya Mosque, 25 to 30 died daily. ¹¹⁹The inability of the Ottoman Empire to provide medical care to the victims was obvious. There were never sufficient doctors or medicine in an empire that as late as 1895 had only 169 physicians in hospitals. ¹²⁰

POSTWAR BULGARIA

With a few exceptions, May of 1878 marked the end of direct attacks on Muslim villages by the Russian army. Public opinion in England and elsewhere in Western Europe had dramatically shifted toward the Ottoman side, and this had an effect on the Russians, who wished to consolidate their gains, not continue the war. There was little further need for direct Russian

action, in any case, because Bulgarian Christians very successfully kept up the pressure on the Bulgarian Muslims. The Russian occupation forces made sure that Bulgarians were given a free hand, and the Russians did all they could to discourage examination of the outrages or interference by British or French consuls, reporters, or charitable agencies. ¹²¹British Consul Brophy at Burgas commented that the Russians, themselves, had ceased to attack the Turks, but that they were using local Bulgarians as instruments of their policy of driving the Turks from Bulgaria. ¹²²While Brophy's analysis of general Russian policy was correct, Russians did in fact, on a more limited basis, still attack Turkish villages and assist Bulgarians in attacking Muslim villages after the end of the war. When it was discovered by the English that Russian troops had assisted Bulgarians in the destruction of the village of Demirciler and the massacre of its inhabitants in November of 1878, the Russian government declared its "strong disapproval" of the event. In one of the very few cases of punishments being meted out, the general in charge of the Russian troops responsible was given twenty days arrest. ¹²³As late as December of 1878, the Russians also offered practical assistance to Bulgarians

-81-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 81.

by destroying houses owned by Turks who had fled, thus making it nearly impossible for returning refugees to live in their old villages, and Bulgarians under Russian protection continued to destroy Turkish houses and villages well into 1879. ¹²⁴If they returned, the Turks were not allowed to build new houses. ¹²⁵

Under the Russian Occupation, Bulgarian Christians were put in charge of the ordinary workings of government. The Russians chose as officials those who had most supported the Russian invasion and occupation, that is, those who had rebelled against the Ottoman government. These were often the same Bulgarians who had been prominent in the massacres. They continued their anti-Turkish activities in their new official capacities, supported by the power of the state and an occupying army. Appeal to the Russians was useless, because the Russians either did nothing or actively supported the perpetrators. ¹²⁶

In occupied Bulgaria, and later in both Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia, the

law was in the hands of Bulgarian police and tribunals, neither of which included Turks. The courts and police were effective agents of the state whose sole intention toward Bulgarian Turks was to insure that they left the country. Thus, Turks could expect no support from the very organs of state that theoretically should have protected them. ¹²⁷In the cities, Bulgarian police were prominent in plundering and attacking Turks. ¹²⁸Rural police (*zaptiehs*) robbed and murdered the citizens of Turkish villages and raped Turkish village women. ¹²⁹There was no appeal from this police terror. When the villagers of Yeniköy were raped and massacred and the village pillaged, two Turkish men escaped, reported the incident to the police, and were themselves thrown into prison. ¹³⁰The tribunals, which were created to judge cases of law, were not only set against the Turks but were generally ignorant of any principles of law. ¹³¹Consul Brophy wrote, "since the commencement of the Russian occupation until now I do not know of a single instance in which a Bulgarian, accused on the strongest evidence of robbery, murder, or outrages upon women, has been punished with more than a few days' imprisonment." ¹³²Despairing of help from the Ottoman government, Turkish villagers and refugees appealed for assistance again and again to European consuls such as Brophy. ¹³³Helpless to assist them, the consuls could only keep lists of "spoliation and outrages," such as a representative list of "property losses in the villages of Denislere, Arnavoutler, Ghebeoh,

-82-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 82.

Kyvanlik, Giaffer, Altchak Dere and Deniskeui" (215 oxen and cows, 74 horses, 632 sheep, 33 buffaloes, and 13,526 piastres) ¹³⁴or any of hundreds of other lists of sacked villages. Nevertheless, by the account of British consul F. R. J. Calvert in Filibe, "the grossest outrages upon the Turkish refugees have been of late more numerous than ever; those that have come to my knowledge alone would fill a good sized volume; and yet there can be no doubt that not a twentieth part of the persecutions that take place ever come to my knowledge." ¹³⁵

After the armistice with the Ottomans, the Russians in theory supported resettlement of Turkish refugees in their old villages. By the rules of the Congress of Berlin, as officially accepted by the Russians, returning refugees were to be given back their houses, land, and possessions, and were to be

free from harassment. The Russian answer to the problems of the large and disease-ridden gathering of refugees at Şumla, for example, was "let them go home." ¹³⁶ The difficulty was that the Russians provided no protection for the returning Turks, who were then at the mercy of their Bulgarian fellow-citizens. Once the refugees left the sight of European observers, the situation was far different from what international agreements had guaranteed. Without protection from the only source that could provide it, i.e., the Russians, the returning refugees were completely at the mercy of the Bulgarians. ¹³⁷ Refugees who returned to their homes found them destroyed or in the hands of Bulgarians, with no hope of return to their owners. ¹³⁸ Despite Russian guarantees that refugees would at least be fed, they were left to starve. ¹³⁹ Bulgarians usually returned none of the harvest from Turkish lands. The returnees had no food, no housing, and no land. Reports on the fate of the returnees invariably ended with words such as, "the survivors have returned to Adrianople." ¹⁴⁰ On the road, they were routinely attacked by Bulgarian bands. ¹⁴¹

Russian authorities dealt with the increasing knowledge in Western Europe of the situation of the Bulgarian Muslims by attempting to cover up the facts. Commissions of inquiry were uniformly met with Russian obfuscation and intransigence. ¹⁴² When questioned on the state of Bulgarian Turks, Russian officials denied any knowledge of massacres, even while they sent out secret burial details to dig surreptitiously hidden graves for massacred Turkish refugees. ¹⁴³

Those refugees who returned to homes in the cities stood a

-83-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 83.

better chance of surviving, but little chance of remaining. The first group of refugees leaving Ottoman protection at Şumla, intending to return to the Razgrad area, were robbed of their possessions soon after they set out. Later, most of their clothes were taken as well. Once in Razgrad, they were forced to remain in the public slaughterhouse ¹⁴⁴ for days without food and with little water:

In the slaughterhouse the refugees were informed: 1. that those who had taken part in the Servian or late war could not remain in the country. 2. All

that were allowed to remain were inexorably required to produce Bulgar guarantee for their honesty and morality! 3. Those whose villages were in mountainous or wooded situations, under pretence of being strategical positions, even if they produced the requisite guarantees, were not to remain. 4. Those whose houses were occupied by Bulgars, even with guarantees, must go. 5. All persons known to be well off were told to leave the country. . . . Then those of Rasgrad who had been told they could remain entered the town, but could not obtain possession of their houses. Of the seven Turkish quarters of Rasgrad, five were occupied by Bulgarians -- the other two were allotted to Cossacks. Several found only the ruins of their houses which had been destroyed or burnt -- the House of Ahmed Agha Helvajzade was actually burned in his presence. . . . The same occurred to the emigrants of Eski Djuma and Osman Bazar. ¹⁴⁵

According to British Vice-Consul Calvert, the Russians offered safe passage to their homes to all Muslims who had taken refuge in the Rhodope Mountains, where they were a source of constant threat of guerrilla war to the Russians. "Several thousand" took advantage of the offer, since they were hungry and cold in the mountains. Once they were on the road, they were assaulted by both Russians and Bulgarians -- some were shot, others had their clothing taken from them and were left to die in the snow. Calvert believed that all of the young women were raped by Bulgarians and Russian soldiers. ¹⁴⁶ Because of this and similar "atrocities, the remaining refugees refused to leave the mountains and organized a guerilla revolt there." ¹⁴⁷

Consul Brophy commented on the fate of many of the refugees who managed to return, comparing their situation to the condition of Christian refugees under Ottoman control:

They addressed a petition to the local authorities that they might be permitted to enter into possession of their houses and lands, and were

told that they should have a definite answer within five days; then those among them who are absolutely destitute sent a petition imploring that rations of food sufficient to support life might be given them: the answer returned by the [Bulgarian] Council was that "they would write to Tirnova on

the subject and let the Turks know when the reply came: the Russian authorities gave them the more straightforward and less derisive answer "that they had no orders."

As a direct contrast to this action on the part of the Russo-Bulgarian Authorities, I may mention the following fact, which I briefly alluded in my dispatch to Your Excellency dated from Constantinople 22 January 1878. When, during the panic and evacuation of Bourgas, Commander Hamond of H.M.S. "Torch" was employing his boats from morning till night in taking off Christian fugitives from the shore, his ship's stores ran short, and he and I applied to the Turkish Governor asking him to *sell* biscuit from the Government stores; he enquired how much we wanted, gave us the required quantity, about lbs. 1940, refusing any payment as, "was it not for the Sultan's Christian subjects?," offering any larger amount we might wish, and merely asking a receipt specifying the purpose for which the biscuit was given.

I need hardly call Your Excellency's attention to the marked difference, in this case at least, between the Christian Russo-Bulgarian and Mussulman Osmanli Authorities (each acting "without orders") when people of another religion were in question: but I must remark that the Russians on their occupation of Bourgas (five days after the Armistice was signed) took possession of all the Government stores, which included grain to the value of £40,000, so that it would have been an act of cheap generosity to save from starvation some scores of unfortunate Turks. ¹⁴⁸

Those Muslims who had remained in Bulgaria and the few refugees who somehow managed to return found a Russian-created, Bulgarian-operated governmental system. The system was not only designed to favor revolutionary Bulgarians, and discriminate against Turks, but to cause the remaining Muslims to depart Bulgaria. Immediately following the Russian conquest, all of Bulgaria was administered by Russian governors, with Bulgarian aides. Once the Congress of Berlin had divided Bulgaria in two, Turks found little difference between Bulgaria proper and Eastern Rumelia. Eastern Rumelia was created as an autonomous Ottoman province under a Christian governor-general, Aleko Paşa. Theoretically, the Eastern Rumelian Commission, created by the Treaty of Berlin and containing European delegates, oversaw the government. In

fact, as the commission members attested, the governor-general "showed contempt for the decisions of the Commission," particularly where Turkish villagers and refugees were concerned. ¹⁴⁹The Commission members, who did not have a military force behind them, could only keep records of offenses against Turks and periodically complain to the Eastern Rumelian authorities. ¹⁵⁰The French delegate, for example, made a formal protest on the state of the refugees in Filibe and stated, "it is evident that the treatment of the refugees is the result of a policy on the part of the government to exterminate the Turkish element." ¹⁵¹

In both the Bulgarian state and Eastern Rumelia, the government worked against the Turks, sometimes brutally, at other times with subtle craft. For example, Muslims in Eastern Rumelia were notified that they would be forced to serve in the militia and wear militia uniforms that had Christian crosses as badges. ¹⁵²They were also told by local officials that Muslim women would have to dress as did Bulgarian women, i.e., without typical Muslim covering. ¹⁵³Compared to more physical punishments, these may appear to be small matters, but to Bulgarian Muslims they appeared as the beginning of the assault on religion and chastity that they expected once Christians took power. Surely the events of the previous two years had given them reason to fear. To such psychological pressures were added other psychological threats of a more convincing nature. Muslims lived in a climate of constant threat and fear. Bulgarian "gymnastic societies" drilled with the militia and both groups openly declared their eventual plans for the Turks. ¹⁵⁴Turks were not permitted to bear personal arms, whereas Bulgarians were given guns. "Warning shots" were routinely fired into Turkish houses. Consul Brophy found that "in the part of the Balkans in which the Turkish population is still compact rifle shots fired by Bulgarians are literally incessant from dark to dawn." Even the Russians admitted to Brophy that the purpose of the shots was to cause Turkish emigration. ¹⁵⁵

Bulgarian psychological pressure to emigrate was naturally successful, because the Muslims knew that **death** was an everpresent possibility.

THE JEWS

The Jews of Bulgaria shared the fate of the Muslims. Reports from Bulgarian cities regularly mentioned the sufferings "of the

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 86.

Turks and the Jews" at the hands of Bulgarians and Russians. When Eski Zagra was taken, both Muslims and Jews were slaughtered, their homes burned, and survivors of both groups became refugees. Mosques and the Eski Zagra synagogue were both desecrated. ¹⁵⁶ The best example of how the Bulgarian Jews were treated came in Kizanlik. In Kizanlik, Jews and Muslims were pillaged, tortured, and murdered by Bulgarians until rescued by Ottoman irregular troops. Consul Blunt reported:

I have moreover been assured by the Turkish notables from Kyzanlik that in some instances the Jews suffered even more than the Mahommedans from the savagery of the Bulgarians. I should also add that the Jews speak in terms of deep gratitude regarding the conduct of the Circassian Irregulars who rescued them and escorted them from Kyzanlik to Eski Zagra. They say that the Jews received from the troops equal care and protection with that accorded to the [Turkish] fugitives; and that it is entirely owing to their valour and devotedness that the lives of all were saved from imminent danger.

Blunt noted a report that indicated that half the Jews of Kizanlik were killed, after days of rape and pillage by Bulgarians and Cossacks. ¹⁵⁷

Like the Muslims, Jews were forced to become refugees by Bulgarians and Russians and were treated as badly. For example, twenty returning Jewish refugee families were stopped and stoned in Carlova while Russian and Bulgarian authorities watched. ¹⁵⁸ Like the Muslims, returning Jews were refused readmission to their towns or found their houses occupied or destroyed. ¹⁵⁹ On returning to their city, the Jews of Yamboli were met at the train station "by nearly all the Bulgarians of the town shouting 'Long Life to Our Czar Alexander! Away with the Turks and Jews! Bulgaria for the Bulgarians!'" ¹⁶⁰ The Jewish refugees from Kizanlik, Eski Zagra, and elsewhere in Bulgaria were reported to be "mostly widows and orphans." ¹⁶¹

The Jews were exclusively an urban population in Bulgaria, so they escaped the village massacres. However, it appears that the small Jewish community suffered as much as did urban Muslims. One reason for Jewish suffering was undoubtedly Christian anti-Semitism. Another reason may have been the extension of Christian hatred for "the infidel Muslims" to whatever "infidels" were close at hand. It is probable that the Jews also suffered because of the amicable closeness of Jews and Muslims in Ottoman Europe, a

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 87.

relationship understood by Muslims, Jews, and Christians alike. The Ottomans obviously felt this closeness, or they would never have sent out columns of soldiers to rescue the Jews of Kizanlik. The Muslims, including the Circassians and Tatars, seem to have treated the Jews as friends. ¹⁶²

REFUGEE NUMBERS

Contemporary estimates of refugee numbers were often inexact. No one was able accurately to count refugees on the road as they fled. Consequently, estimates of refugees "on the road between ----- and -----" must be used with care. Since refugees were in great need of assistance, agencies such as the British Compassionate Fund could count those who received what small aid was available. Once the refugees had settled for a time, their numbers could be fairly accurately counted by Europeans and Ottomans alike. Moreover, the Ottoman government was actually able to register refugees in some localities. ¹⁶³ The estimates of Turkish refugees who arrived at major cities were often as accurate as such statistics can be. ¹⁶⁴ Estimates made at the end of the war and after, when the surviving refugees were huddled more compactly, were better than estimates made earlier. Table 3 lists refugee numbers as they appeared in European and, in some cases, Ottoman sources. (Because refugees moved from one area to another, the same persons are often counted more than once in [Table 3](#).)

TABLE 3. TURKISH REFUGEES* As ESTIMATED IN VARIOUS SOURCES (1877-80).

Eski Cuma	5,000		20 July 1877 ¹⁶⁵
	15,000		19 August 1877 ¹⁶⁶
Eski Zagra	30,000	families	3 August 1877 ¹⁶⁷
Pazarcik	20,000†		17 November 1877 ¹⁶⁸
Filibe	5,000		30 July 1877 ¹⁶⁹

	15,000	February 1878 ¹⁷⁰
	7,000	20 December 1879 ¹⁷¹
Varna	8,000	31 January 1878 ¹⁷²
	30,000	8 February 1878 ¹⁷³

-88-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 88.

TABLE 3. (continued)

Burgas	15,000-20,000	13 March 1878 ¹⁷⁴
Şumla	200,000	2 March 1878 ¹⁷⁵
	200,000	29 June 1878 ¹⁷⁶
	3,000	4 August 1877 ¹⁷⁷
	10,000†	19 August 1877 ¹⁷⁸
Edirne	30,000	15 April 1878 ¹⁷⁹
	60,000	24 April 1878 ¹⁸⁰
	40,000	29 May 1878 ¹⁸¹
	45,000	8 August 1878 ¹⁸²
	28,000	26 May 1879 ¹⁸³
Rhodope Region	100,000†	8 July 1878 ¹⁸⁴
Istanbul	150,000	28 February 1878 ¹⁸⁵
	200,000	4 March 1878 ¹⁸⁶
Üsküp	22,500	10 May 1880 ¹⁸⁷
Yenipazar Sancak	less than	10 May 1880 ¹⁸⁸

10,000

* In and near cities, unless otherwise noted.

† A small number of Pomaks and Circassians included.

MORTALITY AND MIGRATION

When the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 began, there were one and a half million Muslims living in the area that was to become Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia. The Muslims of Bulgaria were

TABLE 4.

Edirne Vilâyeti	432,303
Tuna Vilâyeti	1,069,580
<hr/>	
Total	1,501,883

* The portions of Edirne and Tuna provinces that made up Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia. ¹⁸⁹

primarily Turkish-speaking, with a number of Pomaks, ¹⁹⁰ or Bulgarian-speaking Muslims, and Circassians. Muslims made up 37 per-

-89-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 89.

cent of the total population. They were scattered throughout the region. As might be expected in an area in which various peoples had lived together for hundreds of years, settlement was mixed, with a high proportion of mixed Bulgarian-Turkish villages. There was no one center of Muslim population. However, Muslims were a majority in the northern sancaks of Rusçuk and Tulça ¹⁹¹ (the Dobruja) and in the southern kazas of Aidos, Yabo, Hassköy, and Kizanlik. Dense centers of Muslim population were thus found in both the north and the south.

In less than three years, from 1877 to 1879, perhaps a million Bulgarian Muslims were driven from their homes, many of whom were Circassians and Tatars previously exiled from Russia. Some returned, but more than 500,000 became permanent refugees from their homeland ([Table 5](#)). Like the Muslims from the Crimea and the Caucasus before them, they were settled in what remained of the Ottoman Empire, where they disrupted the lives of those already resident and kept alive hatred of their Christian oppressors. Some settled in what remained of Ottoman Europe -- Macedonia and Thrace -- from which they or their families would once again be forced to flee during the Balkan Wars.

The regions listed in [Table 3](#) were not the final homes of the Bulgarian Turkish refugees. Most of those who were in Ottoman Europe in 1879 remained there. Their presence, along with the

TABLE 5. SURVIVING TURKISH REFUGEES FROM BULGARIA* IN 1879 (ESTIMATES).

Residing in	Number
Edirne Vilâyeti	105,000
Selanik Vilâyeti	60,000
Kosova and Manastir Vilâyets	140,000
Istanbul†	120,000
Ottoman Asia	90,000
<hr/>	
Total	515,000 ¹⁹²

* i.e., the future area of Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia.

† includes Asian dependencies.

migration of Bulgarians from Ottoman provinces into Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia, ¹⁹³ changed areas of Edirne Vilâyeti, in particular, from a Christian to a Muslim majority. The refugees who were in Istanbul in 1879 were almost all later settled in Anatolia and Greater Syria, where they joined other surviving refugees (probably 65,000 in Anatolia and 25,000 in Syria ¹⁹⁴) who had been sent earlier.

TABLE 6. CALCULATION OF MUSLIM LOSSES IN BULGARIA, 1877-79.

672,215	Muslims as Recorded in 1887 Bulgarian Census
+52,731	Muslim Migrants from Bulgaria to the Ottoman Empire, 1879-87
+515,000	Refugees Surviving to 1879
<hr/>	
1,239,946	Bulgarian Muslims Surviving to 1879
1,501,883	Bulgarian Muslims in 1877
-1,239,946	Bulgarian Muslims Surviving to 1879
<hr/>	
261,937	Loss (17%)

When those Muslims who remained in Bulgaria and those refugees who survived are accounted for, the remainder were the dead. The numbers in [Table 6](#) are imprecise, but the figure of loss is so great that any undercounts would have little effect on the conclusions drawn here. Approximately 260,000 Bulgarian Muslims were killed or died of disease, starvation, and cold -- the results of the treatment given them by Bulgarians and Russians. By 1879, 17 percent of the Muslims of Bulgaria had died; 34 percent were permanent refugees. In one way or another, more than half the Muslims had left Bulgaria. ¹⁹⁵

A FINAL ANALYSIS THE COMMENTS OF CONSUL

CALVERT

Edmund Calvert saw the unfolding of the Turkish tragedy in Bulgaria, first as British Vice-Consul in Filibe, then as Acting Consul in Edirne. Like many consular officials, before the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 he was highly critical of Ottoman governmental

-91-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 91.

failures. During and after the war he saw far worse. Calvert was an accurate reporter whose concern for human suffering transcended religious and national prejudices. His analyses of the Russian occupation and Bulgarian government, of which the following is an example, are an accurate indictment of the oppressors of the Bulgarian Muslims.

Adrianople, September 16th, 1878

His Excellency, The Right Honourable, Sir Henry Layard, G.C.B.

. . . The Russian government allows the Christians to take the law into their own hands and to visit the Turkish Community at large with present and indiscriminate bloodshed, rapine, and pillage. The result is now before the world, and I hope I, who assuredly have at no time been backwards in denouncing Turkish provincial misrule, may be believed when I state that the evil state of things now prevailing is of an incomparably more widespread, harsh, and barbarous type than that which it is manifestly intended as a set-off; I speak, of course, of the normal Turkish regime, to which alone a comparison can fairly apply. If the horrors enacted in May 1876 be insisted upon, it should be remembered that they were the result of exasperation and panic engendered by reports of dastardly cruelties perpetrated by the Bulgarians upon inoffensive persons, and the reality of which peculiar class of cruelties, in the subsequent instance of the tragedy in the Balkans above Mufliş, in the Kyzanlik district, have been attested by several English doctors who examined the bodies of the victims. Again, the atrocities committed on the Mussulman inhabitants of the same district of Kyzanlik, who so far from having offered any provocation had stood by the Bulgarians and preserved them from molestation during the first troubles;

and the deliberate and partially successful attempts to exterminate the adult male Turkish population of that district by wholesale and cold-blooded executions, must be held at least a counterbalance to the massacres of Bulgarians in the Tatar Bazardjik district, where there was admittedly provocation.

In the north Balkan regions, to my own knowledge, and, I have been told, in the South Balkans also, and again at the present time in the Rhodope, as lately reported, the excesses committed by Mussulmans have been limited to offending Christian villages. The Christians under Russo-Bulgarian rule, on the other hand, vent their hatred indiscrimi-

-92-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 92.

nately on the whole Mussulman population, with the avowed object of bringing about its expulsion from the country.

Leaving aside, however, as regards the Turks, exceptional events arising from exceptional causes, and taking the ordinary status of the country as a basis of comparison, I may say that where instances of robbery and assassination of individual Christians occurred under Turkish rule, whole Mussulman villages are now liable to that treatment; and whereas Turkish authorities had at least the grace to profess a desire to afford redress, Russian rule in Turkey does not even make that concession to public opinion.

Instances of outrages by Turks on Christian females were, in ordinary times, of far less frequent occurrence than appears to be commonly believed at home. When a single case of the sort happened it would set a whole province in commotion. Since the Russian occupation, it is hardly much to say that the Bulgarians in the rural districts outrage at their will Turkish women and girls by the score.

The material well-being of the Bulgarian peasant under Turkish rule has become an admitted fact, and the national as well as individual spirit of hospitality of the Turk is proverbial. Now that the Bulgarians have the upper hand their chief aim and end (and in this, I regret to say, they are joined by no small part of the Greek rural population) is utterly to ruin the Turk and to

eject him from his home in Europe. By depriving the Mussulman peasantry of their only means of independent subsistence, that is their live stock, and stripping them of all their money and personal property, it is evidently intended to force them to dispose of or to abandon their useless fields and to reduce those Turks who may remain in the country to the condition of field laborers, a state of life hitherto unknown to all but a small fraction of the population.

Again, as regards insults in matters connected with religion, I can aver from the experience of many years that instances of the sort were rare occurrences under the Turkish regime, at any rate in modern times. The ministers of religion were treated with invariable respect. Even such a trivial mark of contempt as the firing of a shot into an empty church would be taken up by the whole community of a province and made a state affair. Under the present Christian rule not one "mesdjid" (or mosque of the class answering to a Christian chapel) out of ten has escaped destruction, even in this town of Adrianople.

If the demeanor of the Turks towards the native Christian personally was, on occasion, haughty or otherwise objectionable (it was not habitually so) it did not under any circumstances take the unmanly and derisive forms which the Bulgarians have adopted towards the lately dominant race; as for instance at Kirk Killisa, where they have taken to compelling the Mussulmans to carry them about the streets on their backs.

-93-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 93.

Lastly, as regards the public service, by universal consent, Turkish venality and corruption at its worst is purity itself compared to its local Russian counterpart.

In short, as I have had the honor to submit above, the fruits of the Russian regime in European Turkey have proved in every point of view of a signally baser quality than those of the Turkish misrule which served Russia as a motive, or pretext, for the late war.

I have the honor to be, with the highest respect, Sir, Your Excellency's most obedient, humble servant.

NOTES

1. British investigator Cullen, investigating the situation of Muslim refugees for the Powers at the Congress of Berlin. (See note 166.)

"Those who have watched the proceedings of the Russians can scarcely doubt that their deliberate object has been to drive the Turkish race out of the provinces they have occupied and to replace it by the Slav. Such has been the policy of Russia in other countries which she has conquered" (F.O. 424-67 -- Confidential [3598], no. 97, *Layard to Derby*, Constantinople, 21 January 1878, quoted in Bilâl N. Simir , *Rumeli'den Türk Göleri*, vol. I, Ankara, 1968, number 153). (Hereafter the two volumes of this work will be cited as *Simir I* and *Simir II*. Both volumes will be extensively cited below, usually by document number. Pages will only be mentioned if extensive sections of the book apply. *Simir's* book is unquestionably the most valuable ever compiled on the question of the Bulgarian Muslims in the period.)

2. Barbara Jelavich, *History of the Balkans*, Cambridge, 1983, vol. II, p. 347. The spellings are hers. See also, Richard Millmann, *Britain and the Eastern Question: 1875-1878*, Oxford, 1979, p. 125.

There are no truly neutral accounts of the Bulgarian Horrors. For examples of the histories written see: Tsenko Genov, "Military Operations in the Balkan Theatre during the 1877-78 War," *Southeastern Europe* 6(2), 1979, pp. 136-53; Valentine Baker, *The War in Bulgaria*, London, 1879; F. V. Greene, *Report on the Russian Army and its Campaigns in Turkey*, New York. These volumes, like the many others printed, offer little help in understanding the losses of the Muslim population of Bulgaria. Civilian populations, especially Muslim populations, are seldom mentioned. For a more balanced account, see Millmann, *Eastern Question*, pp. 125-89, and Millmann "The Bulgarian Massacres Reconsidered" in *Southeast European Review*, vol. 58, no. 2 (April 1980), pp. 218-31.

For a brief Ottoman view of the massacres of Turks and Bulgarians during the "Horrors," see F.O. 881-2904, "The Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs to

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 94.

Musurus Pasha (communicated to the *Earl of Derby* by Musurus Pasha, July 28)," *Constantinople*, 26 July 1876.

3. L. S. Stavrianos, *The Balkans Since 1453*, New York, 1958, p. 379.
4. An estimate in İ. H. Danişmend *şzahli Osmanli Tarihi Kronolojisi*, book 4, *Istanbul*, 1972, where it is also stated that 3,000 houses were destroyed.
5. F.O.195-1137, Dupuis to Layard, Adrianople, 10 July 1877. Rape led to rape and murder to murder. Seldom, of course, were the guilty those who suffered the retribution.
6. By no means were Christians the only ones who suffered from Circassian depredations. See the many reports in F.O.222-1, e.g., two reports from H. H. Kitchener, who had been sent to Adapazari specifically to report on the Circassians, on 29 August and 3 September 1879. Circassian refugees sent to the Arab World were feared by all, regardless of religion.
7. See F.O.195-1077, Reade to Elliot, Rustchuk, 3 May 1876, in which Reade predicts problems with Circassians.
8. F.O.195-1077, Reade to Elliot, Rutschuk, 9 May 1876.
9. F.O.195-1077, no. 30, Reade to Elliot, Rutschuk, 19 July 1876.
10. See F.O.195-1073, Dupuis to Elliot, Philippopolis, 29 August 1876.

11. *F.O.*195-1077, Burgas, Brophy to Elliot, 27 May 1876.

For other examples, see *F.O.*195-1073, no. 22, Dupuis to Elliot, Adrianople, 26 May 1876.

12. The Ottomans claimed that the villagers gave battle to the Ottoman troops, but this seems unlikely. See *F.O.*195-1077, Brophy to Layard, Burgas, 20 August 1876.

13. *F.O.*195-1077, Reade to Elliot, Constantinople, 4 January 1877 (a report on the proceedings of the Şevket Paşa Investigation Commission). Various other figures also exist, much inflated, but these seem to be the most carefully collected statistics. They were drawn up by a commission especially empowered to investigate, not by a journalist with a fertile imagination.

14. It is worth noting that the Russians also used exemplary violence in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 and after. (Note that the usage "Russo-Turkish War", repeated here, is standard, but misleading. "Russo-Ottoman" would be more correct.) For example, the Muslim village of Demirciler was sacked and all those who could not escape were massacred because one Cossack had been killed in the village (*F.O.*195-1185, no. 66, Calvert to Layard, Adrianople, 2 November 1878).

15. *F.O.*78-2496, no. 43, Blunt to Elliot, Salonica, 21 July 1876.

16. *F.O.*195-1077, Burgas, Brophy to Elliot, 22 July 1876, and 26 August 1876.

17. *F.O.* 195-1077, Burgas, Brophy to Elliot, 29 October 1875.

18. *F.O.*195-1077, Burgas, Brophy to Elliot, 14 September 1876 and *F.O.* 195-1073, no. 27, Dupuis to Elliot, Adrianople, 8 October 1875.

19. For a description of the successes, failures, and general difficulties of the Ottoman efforts, see *F.O.*195-1073, no. 5, Dupuis to Elliot, Philippopolis,

6 September 1876.

20. Consul Reade at Rusçuk reported that the main problem in putting down the Circassian and başi bozuk troubles was Ottoman weakness, "from the small number of police at their disposal" (*F.O.195-1077*, no. 47, Reade to Elliot, Rutschuk, 5 October 1876).

-95-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 95.

21. *F.O.195-1077*, 17 May 1876.

"The fact is that the provincial authorities have not sufficient means of repression at their disposal" (*F.O.78-2496*, Blunt to Elliot, Salonica, 25 September 1876).

22. Montenegro declared war on the Ottoman Empire on 30 June 1876; Serbia, on 2 July.

23. *F.O.78-2496*, Blunt to Elliot, Salonica, 25 September 1876 Serbia. See also the extensive accounts in *F.O.195-1077*, no. 114 and *F.O.195-1137*. A detailed picture of what did and did not happen in the Horrors is found in *F.O.195-1073*, Dupuis to Elliot, Adrianople, 7 August 1876 and *F.O.78-2490*, Dupuis to Her Britannic Majesty's Secretary of State, Adrianople, 7 August 1876. For a relatively sympathetic assessment of the Turkish treatment of the Bulgarians, see Charles S. Ryan , *Under the Red Crescent*, New York, 1897, especially pp. 22 and 23.

24. *F.O.195-1077*, Reade to Elliot, Rutschuk, 5 October 1877, *F.O.78-2496*, Blunt to Derby, Salonica, 23 August 1876, *F.O.195-1073*, Dupuis to Elliot, Adrianople, 7 August 1876.

25. See R. T. Shannon, *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation of 1876*, London, 1963 and Walter G. Wirthwein, *Britain and the Balkan Crisis, 1875-1878*, New York, 1935.

26. The estimate of the Ottoman Investigation Commission. This difference in figures is only one of the many differences that occur in the documents on the Bulgarian Horrors. While the Ottoman government and the Europeans seem to have almost universally agreed on the later massacres of Muslims, they disagreed often on the Horrors. Consul Brophy, for example, was accused by the Ottomans of sending false reports on Circassian and başi bozuk atrocities, and the Ottomans produced testimonies of Bulgarians who had been "on the spot" to refute him. Brophy responded that the testimonies were coerced (F.O.195-1077, Brophy to Layard, Burgas, 16 September 1878).

27. The estimate of the American consular official Schuyler, who conducted his investigation with a reporter from the anti-Turkish *Daily News* and a Bulgarian interpreter.

The question of the numbers killed in the Bulgarian Horrors will always remain open. There is no way to statistically separate deaths of Bulgarian Christians in the Horrors from deaths later in the war. The estimates of Schuyler, and the much inflated estimates that appeared later, were guesses that were drawn from "eyewitness" accounts of Bulgarian Christians, usually given second-hand. There should be no need to demonstrate here the error of drawing one's figures from those who had an inherent interest in maximizing their estimates. Correspondingly, the Ottoman government had an interest in minimizing their estimates.

28. The most accurate, albeit brief, account of the Horrors I have found is in Charles and Barbara Jelavich, *The Establishment of the Balkan National States, 1804-1920*, Seattle, 1977, Chapter 9: "Occupied elsewhere, the Ottoman government had only a limited number of regular soldiers to send against the rebels. Consequently, it was compelled to use irregular detachments. Ottoman feeling was very strong since the Bulgarian insurgents, like other Balkan people in similar circumstances, had massacred resident Turkish civilians. Moreover, the revolt was put down only after heavy fighting and after atrocities had been committed on both sides. The Ottoman reprisals, the so-called Bulgarian horrors, received great publicity in Europe where only the Bulgarian side of the

story was known. . . ." (p. 139).

-96-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 96.

29. The Constantinople Conference, which opened on 12 December 1876, demanded that the Turks accept two autonomous provinces in Bulgaria, an autonomous and united Bosnia-Herzegovina, an enlarged Montenegro, and no Serbian territorial losses, despite the Ottoman victory over Serbia. Supported by Disraeli, the Ottomans refused.
30. The Ottoman government reported that few civilians remained in Rusçuk when the Russian bombardment began (*Rusçuk'un 25,000'e yakın nüfusundan pek az kalip...*). The Tuna Vilâyeti Baş Katibi, Ahmet, quoted in *Şimşir I*, 14.
31. One of the interesting comments on the Russo-Bulgarian rule in Bulgaria is the change in the opinions of the British consuls concerning Turks and Bulgarians. Before 1877, one could at best hope to see an only mildly anti-Turkish consul. Sympathy for the Turks was out of the question. Consuls such as Brophy and Reade, quoted frequently here, could find little good to say about the Ottoman government or the Turks. The Ottoman government was continually compared to the British government and found wanting. During and after the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 these opinions changed, because the consuls had something to which the Ottomans could be favorably compared, the successor regime. Sympathy for the plight of Bulgarian Muslims was obvious, but so was a more reasonable evaluation of the state of Bulgaria under Ottoman rule, the loss of which was lamented. British Consul Brophy in Burgas:

I have been over ten years in this country and have served eight years as Vice-Consul: I was always one of the first to make known to His Majesty's Embassy such abuses as existed in the Turkish Provincial Government, which were by no means few in number, but I must say

that after my experience of some, the worst -- because the most difficult -- phase of the Turkish rule here, I am not a little surprised that under the nominal administration of a great European Power, and after six months of undisputed (at least in my district) rule, I can only say the last state of the Sandjak is ten times worse than the first.

(F.O.195-1189, no. 36, Brophy to Layard, Bourgas, 9 September 1878)

32. *Arifi Paşa to the Ottoman Embassy in Paris*, 21 July 1877, quoted in *Atrocities Russes*, p. 16 ,my translation. The statement appeared in English papers on 23 July 1877 (Wirthwein, p. 255). For a list of wounds on women and children in Edirne, which further proves this point, see F.O.195-1137, no. 90, Blunt to Elliot, 6 August 1877, enclosure no. 8. See also F.O.424-59 -- Confidential (3344), pp. 18-19, no. 22, quoted in *Şimşir I*.

33. The sources never give detailed descriptions of the Cossack units involved, usually stating that a certain action, often a brutal one, was done "by the Cossacks."

34. One might be pardoned if, on reading of the various atrocities visited upon the Balkan Turks, it seems as if the atrocities were invented, or at least much inflated, by those who allegedly suffered. One answer to this is the type of confirmatory evidence provided by European consuls, reporters, and other observers. I believe, though, that the evidence drawn from Muslim refugees was generally reliable in itself. Those who in 1876-78 had long dealt with Turks avowed that Turks were very unlikely to overstate their suffering. Quite the opposite was true -- Turks were unlikely to mention their defeats, or to underplay them, and the massacres of the Balkan Turks were a horrible defeat. British Consul Blunt at Edirne spoke of the difficulty of getting Turks to speak of their sufferings,

because of the "habitual reluctance of the Turks to speak of indignities to which any among them have been subjected. (It is this very policy, I may add, which induced them to conceal from public knowledge, rather than denounce the mutilations constantly practiced by the Montenegrins on their Turkish victims.)" (*F.O.* 195-1137, no. 90, Blunt to Layard, Adrianople, 6 August 1877.)

35. *F.O.*195-1184, Blunt to Layard, Adrianople, no. 20, 5 January 1878, and no. 20, 13 January 1878. Blunt commented on the conflict over whether to use trains to transport troops or refugees, when not taking the refugees would mean their deaths. The refugees' needs often won out, hampering the Ottoman war effort tremendously.

36. Necati Okse, "The Turco-Russian War (1877-1878)", *Revue Internationale d'Histoire Militaire*, vol. 46 (1980), p. 158.

37. "All that is taking place in these matters tends to show that the decided object of the Russians is to drive away all Mussulmans from the country -- but from their repeated declarations before Europe on the subject they leave this entirely to the Bulgars who perfectly well understand them, and as the rancorous antipathy of the latter towards all in the country beyond their own community has ever been a matter of general notoriety Your Excellency will imagine with what gusto they carry out the views of the Russians" (*F.O.*195-1189, Reade to Layard, Varna, 14 June 1878).

38. For two good examples of this, see *F.O.*195-1137, no. 66, Blunt to Layard, Adrianople, 14 July 1877 and *F.O.*195-1137, no. 69, Blunt to Layard, Philippopolis, 19 July 1877. Both transmit reports by Vice-Consul Calvert, who investigated the reports in person. See also, no. 82, Blunt to Layard, Adrianople, July 1877.

39. These reports were collected by Edmund Calvert (enclosure in *F.O.*1951137 no. 90, Blunt to Layard, Adrianople, 6 August 1877). (Unless F. R. J. Calvert is indicated, all future references to Calvert are Edmund Calvert.) See also *Layard to Derby*, 5 August 1877, quoted in *Şimşir I*, number 74.

40. *F.O.195-1137*, no. 33, Dupuis to Blunt, Adrianople, 6 August 1877. In no. 88 (enclosure in *Blunt to Layard*, Adrianople, 3 August 1877), Consul Blunt gave Süleyman Paşa's report on the happenings at Eski Zagra and states that he told Süleyman Paşa that he could not believe such things unless they were proven. He later (no. 90) saw the proof and was convinced.
41. *F.O.195-1137*, no. 90, Blunt to Layard, Adrianople, 6 August 1877,
42. *F.O.195-1137*, Calvert to Blunt, Kyzanlik, 15 July 1877.
43. Safvet Paşa, quoted in *Şimşir I* number 26.
44. *F.O.195-1137*, Blunt to Layard, Adrianople, 1 August 1877.
45. Safvet Paşa quoted in *Şimşir I*, no. 26 and Layard to Derby, 14 July 1877, quoted in *Şimşir I*, no. 27. See also, *F.O.78-2582*, no. 967, Layard to Derby, Therapia, 21 August 1877.
46. For example, the report that there were 100 massacred when "the Russians" entered the village of Issova (*F.O.195-1184*, no. 20, Blunt to Layard, Adrianople, 13 January 1878).
47. *F.O.195-1137*, no. 90, Blunt to Layard, Adrianople, 6 August 1877.
48. *F.O.195-1137*, Telegram from Blunt to Embassy, Kyzanlik, 14 July 1877.
49. Wellington Lake ("Surgeon of the Late Stafford House Hospital, Rutschuk") described the shelling and destruction of the hospital by the Russians, condemning them for their deliberate disregard of the Geneva Convention. Ignor-

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 98.

ing the Bulgarian Hospital in the city, the Russian artillery destroyed the British Stafford House Hospital, which treated Turks, even though they knew it was a hospital, a fact that Lake proves conclusively. He states that standard European ideas of the Russians and the Turks were in error, that "the whole of Europe" would have condemned Turkey if she had done such a hideous thing, "but that the Russian hospital was never attacked by the Turks. In every respect Russia puts herself on a level with the worst savages and barbarians -- and no censure is too severe" (*F.O.195-1189*, 5 Stafford House Committee, Varna, 11 January 1878).

50. *Safvet Paşa to the Ottoman Mission in Paris*, 16 July 1877, quoted in *Şimşir I*, p. 141.

51. *F.O.424-57* -- Confidential 3321, p. 132, No. 258, Layard to Derby, Constantinople, 14 July 1877, quoted in *Şimşir I*, p. 135.

52. *Turkey* No. 28 (1877), p. 9, quoted in *Şimşir I*, p. 136, Blunt to Layard, Kyzanlik, 14 July 1877.

53. "When the Russians approached Djumaa from Kustendil they summoned the inhabitants and the fugitives there to surrender and give up their arms. The latter gave the usual answer that they were ready to do so if the Russians would guarantee their lives and property. The Russians then brought up four guns at night and bombarded the place destroying the houses of Christians and Mussulmans together. The Mussulmans, leaving their dead and wounded, then fled to the mountains" (*F.O.195-1184*, no. 13, E. Calvert to Layard, Adrianople, 8 May 1878).

54. *F.O.195-1044*, no. 56, Reade to Elliot, Varna, 28 July 1877.

55. As a consequence of this action, the Russian military Governor of the

kaza was removed from his post, but the Turkish prisoners taken in the attack were not released and at least one was sent to Siberia for "killing a soldier during the defense of the village" (*F.O.195-1252*, Brophy to Layard, Bourgas, 3 February 1879 and 15 January 1879).

56. *F.O.195-1252*, Brophy to Layard, Bourgas, 3 February 1879.

57. *F.O.195-1189*, Brophy to Layard, Bourgas, 16 May 1878.

58. *F.O.195-1136*, no. 27, Calvert to Blunt, Philippopolis, 30 July 1877, enclosure no. 7 in Blunt's no. 90.

59. The examples of this in diplomatic records are numerous. See *Şimşir I*.

60. On rare occasions, the Russians made a public gesture toward arresting the Bulgarian pillage and murder of Muslims. At one point, "40 Bulgarians were brought in here [Edirne], in chains, from the neighborhood of Kirk Kilissa where they had been robbing and maltreating Turkish emigrants who were coming back to their villages from Constantinople under safe conduct from the Russian authorities" (*F.O.195-1184*, no. 13, E. Calvert to Layard, Adrianople, 8 May 1878; Calvert does not mention if the Bulgarians were tried or punished). Usually, the few Russian attempts at stopping Bulgarian atrocities were publicized "window dressing." Occasionally, a humane Russian officer might stop inhuman actions on his own authority, but the Bulgarians at fault were almost never punished. For example, when Bulgarians attacked a Muslim village on 20 August 1878, they were dispersed by six Russian soldiers, but not arrested or punished. The Bulgarians proceeded immediately to seven other occupied Muslim villages, where they tortured, killed, and pillaged. "The deserted Turkish villages of Allagünü, Evreneoh Keui, and Denisova were also fired by the same bands: this being done

Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 99.

to prevent the possibility of returning Turkish fugitives again occupying their former homes" (*F.O.*195-1189, no. 32, Brophy to Layard, Burgas, 24 August 1878).

61. *F.O.*195-1184, no. 13, E. Calvert to Layard, Adrianople, 8 May 1878.

62. *F.O.*195-1137, Blunt to Layard, Philippopolis, 19 July 1877.

63. *F.O.*195-1252, Michell to Layard, Philippopolis, 18 June 1879.

64. *F.O.*195-1254, Brophy to Layard, Bourgas, 13 August 1879.

65. See, for example, *F.O.*195-1185, no. 37, Calvert to Layard, Adrianople, 27 August 1878.

Some, including the prince who later was to be the first king of Bulgaria, felt that the blame for the atrocities in Bulgaria lay more on the Bulgarians than on the Russians: "February 11th. Prince Alexander of Battenberg called this morning at H.M.'s Consulate and asked if I could inform him where H.M. Ship 'Sultan' was stationed and whether the Duke of Edinburgh was on board. As I was unable to furnish information on the subject, His Highness requested me to telegraph to H.M.'s Embassy at Constantinople, which I did, giving him the telegram to forward through the Russian authorities. The Prince spoke in bitter terms of the Bulgarians. He said that if the Turks were bad, the Bulgarians were a thousand times worse; that he pitied him who should be called upon to govern them; and that it would be absolutely necessary that they should be ruled with an iron hand. He attributed the present lack of discipline in the Russian army of occupation, and the pillaging which goes on in this town as elsewhere, to the evil influence of these Bulgarians, whom he considers to be a despicable people" (*F.O.*195-1184, "Consul Blunt's Journal," Adrianople, February 1-12th, 1878). The Prince's attitude may explain some of his later difficulties in ruling Bulgaria.

66. *F.O.*195-1185, no. 73.

67. *F.O.*195-1137, no. 104, Blunt to Layard, 18 August 1877.

68. For example, the Turkish Quarter of Eflehanli was burned by "Russians and insurgents" (*F.O.*195-1136, no. 27, Calvert to Blunt, Philippopolis, 30 July 187).

69. For examples, see *F.O.*195-1189, no. 44, Brophy to Layard, Bourgas, 6 November 1878; French Consul at Adrianople Waddington to the *Ministre des Affaires Étrangères*, Adrianople, 19 August 1878; and *Donoughmore to Wolff*, Philippopolis, 20 September 1878, quoted in *Şimşir I*, number 347 and 369.

70. *F.O.*195-1137, no. 43, Blunt to Layard, Adrianople, 19 July 1877.

71. *F.O.*195-1137, no. 32, Dupuis to Blunt, Adrianople, 4 August 1877.

72. *F.O.*195-1254, Michell to Layard, Philippopolis, 4 September 1879.

73. And, to a lesser extent, Greek. Greeks joined in the seizure of Muslim property where possible. (See *F.O.*195-1184, no. 14, Calvert to Layard, Adrianople, 14 May 1878.) "It must be stated that the Greeks in this neighborhood are now even more conspicuous than the Bulgarians in their persecution of the Turks" (*Layard to Derby*, Constantinople, 15 March 1878, quoted in *Şimşir I*, number 229). However, the Bulgarians, who had the upper hand, usually made sure the spoils were theirs. See *F.O.*195-1185, no. 36, Calvert to Layard, Adrianople, 15 August 1878 for an example of the varying response of Russian authorities to Greek and Bulgarian atrocities upon Muslims. The Bulgars were not prosecuted, while the Greeks occasionally were. Also see no. *F.O.*195-1184, no. 51, Calvert to Layard, Adrianople, 3 October 1878.

74. Consuls in all areas of Bulgaria reported that the courts and laws of

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 100.

Occupied Bulgaria, as well as the offices of the Russian occupiers, were always against the Muslims. (See, for example, F.O. 195-1189, no. 46, *Reade to Layard, Varna, 14 June 1878*.) The few exceptions to Russian official indifference to attacks on Muslims came occasionally when the attackers were Greeks, not Bulgarians. See, for example, F.O. 195-1185, no. 36, *Calvert to Layard, Adrianople, 15 August 1878*.

75. F.O. 195-1184, "Consul Blunt's Journal, Adrianople, February 1-12, 1878".

British consul F. R. J. Calvert stated that the Ottoman soldiers had protected Philippopolis from looters and arsonists and had saved the property of Christians. Even when the Turks were retreating "only a few shops" were looted. When the Russians arrived, most Turks had fled, but the Bulgarians who accompanied the Russians attacked "the Greeks, Roman Catholics, and Armenians" who remained. All Turkish and much other property was pillaged and a number of the 100 or so (of the original 15,000) Muslims who remained were killed (F.O. 195-1184, F. R. J. Calvert, Acting Consul at Philippopolis, to Layard, 20 January 1878).

76. F.O. 195-1184, *Calvert to Blunt, Philippopolis, 10 March 1878*.

77. F.O. 195-1184, "Consul Blunt's Journal", entry for 3 February.

78. See, for example, the *Daily News'* reporting of the war in *The War Correspondence of the Daily News*, London, 1878. The *Daily News*, a rabidly pro-Gladstone paper, had much of the responsibility for creating and publicizing the Bulgarian Horrors. In its 643 pages on the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 I have found *one* mention of Muslim refugees, a number of pages on Bulgarian refugees, many citings of purely imaginary massacres of Bulgarians, but *no* mention of the massacre of

Muslims. To the *Daily News* and similar newspapers, "oppression" was a word that could never be applied to any but Christians.

79. F.O. 195-1189, no. 5, *Reade to Layard*, Varna, 26 January 1878.

80. F.O. 195-1137, Dupuis to Blunt, Adrianople, 29 August 1877. F.O. 195-1137, no. 47, Dupuis to Blunt, Adrianople, 2 September 1877. F.O. 195-1137, no. 31, Dupuis to Blunt, Adrianople, 1 August 1877. F.O. 195-1137, no. 159, *Blunt to Layard*, Adrianople, 22 September 1877.

81. F.O. 195-1189, no. 9, *Reade to Layard*, Varna, 6 February 1878. F.O. 195-1189, no. 13, *Reade to Layard*, Varna, 2 March 1878.

82. F.O. 195-1137, no. 99, *Blunt to Layard*, Adrianople, 14 August 1877.

83. For an example of reported massacres of Bulgarians, see F.O. 195-1144, enclosure no. 9 in no. 7, *Brophy to Layard*, Bourgas, 11 August 1877, which speaks of atrocities on both sides. It is doubtful if many atrocities perpetrated by Muslims were missed. Europeans usually eagerly searched out (or sometimes invented) such actions. On the reasons for Turkish actions, see F.O. 881-3351, Captain Molloy to Layard, Rustchuk, 12 October 1877.

84. F.O. 195-1185, no. 51, *Calvert to Layard*, Adrianople, 3 October 1878.

85. F.O. 195-1137, no. 42, *Blunt to Layard*, Adrianople, 17 July 1877.

86. F.O. 1951137, no. 51, Dupuis to Layard, Adrianople, 27 July 1877. For example, the aforementioned massacres in Osman Pazari and Curna. The only evidence of these massacres seems to have been the word of "a Bulgarian notable of Schumla," unnamed (F.O. 195-1189, no. 9, Varna, *Reade to Layard*, 6 February 1878).

87. F.O. 195-1137, no. 87, *Blunt to Layard*, Adrianople, 3 August 1877.

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 101.

88. F.O. 195-1137, no. 78, *Blunt to Layard*, Adrianople, 14 August 1877.

89. For example, in Kirk Kilisse, four "cases of outrage" were committed against Bulgarians. "In each case, the Turkish authorities have promptly imprisoned the offenders" (F.O. 78-2618, no. 15, Adrianople, Blunt to Derby, 16 May 1877). This is a good example of the situation, since most of the offenses against Bulgarians seem to have been small-scale, often person-to-person attacks. In the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78, large-scale atrocities against Bulgarians were very seldom mentioned in the diplomatic literature. When one compares this to the reporting of the Bulgarian Horrors, it seems obvious that such massacres must have been few.

90. F.O. 195-1137, no. 115, *Blunt to Layard*. Adrianople, 4 September 1877; F.O. 195-1137, *F. R. J. Calvert to Layard*, Philippopolis, 30 September 1877.

91. F.O. 195-1137, no. 87, *Blunt to Layard*, Adrianople, 3 August 1877.

92. For examples of official treatment given to pillaging Ottoman soldiers by the Ottoman High Command, see Ryan, pp. 150-51.

93. Reade to Derby, Rustchuk, 2 May 1877, and Sankey to Layard, Kustendji, 8 May 1877, quoted in Şimsir I, nos. 5 and 86.

94. There are always a certain number of refugees in wartime. Those in the paths of armies are fools if they do not run. Thus, even Bulgarians fled the advancing Russian army: "Djemal Pasha last night received a

telegram from the Bulgarian Bishop of Slimnia stating that the Bulgarian Community of that town had decided upon taking refuge with the Turkish inhabitants of Burgas, and from there they hope to find their way to Constantinople. Djemal Pasha immediately telegraphed instructing the Governor at Slimnia to afford assistance and protection to Christians and Turkish fugitives alike" (F.O. 195-1184, Blunt to Layard, Adrianople, 11 January 1878). It is, of course, more than possible that those who asked for Ottoman assistance were pro-Ottoman Bulgarians who feared that their fate would be tied to that of the Turks.

95. As in Mustapha Paşa, where the refugees who had settled down were forced to leave when Bulgarians massacred women and children of their group (F.O. 195-1184, "Consul Blunt's Journal").

96. See [Table 3](#), below.

97. F.O. 195-1184, no. 1, *Blunt to Layard*, Adrianople, 1 January 1878.

98. F.O. 195-1184, no. 20, *Blunt to Layard*, Adrianople, 13 January 1878.

99. F.O. 195-1184, *Blunt to Layard*, Adrianople, 11 January 1878.

100.F.O. 195-1184, *Calvert to Blunt*, Philippopolis, 10 March 1878.

101.*Ethem Paşa to Süleyman Paşa*, Tatarpazarcik, 13 January 1878, quoted in Şimşir I, number 140.

102.*Blunt to Layard*, Constantinople, 1 February 1878, quoted in Şimşir I, number 185.

103.F.O. 195-1184, no. 20, *Blunt to Layard*, Adrianople, 13 January 1878.

104.*Blunt to Layard*, Constantinople, 1 February 1878, and the enclosures in

Layard to Derby, Constantinople, 21 January 1878, quoted in Şimşir I, nos. 185 and 153.

105. Blunt to Layard, Constantinople, 1 February 1878, quoted in Şimşir I, no. 185.

106. British reports indicated the fate of some of the refugees. At Harmanli, where an estimated 60,000 refugees were gathered, "The Russian soldiers charged repeatedly on the terror stricken mass of people, inflicting fearful slaughter. The

-102-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 102.

panic was general. Many people, especially children, were lost crossing the river" (F.O. 424-79 -- Confidential [3910], p. 306, no. 352, enclosure no. 1, Report of Walpole to Wolff, quoted in Şimşir II, p. 117).

107. This is an extrapolation from the evidence of large numbers of Muslim villages seen by Europeans.

108. *Calvert to Blunt*, Philippopolis, 30 July 1877, quoted in Şimşir I, no. 63.

109. Ethem Paşa, 13 January 1879, quoted in Şimşir I, no. 140.

110. Enclosure in *Layard to Salisbury*, Therapia, 7 May 1878, quoted in Şimşir I, no. 262.

111. See the many reports in Şimşir II, especially nos. 54, 165, 187, and 189.

112. F.O. 195-1184, *Calvert to Blunt*, Philippopolis, 10 March 1878.

113. The text reads "15" years of age, an obvious copying error.

114. *Consul-General Fawcett to Layard*, Constantinople, 9 July 1878, quoted in Şimşir I, pp. 514 and 515. This is part of a detailed report that formed part of the investigation of the refugee situation in the Rhodope region by the Powers of the Congress of Berlin. It is given in detailed form on pp. 513-32 in Şimşir I and is an accurate and horrifying account of the state of the refugees.

115. See Şimşir I no. 311.

116. The French consul at Adrianople, Adrianople, 15 April 1878, quoted in Şimşir I no. 250. An estimated 10,000 (62 percent) of the cases died (Şimşir's calculation).

117. The French consul at Adrianople, Adrianople, 15 April 1878, and Layard to Salisbury, Constantinople, 28 April 1878, quoted in Şimşir I no. 250 and no. 257. "Mosques and other public places converted into asylums contain between 800 and 900 cases of typhus" (Layard to Salisbury, Constantinople, 28 April 1878, quoted in Şimşir I number 257). For a more complete report on refugee mortality, see Drs. Mordtmann, Gabuzzi et Stécouli, *Les réfugiés de la Roumelie en 1878: Rapport présenté au Conseil International de Santé*, Constantinople, 1879.

118. *Dickson to Layard*, Constantinople, 19 June 1878, quoted in Şimşir I, no. 303.

119. *ibid.* See also F.O. 195-1185, no. 47, *F.R.J. Calvert to Layard*, Philippopolis, 7 September 1878, and F.O. 195-1254, no. 299, *Michell to Salisbury*, Philippopolis, 25 October 1879.

120.Justin McCarthy, *The Arab World, Turkey, and the Balkans*, Boston, 1982, p. 108. See also Şimşir I, nos. 192, 208, 209, 213, 249.

121.*Reade to Salisbury*, Varna, 8 July 1878, quoted in Şimşir I, no. 312.

122.F.O. 195-1189, no. 44, *Blunt to Layard*, Bourgas, 6 November 1878.

123.F.O. 195-1185, no. 78, *Calvert to Layard*, Adrianople, 30 November 1878. The punishment was not as unfair as might be supposed, because, as Consul Calvert stated, the general in charge, General Skobeleff, was merely a scapegoat. Calvert believed that a Russian officer could never take such an action on his own, given that the officers had too much "abject fear of incurring responsibility and the possible displeasure of their superiors to try much on their own. Many, in fact, find the actions they must do to be repugnant" (F.O. 195-1185, no. 79, *Calvert to Layard*, Adrianople, Nov. 30, 1878).

124."Destruction of the remaining Turkish houses is reported to be resumed on a large scale" (F.O. 195-1253, *Michell to Layard*, Philippopolis, 24 June 1879). See also, *Wolff to Salisbury*, Therapia, 29 October 1878, quoted in Şimşir I, no. 404 and F.O. 195, no. 52, *Brophy to Layard*, Bourgas, 24 December 1878.

125.F.O. 195-1254, no. 299, *Michell to Salisbury*, Philippopolis, 25 October 1879.

126.F.O. 195-1184, no. 23, *Blunt to Layard*, Adrianople, 17 June 1878. See also, F.O. 195-1185, no. 55, *F.R.J. Calvert to Layard*, Philippopolis, 25

September 1878 and no. 153, F.O. 195-1185, no. 43, *E. Calvert to Layard*, Philippopolis, 16 September 1878. "It is a patent and incontestible fact that the Russian authorities give at least their tacit assent to the abominable deeds still daily perpetrated by the Bulgarians on the defenseless Mussulmans" (F.O. 195-1185, no. 36, *E. Calvert to Layard*, Philippopolis, 15 August 1878).

127. This chapter dwells on the sufferings of the Muslims of Bulgaria, which was greater than those of the Muslims of the area attacked by Serbia. However, it is only in comparison to Bulgaria that Muslims in the region conquered by Serbia can be said to have done well. British Consul Baker at Nish recorded that the Muslim population of Nish dropped from 8,300 to 300 immediately after the Serbian conquest. Most Muslim property was stolen and most of their houses were burned down. Mosques were either used for military and official purposes or destroyed. Baker did not relate the destination of the refugees (F.O. 260-7, Vice-Consul Baker to G.F. Gould, H.M. Minister Resident, Belgrade, Nisch, 20 September 1879).

128. F.O. 195-1184, no. 23, *Blunt to Layard*, Adrianople, 17 June 1878. "Destruction of Turkish houses, which had been interrupted for a time, has been resumed with greater activity than before, and this time with the open sanction and assistance of the police" (F.O. 195-1185, no. 33, *F. R. J. Calvert to Layard*, Philippopolis, 20 July 1878). "The conduct of the Bulgarians appears to be infinitely more corrupt, lawless, and brutal than that of the Turkish zaptiehs" (F.O. 195-1252, *Brophy to Layard*, Bourgas, 6 February 1879).

129. F.O. 195-1254, no. 4, *Brophy to Michell*, Bourgas, 27 August 1879. It seems best not to quote from the gruesome examples of rapes in the documents. See, for example, F.O. 901-2, The Memorandum of A. *Simmons to Wolff*, 8 November 1878.

130. F.O. 195-1185, no. 37, *F. R. J. Calvert to Layard*, Philippopolis, 20 July 1878.

131. F.O. 195-1254, no. 255, *Michell to Salisbury*, Philippopolis, 6 September 1879.

132.F.O. 195-1254, no. 4, *Brophy to Michell*, Bourgas, 27 August 1879.

133.For examples of the many petitions received, see Şimşir II, pp. 371-448.

134.F.O. 195-1254, no. 39, *Brophy to Layard*, Bourgas, 30 September 1879.

135.F.O. 195-1185, no. 55, *F. R. J. Calvert to Layard*, 25 September 1878.

136.The Russians vacillated on the return of the refugees. The refugees in the Şumla-Varna area, for instance, were sometimes told to return to their villages and given hollow promises of safety. At other times, they were refused admission into Russian-held territories until the Ottomans surrendered their remaining fortresses in Bulgaria. The latter policy led to an impasse, because the Ottomans refused to leave the area until the refugees were actually allowed to return and take up their old farms and homes in peace (*Layard to Salisbury*, Therapia, 2 August and 5 August 1878, quoted in Şimşir I, nos. 336 and 337).

137."The open declarations of the Christians, no less than their acts, as daily

reported from all parts of the country, point to a settled resolve to bring about a general exodus of the Musulmans. One Turkish village after another is being plundered of its cattle and the owners are killed whenever they offer resistance. The Turkish peasants are everywhere told they must prepare to leave the country. In the abandoned villages

the mosques are being levelled with the ground and such houses as remain are occupied by Christians from neighboring places. In all cases, where fugitives have attempted to return to their homes they have been driven away, and in no single instance have their petitions for protection been attended to" (F.O. 195-1184, *Calvert to Layard*, Adrianople, 17 June 1878).

138. See Şimşir II, nos. 53, 64, 154, 164, 172.c

139. F.O. 195-1254, nos. 46 and 47, *Brophy to Layard*, 22 November and 27 November 1879:

In theory, the following rules applied:

1. Refugees have the right to return and take possession of their property, as well as of revenues of the latter, which are deposited in provincial chests.
2. Police will give aid and protection.
3. The Governor of Adrianople will prepare lists of refugees in groups of villages who desire to return.
4. Both governments will arrange for exclusion of men dangerous to public tranquility.
5. Authorities of place of origin must furnish refugees means of existence for one month.
6. The houses of Mussulman refugees now occupied by Christian Bulgarians are to be restored to their proprietors and measures to be taken for their evacuation.

(F.O. 195-1253, *Michell to Layard*, Philippopolis, 17 June 1879)

140. The problems of returning refugees were well and voluminously documented, even though reports on most of the tragedies could not have reached European consuls. For example, 53 returning refugees from the Yamboli region suffered rapes, extortion, etc. and because of this left their homes permanently (F.O. 195-1185, no. 56, *Calvert to Layard*, Adrianople, 10 October 1878).

In some cases, lists were made by village as reports came in of refugee massacres, such as Calvert's list of the troubles in "Khalfa-Kioi,

Gölemen, Khidrja, Smavli, and Karabunar." In each of the villages, burned houses, stolen crops, robberies, beatings, and rapes were documented (F.O. 195-1185, *Calvert to Layard*, Adrianople, 8 November 1878).

141. *Reade to Salisbury*, Varna, 8 July 1878, quoted in Şimşir I, no. 312. F.O. 195-1189, *Brophy to Layard*, Bourgas, 2 August 1878. F.O. 195-1189, no. 36, *Brophy to Layard*, Bourgas, 9 September 1878. On the general conditions of Muslims in post-war Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia, see Şimşir II, numbers 80, 83, 155, 156, 201, and 247.

142. Şimşir I, nos. 318, 320, 323, 361, 376, and 414.

143. F.O. 195-1185, *Calvert to Layard*, Adrianople, 15 August 1878.

144. Use of public slaughterhouses and similar "dwellings" for refugees was common. The psychological effect on the refugees must have been great. See F.O. 195-1254, no. 299, *Michell to Salisbury*, Philippopolis, 25 October 1879, for the similar case in Eski Zagra.

145. F.O. 195-1189, *Reade to Layard*, no. 60, Varna, 30 July 1878. Consul

Reade added the following: "From the foregoing as well as other conduct of the Russians and Bulgars it appears to be very evident that their real object is to rid the country of all Mussulmans."

146. F.O. 195-1184, *Calvert to Blunt*, Philippopolis, 10 March 1878.

147.The Rhodope "insurgents" were almost entirely refugees from other areas of Bulgaria, joined by "the inhabitants of the neighboring villages which had been plundered and destroyed by the Bulgarians" (F.O. 195-1184, no. 8, *Calvert to Layard*, Adrianople, 24 April 1878). See also F.O. 195-1185, no. 29, *Calvert to Layard*, Adrianople, 4 July 1878.

148.F.O. 195-1189, *Brophy to Layard*, Bourgas, 22 August 1878. F.O. 1951252, *Brophy to Layard*, Bourgas, 14 April 1879.

149.F.O. 195-1254, *Michell to Layard*, Philippopolis, 23 August 1879.

150.See, for example, F.O. 195-1254, *Michell to Layard*, Philippopolis, September 1879, the signed complaints of several hundred Turks, and 4 September 1878, an analysis of the state of the Eastern Rumelian Turks.

151.F.O. 195-1254, *Michell to Layard*, Philippopolis, 5 September 1879. See the summaries of petitions addressed to the Commission by Muslims in F.O. 901-2, Wolff to Salisbury, Philippopolis, 12 November 1878.

152.F.O. 195-1252, *Brophy to Malet*, Bourgas, 26 March 1879 and F.O. 1951252, *Brophy to Layard*, Bourgas, 8 May 1879.

153.I have found no evidence of an actual law to this effect, but there are numerous accounts in the diplomatic records of Bulgarian officials stating that Muslim women must change their dress, as well as numerous examples of its enforcement.

154.F.O. 195-1254, *Michell to Layard*, Philippopolis, 29 August 1879. F.O. 195-1254, *Michell to Layard*, Philippopolis, 4 September 1879. F.O. 195-1254, no. 340, *Michell to Salisbury*, Philippopolis, 7 November 1879. The "gymnastic societies" were officially disbanded in November of 1879, but the members were allowed to keep their guns (and such societies reappear later).

155.F.O. 195-1252, *Brophy to Layard*, Bourgas, 22 April 1879, and F.O.

901-17, "*Telegram from Lord Donoughmore" to Salisbury*, 9 April 1879. Lord Donoughmore described "the means which have been adopted to render the state of the Turks of Eastern Roumelia what it is -- one of almost absolute destitution, with the prospect of almost total annihilation" (F.O. 901-16, *Donoughmore to Wolff*, Philippopolis, 27 September 1878. This document also contains descriptions of Bulgarian activities against Turks in Eastern Rumelia).

156.F.O. 195-1137, no. 32, *Dupuis to Blunt*, Adrianople, 4 August 1877 and no. 33, 6 August 1877.

157.F.O. 195-1184, an article in the *Jewish Chronicle* of 5 October 1877, reprinted from the *Standard*. Consular verification of the story, which is filled with graphic descriptions of horrors, indicates that it was essentially correct, though highly colored (F.O. 195-1184, no. 15, *Blunt to Layard*, Adrianople, 7 January 1877). See also F.O. 195-1137, no. 105, *Blunt to Layard*, Adrianople, 21 August 1877, and F.O. 195-1137, no. 40, *Blunt to Layard*, Adrianople, 22 August 1877.

158.F.O. 195-1153, *Michell to Layard*, Philippopolis, 24 June 1879.

159.*Brophy to Layard*, Bourgas, 24 August 1878, quoted in Şimsir I, no. 353. The authorities enforced much better treatment of native Greeks than Turks, but

some Greeks suffered persecution as well (F.O. 901-16, *Donoughmore to Wolff*, Philippopolis, 27 September 1878).

160.ibid. It should be added in fairness that two of the leading Bulgarians of the town did try to protect Turkish and Jewish refugees.

161.F.O. 195-1184, no. 15, *Blunt to Layard*, Adrianople, 7 January 1877.

162.F.O. 195-1137, *Blunt to Layard*, Adrianople, 29 August 1877.

163."There exists a register on which has been written all the names of the refugees in the kaza [İsketçe] by age, sex, and place of origin" (Procès-Verbal No. 4 of the International Commission of Rhodope, 24 July 1878, quoted in Şimşir I, p. 550). For examples, see Wallace to Wolff, 9 January 1879, quoted in Şimşir II, p. 120, and Edhem Paşa to Caratheodory Paşa, 28 May 1879, quoted in Şimşir II, p. 290, as well as the many others in Şimşir II. The only numbers of refugees analyzed here are Surviving Refugees. For considerations of the total number of refugees, see Şimşir's note on p. 628 of Şimşir I.

164.As Table 1 indicates, European estimates of refugee numbers, which have not been chosen selectively, were remarkably consistent. Some of their consistency derives from the fact that a number of figures were in fact drawn from one estimate, that of the agent on the spot, usually a British consul or vice-consul or an official of a European charitable institution. Many of these estimates began life as Ottoman governmental refugee figures. However, it should be noted that the diplomatic literature is remarkably free of the statistical disagreements that like estimates usually caused. The presence of some detailed figures, from which the estimates were drawn, also tends to establish the authenticity of the estimates.

165.Hanley of the *Morning Advertiser*, Pera, 20 July 1877, quoted in *Russian Atrocities in Asia and Europe*, Constantinople, 1877, p. 77.

166.Layard to Derby, 19 August 1877. F.O. 424-59, p. 198, no. 274, quoted in Şimşir I.

167.Gambier of the *Times*, Chumla [*sic*], 17 July 1877, quoted in *Russian Atrocities*, p. 72.

168.Boysset, French vice-Consul at Philippopolis to Mouy at Constantinople, Philippopolis, 17 November 1877, quoted in Şimşir I, no. 105.

169.F.O. 195-1136, *Calvert to Blunt*, Philipoppolis, 30 July 1877, enclosure no. 7 in Blunt's no. 90.

170.*Calvert to Blunt*, Philippopolis, 10 March 1878, and *Calvert to de Winton*, Philippopolis, 17 March 1878, quoted in Şimşir I, nos. 221 and 245.

171.*Reade to Layard*, Varna, 21 August 1878, and "Sawas Pacha," Constantinople, 24 August 1878, quoted in Şimşir I, nos. 350 and 352.

172.*Reade to Layard*, Varna, 31 January 1878, quoted in Şimşir I, no. 175.

173.Layard to Derby, Constantinople, 8 February 1878, quoted in Şimşir I, no. 194.

174.Brophy to Layard, Bourgas, 13 March 1878, quoted in Şimşir I, no. 227.

175.*Reade to Layard*, Varna, 2 March 1878, quoted in Şimşir I, no. 209.

176.*Reade to Layard*, Varna(?), 29 June 1878, quoted in Şimşir I, no. 308.

177.F.O. 424-59, p. 161, no. 227/10, Lt. Layard to Layard, Adrianople, 4 August 1877, quoted in Şimşir I, no. 73.

178.Gay of the *Daily Telegraph*, Pera, 19 August 1877, quoted in *Russian Atrocities*, p. 102-5. This article and others by Gay in the volume are especially important, though sensationalized, sources on the sufferings of the Muslim refugees.

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 107.

179.The French consul at Adrianople, quoted in Şimşir I, no. 250, p. 409.

180.F.O. 195-1184, Acting Consul *Calvert to Layard*, Adrianople, 24 April 1878.

181.The French consul at Adrianople, quoted in Şimşir I, no. 250, p. 409, note.

182.*ibid.*

183.Server Pacha, 19 September 1877, and *Reade to Layard*, Rasgrad, 21 September 1877, quoted in Şimşir I, nos. 92 and 93.

184.Fournier, French Ambassador at Constantinople to Waddington, Therapia, 8 July 1878, quoted in Şimşir I, no. 310.

185.Layard to Derby, Constantinople, 6 February 1878, quoted in Şimşir I, no. 192.

186.Jago to Derby, Damascus, 4 March 1878, quoted in Şimşir I, no. 213.

187.F.O. 97-527, p. 5, Report from Consul Alvarez at Kosova, 10 May 1880.

188.*ibid.*

189.I.e., only a portion of Edirne Province was part of the award to the Bulgarians.

190.Because Ottoman statistics divided the population by religious group (i.e., millet) and not language group, one cannot separate Pomaks from Turks in the returns. Tatars can be considered Turks, for they are ethnically and linguistically close.

191.Tulça was given to Romania at the Congress of Berlin, so its Muslim population has not figured in these calculations.

192.The Ottoman "Special Inspectors of the Emigration Service" estimated "more than 500,000" (*Les réfugiés de la Roumelie*, p. 8):

Emigrants passed through the Capital	300,000
Emigrants passed through Rodosto	50,000
Emigrants passed through Dedeağaç	50,000
Emigrants passed through Varna, Burgas, Balcik	100,000

TOTAL	500,000

SOURCE: *Les réfugiés de la Roumelie*.

193.The Russians kept extensive records of migrants from Edirne Vilâyeti to Eastern Rumelia. They listed 20,222 leaving by train by November of 1878, a figure Consul Calvert analyzed and accepted. Calvert stated that the Bulgarians carried much "excess baggage" made up of plunder from Turks (F.O. 195-1185, *Calvert to Layard*, Adrianople, 8 November 1878). On the eviction of Turks from their homes and lands to make way for the Bulgarian refugees, see F.O. 901-17, no. 10, Donoughmore to Wolff, Philippopolis, 10 April 1879.

194.In Syria, 25,000 (quoted in Şimşir I, no. 253). See also Şimşir's note on p. 594 of Şimşir I.

195.Emigration from Bulgaria continued at a steady rate throughout the rest of the nineteenth century. In 1887, Bulgaria was only 21 percent Muslim. For a number of estimates and Ottoman documents on the Muslim refugees, see Ahmet Cevat Eren, *Türkiye 'de Göç ve Göçmen Meseleleri, Istanbul, 1966, pp. 79-89.*

196.F.O. 195-1185.

-108-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 108.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE EAST, 1878 TO 1914

THE PERIOD THAT LED up to World War I was one of increased polarization in the east. The Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 resulted in further additions to the de facto population exchange of Muslims to Anatolia and Armenians to the Caucasus. The wartime aid given the Ottomans by Caucasian Muslims and aid given the Russians by Anatolian Armenians reinforced the primacy of ethnic and religious affiliation over loyalty to governments. In Anatolia, Armenian revolutionary agitation and Kurdish raids both exacerbated the hatred and divisions between Armenians and Muslims. In the Caucasus, the same hatred and divisions surfaced in a bloody fashion during the Revolution of 1905.

THE RUSSO-TURKISH WAR OF 1877-78

The Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 began rapidly in the east. On the day war was declared, 24 April 1877, Russian troops crossed the Ottoman border. ¹The Ottomans concentrated their defense forces near Ardahan, but were defeated in May. By June, the Russians were before the city of Kars

and had begun to lay siege to that fortress city. To the west, the Russians had moved around Mount Ararat and taken Bayazit by 1 June 1877. They moved on into the Eleşkirt Valley, where they were welcomed by the sizeable Armenian population of the valley. The Russians, however, were checked by Ottoman forces under Ahmed Muhtar Paşa and forced temporarily to retreat. The Turks advanced into Russian territory near Iğdir, where they were in turn held by the Russians. By October, the Russians had once again advanced and had won a great battle at Alacadağ. On 18 November 1877, Kars fell. The Ottoman

-109-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 109.

troops, who had suffered tremendous losses, retreated toward Erzurum. Erzurum fell on 31 January 1878. Thus, by the beginning of 1878, Ottoman forces in the east had been completely defeated.

During the war, the Ottoman strategy that most threatened the Russians was a diversion by sea to Abkhazia. On 12 May 1877, the Ottomans landed troops north of Sukhumkale. The small Russian garrisons fled. More landings followed, including contingents of Circassians and Abkhazians who had fled to the Ottoman Empire ten years previously and intended to raise against the Russians those of their people who still remained in the Caucasus. In this they were successful. Abkhazians from the coastal districts joined the Ottoman soldiers against the Russians. As word of Ottoman landings spread, revolts also broke out among the Muslims of Chechnia and Dağstan. Despite some success in drawing off Russian soldiers from the main battleground to the south, however, both the Ottoman invasion and the revolts in Chechnia and Dağistan failed. Russian forces in the area were ultimately too strong, and too few Caucasian Muslims remained after the deportations of the 1860s to support an active revolt. The fact that, despite great odds, Caucasian Muslims were willing to again revolt against the Russians illustrates once more the religious principle of loyalty in the Caucasus. The Armenians of the Eleşkirt Valley and Kars had sided with the invading Russians and the Muslims of the Caucasus with the invading Turks. Both groups showed that their loyalties lay with their religious brothers, not with the governments that were theoretically their masters.

SOURCES

Information on the eastern theater of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 is in marked contrast with the information on the war in Bulgaria, due to the relative lack of observers in the east. Whereas Western consuls were to be found all over the European war zone (Galatz, Sofia, Niş, Rusçuk, Filibe, Edirne, Selanik, Üsküp, etc.), consuls were few in the east. The closest consular establishments to the war zone were in Trabzon, Erzurum, and Tiflis, quite far from most of the fighting. Zohrab, the British consul in Erzurum, was, moreover, both deeply prejudiced and lacking in the observa-

-110-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 110.

tional skills expected of a diplomat. When he left Erzurum during the war, British consular reports from Erzurum dried up completely. Consequently, the most complete consular information on the eastern front of the war came from the relatively less biased British consuls in Tiflis and Trabzon.

The Ottomans were in no position in the years between 1877 and 1878 to record much of what is most important here -- refugee migration. They did, however, interest themselves quite naturally in the massacres of Muslims by Russians and their Allies. Even here, however, they were often forced to rely on information gathered by European reporters and observers. There is some evidence of Russian actions against Muslims on the eastern front to match those on the western front in 1877-78. Almost nothing was actually reported on the effects of the war on civilians. This was in marked contrast to the reporting, both by consular officials and journalists, of the war in Bulgaria.

RUSSIAN AND ARMENIAN ACTIONS IN THE WAR

During and probably before the war the Russian government began to exploit religious and incipient ethnic separateness of Armenians in Anatolia.

²For example, although they were not drafted into the Ottoman service at

the time, Christians were able to volunteer for military service in early 1877, before the war began. In Erzurum, 84 Christians volunteered on the first day of enrollment. None subsequently volunteered, because the Russian consul notified the Greek and Armenian bishops that such enrollment was to be discouraged. The bishops and their followers obeyed. ³

Perhaps the prime example of Russian atrocities in their Caucasian campaign was the taking of Ardahan, a city that had peacefully surrendered to them. ⁴ Although the surrender was peaceful, the Russian forces, primarily Cossacks and Karapapaks (a heterodox Muslim group) in Russian service, killed an estimated 300 of the Ottoman garrison and a much greater number of civilians. Russian telegrams spoke of 800 Turkish bodies on the ground in the city and many bodies thrown into ravines. ⁵ The British Consul in Tiflis, Ricketts, reported that the Ottoman garrison at Ardahan, which had surrendered peacefully, was largely slaughtered and the city sacked by 12,000 troops of the Russian regular army. ⁶ Ardamiş was

-111-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 111.

treated similarly, with much loss of civilian life in both cities. ⁷ Ottoman sources reported the massacre as well, adding that Turkish villages outside Ardahan were also sacked and that much of the Turkish population of the Ardahan region fled to Kars and (shortlived) safety. ⁸

Kars does not seem to have fared as badly as Ardahan. When it fell, the Russian soldiery was allowed to plunder it for three days, but their activities seem to have been mainly theft. ⁹ Rape and torture of prisoners were commonly seen. ¹⁰

Ottoman soldiers who surrendered were treated barbarously, as British Consul Ricketts reported: "Condition of the Turkish prisoners coming from Headquarters deplorable, out of 700 that left Kars 400 remained on the route either dead or sick of fever." ¹¹ Ricketts further reported that the murderous treatment of Ottoman prisoners of war by the Russians was to be expected, because of the same treatment given to Turkish prisoners in the previous war. ¹² On the Russian treatment of Turkish soldiers, the reporter Charles Williams observed that the Russians "are assisted in

murdering the wounded by their Armenian friends." ¹³

Russian actions after the conquest drove the Muslims to unsuccessful revolt. Armenian activities against Muslims grew each day and the Russians did nothing to defend the Muslims, a picture too similar to what was occurring in Bulgaria to be coincidence or poor reporting. The Muslim revolt, which was undertaken out of desperation, with no real hope of success, naturally failed.

When the Russians took Erzurum, the city's Armenians took advantage of Christian rule to abuse Muslims. The Russians recognized this and, at least in their own accounts, made an effort to punish the guilty Armenians. Whether or not he was a trustworthy officer is unknown, but the fact that the Russian-appointed head of the Erzurum police force was an Armenian must have led to a certain apprehension on the part of Muslims. ¹⁴The British consul in Trabzon reported that 6,000 Turkish families had fled from Erzurum by the end of the summer of 1878 and that if the Russians remained, most of the remaining Muslims would flee, as well. ¹⁵Ambassador Layard remarked that "as there is no doubt that when the Russians occupied Erzeroum the Armenians availed themselves of the protection which they received to molest, ill-treat, and insult the Mahomedan population, it is not unnatural that on the departure of their protectors the Mussulmans should seek to revenge

-112-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 112.

themselves." ¹⁶There was thus every reason to believe that the Muslims of Erzurum would retaliate when the city was returned to the Ottomans after the Peace Treaty. The Ottomans in fact managed to keep order, and the Christians were protected by the Ottoman soldiery, ¹⁷but the local Muslims must have learned what they could expect under Russian and Armenian rule.

MIGRATION

Tens of thousands of Muslims crossed into the Ottoman Empire from Russia immediately before and during the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78; many of those who crossed over by land were Kurds. ¹⁸During and immediately after

the war, much of the Armenian migration from Ottoman to Russian territory was occasioned by fear of Kurdish tribes, not of the Ottoman government or of local Turks. During the war, many Armenians had become allies of the Russians. Now that the Russians were leaving, many Armenians felt it necessary to leave as well. ¹⁹Between two and three thousand Armenian families were reported to have left the Eleşkirt Valley alone and to have followed Russian troops into Russian territory after the war. ²⁰More left from other regions of the east. ²¹Perhaps 25,000 Armenians crossed the border. ²²The total number of Muslim migrants during the war exceeded 60,000. ²³

Many more Muslims came from the southern Caucasus to the eastern Ottoman Empire after the war, primarily from the KarsArdahan areas ceded to the Russians, but including some refugees from Ottoman Europe. (Detailed records of the migrants were kept, but have only partially been found in archives.) ²⁴

By 1881, the Ottoman government had counted 27,712 refugees in Sivas Vilâyeti alone. ²⁵Throughout the east, the refugees came to an empire prostrated by war and even less able than in the 1860s to provide assistance to immigrants. ²⁶The total number of Muslim refugees from the Caucasus during and immediately after the war must have been greater than 70,000.

In addition to displaced Turks, a great number of refugees from the territories newly conquered by the Russians were Kurds, and a number were Caucasian mountaineers who had been resettled in the Ottoman Empire after the Russian expulsion and were now forced to move again. As they settled farther south, they came into

conflict with Armenians dwelling in the Van and Erzurum provinces. They were the cause of numerous protests by Armenians. ²⁷Unlike settlements in areas of western Anatolia, the population of "new" Circassians settled in eastern Anatolia was relatively small. The Circassians, however, as a group were important, because their numbers in the east had been building since the 1860s until they were a significant minority there, and because they had brought with them a considerable hatred of Caucasian Christians, whom

they undoubtedly saw as those who had stolen their old homes. The Christians of eastern Anatolia were mainly Armenians.

Laz. The Laz were a Muslim people who spoke a dialect of Georgian and lived in the southeastern coastal region of the Black Sea, in what today is Georgia (the area of Batum) and Turkey. Their homeland was part of the Ottoman Empire until the beginning of the Russian conquests. Though a relatively small group, Laz soldiers fought heroically when the Russians invaded their region in 1828, 1853, and 1877. The Laz immigration into the Ottoman Empire, like the previous Circassian immigration, was the movement of much of an entire people. Laz within the Russian borders had fought as irregulars against the Russians in the war and feared for their situation if they came under Russian domination. The Laz properly feared mistreatment by the Russians, who had devastated part of their land during the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78. ²⁸

After the Treaty of Berlin awarded the Batum, Kars, and Ardahan regions to the Russians, the Laz began an exodus from their traditional homes to the seashore and then took ship for the Ottoman Empire. Unable to find purchasers for their land, they destroyed their homes, cut down their fruit trees, and made the trek to Batum and the boats. ²⁹By choice, they settled in the Black Sea region, because of its similarity to their home region and its geographic closeness to Russian Lazistan, to which they hoped to return. ³⁰ The Ottoman government, however, anxious to spread the burden of the new immigrants, placed a large number of Laz migrants in northwestern Anatolia, in the vilâyet of Hüdavendigâr (Bursa) and the sancak of izmit. ³¹

1

While the Russians made it impossible for the Laz to remain in their homeland, they also made them suffer in the process of leaving. In 1880, the British Consul at Tiflis reported on Batum:

-114-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 114.

Nearly the entire Muhammadan population consisting it is said of 10,000 families of 60,000 souls have determined to emigrate into Turkey, and would for the most part already have left Russian territory had not the vexatious formalities, which they are compelled to undergo, at the hands of

the Russian (Armenian) government employees who are occupied in extorting money and property from them by questioning their titles, refusing them passports, and other harassing procedures, detained them. In fact, the accounts of my informants, who talk all the languages of the country well, describe it as a scene of wholesale injustice, pillage, and spoliation. ³²

Russian and Armenian government employees in the region were able to enrich themselves at the expense of the Laz simply by denying them the right to sell their property except with government approval. Approval was only given for sales to a syndicate of government employees. ³³

Like the other migrants before them, the Laz found that the Ottomans were ill-equipped to handle large numbers of refugees from the Caucasus. Most of the refugees received land, but they were given little else. After the recent Ottoman losses in the Russian war, there must have been little for the government to give. Laz refugees to western Anatolia were usually well-situated and, if they were able to find seed grain, fit in reasonably well, far better than the Circassians. ³⁴ Those in the east found little support in a region ravaged by war. ³⁵

The settling of the Laz in Ottoman Anatolia was not always welcomed by either Muslims or Christians of the areas of intended settlement. Part of this reaction was prejudice -- the Laz had a reputation as a disruptive element that was far in excess of their actual troublemaking. In fact, actual complaints of Laz robberies and other misbehavior were few. ³⁶ Nevertheless, it was popularly believed that an area that received Laz immigrants would necessarily become unsafe. A more reasonable cause for their rejection was the settlement policy of the Ottoman government. Villagers were forced to donate seed to recently arrived Laz and to assist them in building houses and clearing land. This meant that wherever Laz were settled, villagers necessarily became poorer and were forced to work for the benefit of strangers; neither was likely to have much appeal. ³⁷ But it is difficult to see what the Ottoman government could do other than, in effect, quartering the Laz on villages already in existence. There was little available financially to support Laz settlement. Consul Biliotti in Trabzon telegraphed on 5 September

1878, "2,000 Laz emigrants have arrived; 1,000 more are expected. No rations are issued to them there being no money in the government chest."³⁸ In 1878, given the internal and international political and economic position of the Ottoman Empire, "no money in the chest" was an appropriate description.

By 1882, approximately 40,000 Laz had settled in the Ottoman Empire.³⁹

EASTERN ANATOLIA, 1878-1914

When conditions made it possible to again provide troops for policing duties, the Ottoman government seems to have done all it could to return the situation in the east to one of relative domestic quiet after the war. It can be cynically observed that the Ottomans were trying to impress the European Powers with their ability to police their own country, but they seem in fact to have been simply reasserting their prewar position. Troops were assigned to protect Christian communities, merchants, and roads, all of which were as important to the Ottoman state and its tax base as they were to the individuals in the eastern vilâyets.⁴⁰ The Ottoman government did also hope that it would convince the European Powers of its intention to institute "reforms" in the east, as specified by the Berlin Treaty. However, the root problem of the Ottomans, lack of financial resources, continued and frustrated efforts at reform. The depth of the division between Muslims and Armenians in the east was greater after the war than before. This was due to the events of the war and of the immediate postwar period, the realization by both Muslims and Armenians of Russian power and intentions, and the activities of Armenian revolutionary organizations.⁴¹

During the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 and in the years immediately following, the Armenians of southeastern Anatolia had suffered at the hands of Kurdish tribes, as had settled Kurds and Turks and even Ottoman soldiers and government officials. Armenians had been victims of the Kurdish revolt and their natural inclinations were to doubt the authority of the Ottoman government and to hate tribal Muslims. For many it was a short step to assuming evil intentions on the part of the government. The creation in 1891

of the Hamidiye cavalry units by Sultan Abdülhamid II surely added to their fears. The Hamidiye were regiments of Kurds who were given government arms and uniforms and a modicum of military organization. Although Abdülhamid's concept was the creation of a force similar to the Russian Cossacks, the Hamidiye must have been seen by the Armenians as putting the fox in charge of the henhouse. (On the other hand, to the sultan the Hamidiye may have appeared to be the only way to exercise some control over the Kurds and to have a force ready to combat Armenian insurrection.) Many Armenians were thus doubtful of the peace-keeping ability of the government; other Armenians believed that the government was set against them. Some saw arming themselves to be essential for self-defense; others saw arming as a necessity for the revolutionary nationalism in which they believed.

The power of the Russian Empire, as exemplified by the complete defeat of the Ottomans in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78, was another impetus to Armenian separatism. Not even the most ardent revolutionary could have believed that the Armenians could stand alone against their government. There was no need to stand alone, however. Russia was expected ultimately to defeat the Turks and conquer the east. After the establishment of a Christian government in the east, it was somewhat naively believed, the question of an independent Armenia could be settled. ⁴²

By 1879, Armenian nationalistic feelings had obviously begun to develop, particularly among the younger and urban elements and the Armenian clergy. ⁴³ Nationalistic plays were written and produced. Armenian bishops showed themselves in favor of national autonomy and self-expression, if not independence. Much of this sentiment was surprisingly open. ⁴⁴ The Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople himself openly supported the detachment of "Armenia" from the Ottoman Empire. He addressed a letter to that effect to Bismarck and other leaders and told British Ambassador Layard of his plan. Layard mentioned to him that in "Armenia" "a very large majority of the population consisted of Musselmans," but Patriarch Narses assured him that Muslims would be glad to be ruled by Armenians. ⁴⁵

The traditional Ottoman system of allowing the peoples of the eastern provinces to look after themselves enabled the Armenians to develop anti-Ottoman sentiments, and ultimately actions, in relative security. The same lack of Ottoman control that threatened

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 117.

Armenian villagers also permitted Armenians to develop anti-Ottoman revolutionary activities.

The Armenian revolutionary parties were a classic nineteenth century response to the stirrings of nationalism. It is beyond the scope of this study to consider their development, a topic considered adequately elsewhere.⁴⁶ The three main Armenian parties (Armenakan, Hunchak, and Dashnak) were similar to the successful revolutionary organizations of Greece and Bulgaria in their nationalistic ends and willingness to resort to mass violence or selective assassination whenever needed. They were unique in that their people formed a distinct minority in the land they planned to seize. The degree to which they were willingly supported by the eastern Armenians cannot be known; it is doubtful if, given their violent traditions, many Armenians could have successfully or openly opposed them.⁴⁷

The revolutionary parties were, at one time or another, willing to sacrifice both Armenian and Muslim lives for their purposes. In broad outline, their plan was to emulate the successful Bulgarian uprising of 1876 -- instigate local Armenians to attack Muslims (or do the job themselves), thereby provoking massacres of Armenians, with a resulting European intervention in favor of an Armenian state.

One of the revolutionaries told Dr. Hamlin, the founder of Robert College, that the Hentchak bands would "watch their opportunity to kill Turks and Kurds, set fire to their villages, and then make their escape into the mountains. The enraged Moslems will then rise, and fall upon the defenseless Armenians and slaughter them with such barbarity that Russia will intervene in the name of humanity and Christian civilization." When the horrified missionary denounced the scheme as atrocious and infernal beyond anything he had ever known, he received this reply: "It appears so to you, no doubt; but we Armenians have determined to be free. Europe listened to the Bulgarian Horrors and made the Bulgarians free. She will listen to our cry when it goes up in the shrieks and blood of millions of women and children. . . . We are desperate. We shall do it."⁴⁸

In the east, the main effect of the Armenian revolutionary parties was to provide an organizing principle for the Armenians. Russia and other powers, no matter how well disposed toward an Armenian revolt, could not have

been able simply to distribute arms to every Armenian village. Arms and support could, however, be given to, for example, the Dashnak Party, which would insure

-118-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 118.

their organized use against both Ottomans and local Muslims. ⁴⁹Through the revolutionaries, inchoate feelings of hatred for Muslims and Muslim rule could be channelled into revolutionary struggle.

While the Armenian revolutionaries were correct in assessing European prejudice in favor of the Christians of the Ottoman Empire, they overestimated European willingness to give practical assistance to their revolution. Throughout the 1890s, Armenian rebellions broke out on a small scale and resulted in the deaths of many Muslims and more Armenians. Europeans never forcibly intervened, but the revolutions did convince Muslims that all they feared was true. Ambassador Layard, probably the most astute European observer of the events, accurately analyzed the situation. He felt that the Armenian revolutionaries were deceiving themselves. The only ultimate gain would be a Russian gain; Armenians would be swallowed by the Russian Empire. ⁵⁰

ARMENIAN REBELLIONS

Rebellions against the Ottoman government and intercommunal battles between Armenians and Muslims were common all over the east in the two decades after 1890. Armenian revolutionaries were active in the area of Sasun in the 1890s, forming guerrilla bands and fighting Kurdish tribesmen. Armenians, Kurds, and Ottoman soldiers were all involved in the bloodshed as killers and victims. ⁵¹In 1894, large Armenian rebel bands in the Sasun region attacked Ottoman tax collectors and other officials. Fleeing before the Ottoman army, which had been sent to punish them, the rebels slaughtered the inhabitants of Muslim villages in their path. The Ottoman regular army and Hamidiye units responded by massacring Armenians in villages in the rebellious region. The number who died in the rebellion has been hotly contested, but the fact of massacre and countermassacre is sufficient to establish the hatreds of Armenians and Muslims in the region and the

corresponding danger for both. ⁵²

In 1895, a rebellion led by the Hunchak Party in Zeytun spread to the entire region around Zeytun and Maraş. The Armenian leader of the rebellion claimed that 125 Armenians and 20,000 Muslims had been killed, ⁵³surely an exaggeration (many Armenians and some Europeans claimed a much larger Armenian mortality), but the Ottomans undoubtedly had a difficult time in putting down

-119-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 119.

the rebellion. ⁵⁴Contemporaries believed that the Ottomans might lose to the rebels, but the Armenians were eventually defeated and put under siege in the city of Zeytun by the Ottoman Army. At that point, European representatives forced the Ottomans to raise the siege, grant amnesty to the rebels, and allow five leaders of the rebellion to emigrate. ⁵⁵In the Van rebellion of the same year, 400 Muslims and 1,700 Armenians died in the one revolt. ⁵⁶Other incidents in 1895 ranged from solitary murders of Armenians and Muslims to the attempted assassination of the Governor of Erzurum and, in 1905, of the sultan. In general, the Armenian population seems to have suffered the worse mortality.

Events that occurred in Adana in 1909 were symptomatic of the deteriorated situation. They indicate that throughout the Ottoman east each "side" was expecting the worst of the other, an expectation that produced a resolve in both communities to attack before one was attacked. In 1908, the Committee of Union and Progress had led a revolt against Abdülhamid II, deposed him, and declared a new constitutional era. The time was one of publicly avowed brotherhood between Turkish and Armenian politicians, as well as a time of revolutionary development among Armenians. By the terms of the new constitution, all Ottoman citizens were legally allowed to purchase arms. The Armenians as a group had taken advantage of the new law to purchase great numbers of weapons. Previously quiet areas in Cilicia thus became as armed as the Van or Erzurum vilâyets had always been. Armenian attacks on Muslims in the Adana region began on 14 April 1909, influenced by the revolutionary cleric Bishop Musech ⁵⁷of Mersin, who preached an Armenian nation in Cilicia. Hearing greatly exaggerated stories of the strength and activities of the rebels, Ottoman officials in Adana

panicked. They called on Adana's Muslim population to defend itself against the Armenians, few of whom were in fact part of the rebellion. The Muslims responded, as must have been expected, by attacking the Armenians. In the end, between 17,000 and 20,000 had died, 10 percent of them Muslims, the rest Armenians. Both Armenians and Turks had expected Europeans to intervene in Adana on the side of the Armenians. When England, France, or Russia did not come to the assistance of the Armenian rebels, overwhelming Muslim numbers told against the Christians. ⁵⁸

The events of 1890 to 1909 were important in preparing the psychological climate of 1915. Muslims were convinced that Arme-

-120-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 120.

nians were planning a revolution and that, if Armenians got the upper hand, Muslims would be slaughtered, as in Zeytun. The Armenians had equal reason to fear massacre, should Armenians attempt revolution and lose (even if they, themselves, had no part in the revolt, as happened to many Armenians in Adana). Both sides were convinced that **death** would be the price of defeat. In the wars to come their convictions proved to be true; in the course of the wars both sides were to be defeated and both to suffer great mortality.

CONTINUING ARMENIAN EMIGRATION

Even though by the 1890s the Ottoman government was discouraging emigration of Armenians to Russia, large numbers were still being lost, in effect, exchanged for Muslims, who kept coming from Russia to the Ottoman Empire. The Russians encouraged the migration. Migrating Armenians were given land that had previously belonged to Muslims who had left or died. ⁵⁹

While some of the Christians emigrated because of "national" or religious sentiment, much of this emigration was due to economic reasons. Armenians and Greeks from relatively prosperous areas were considerably less likely to emigrate, as were those in regions in which Ottoman

governmental power was strong and security thus enhanced. ⁶⁰There was even some minor emigration of Muslims from the eastern Black Sea region, especially after new immigrants began to appear there. ⁶¹

European consuls reporting on Christian emigration seldom mentioned "nationalistic" reasons. The reasons they listed were usually economic -- escape from overtaxation, from theft by Kurds, and from a system of agricultural tenure that often put the land in the hands of overlords who exploited the peasants. ⁶²The Armenians did not complain of religious or ethnic persecution, but of an unfair economic system and a lack of security. ⁶³These problems they shared with the Muslim neighbors. The Armenians, however, unlike the Muslims, had the possibility of escape. Whether their lives were actually bettered by the move to Russian territory is immaterial here; on the whole, life for Christians in Russian Armenia was probably an improvement over that in eastern Anatolia. Life for those Christians who migrated to other parts of the Ottoman Em-

-121-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 121.

pire, especially Ottoman Europe and western Anatolia, was also greatly improved. The question was not one of escaping *to* Russia, but of escaping *from* eastern Anatolia. ⁶⁴

For political and economic reasons, the Russian government encouraged immigration of relatively well-off Christian ⁶⁵over that of poor Armenians or those peasants who did not appear to be capable of lucrative farming. ⁶⁶ Economically, there can be no doubt that the replacement of nomadic Muslims with settled Armenians meant an improvement in the agriculture-based economy of the Russian Caucasus. Correspondingly, the economy and tax base of the Ottoman territories must have suffered through Armenian emigration. For that reason, the Ottoman government was anxious to keep the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire. Politically, Armenian settlement in the Caucasian borderlands provided the Russians with a friendly population and a buffer against Ottoman invasion. The Russians could always count on the Armenians to oppose the Ottomans, just as the Ottomans could count on people such as the Laz to oppose the Russians.

As an inducement to emigration, the Russians promised, usually through

rumor rather than official announcement, that various benefits would accrue to immigrants to the southern Caucasus: "According to the statements of Christians here [Ünye region ⁶⁷], the families that emigrated this year [1879-80] to Russia, besides receiving lands, and 15 roubles each, were promised exemption from the military service and from taxation for 7-14, even 20 years if they were not successful in their agriculture." ⁶⁸ These were exceptional terms; they were probably seldom met in fact, yet afforded an excellent inducement to migrate and avoid Ottoman taxes.

The Ottoman government recognized the causes of much of the Christian emigration and did what it could to counter it. When the Ottoman government was notified of an impending Armenian migration from Ordu, they sent out a mixed Christian-Muslim commission to Ordu to investigate the complaints of Armenians in the region. ⁶⁹ Almost half the families from Ordu Kazasi who planned to emigrate were brought back from the seashore, where they were taking ship for Russia, by the promise of land grants from the Ottoman government. ⁷⁰ At times, when they felt strong enough to resist Russian pressures to allow open emigration, the Ottomans restricted granting passports to Armenians who wanted to leave the empire. ⁷¹

Some Armenian emigration must have been the result of the

-122-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 122.

great famine of 1879, which struck hard in large areas of Erzurum, Van, and Diyarbakir vilâsyets. ⁷² Some Armenians left for purely economic reasons. For example, Armenian workmen in Erzurum left for Russia in 1879 because the Russians had stopped the exportation of timber needed for the Armenians' jobs. They left to continue their occupations in the Caucasus. ⁷³

THE CAUCASUS, 1905

The hatreds between Armenians and Turks (called "Tatars" or "Tartars" by the Russians) in the southern area of the Caucasus came to a head during the Russian Revolution of 1905, when effective Russian policing power was for a time removed from Transcaucasia. In Caucasia, the Russians had in fact adopted much the same policy as the Ottomans in eastern Anatolia,

though with greater effect. Russian troops had been used to separate the antagonistic and warring Muslim and Armenian populations. By attacking another community, the attackers could usually expect a response from Russian soldiers. Russians usually favored Armenian Christians over Muslims, but their favoritism had limits. The Russian intent was to rule the Caucasus and eastern Anatolia for themselves. Although sympathy for brother Christians may have accounted for a small part of Russian actions, support for Armenian Christians was essentially a tool of imperial expansion and control. Armenians, like Muslims, were not to be allowed to engage in battles and massacres. Massacres hurt civil order and the economy and were potential threats to Russian rule. Moreover, the Russians had adopted measures to limit Armenian independence, curtailing the activities of the Armenian Church and seizing Church lands -the basis of the clergy's power and wealth -- in 1903.

In 1905, following its defeat in the war with Japan, the Russian government was beset with strikes and open rebellion in the Caucasus as elsewhere in Russia. Industries were closed; peasants attacked landlords and seized land. To meet the threat in the Caucasus, the Russians essentially did nothing. They successfully relied on the deep hatred between Christians and Muslims to keep the enemies of the Tsar's regime divided. Indeed, soon after the beginning of the revolution, the center of revolution in the Caucasus,

-123-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 123.

the oil port of Baku, had descended into ethnic warfare between Armenians and Turks. ⁷⁴In February of 1905, British Consul Stevens reported "serious racial disturbances" in Baku. He reported 900 Armenians and 700 Muslims killed as of 25 February 1905. ⁷⁵The fights between Muslims and Armenians continued with "regular pitched battles between Armenians and Tartars in various parts of the town," ⁷⁶once again described as the result of "racial hatred." ⁷⁷

In Baku, serious fighting between Armenians and Turks broke out again on September 2 and by the next day had engulfed the region of the Baku oil fields. Interestingly, in this second round of fighting the Russian system of divide and conquer did not work. While the fighting may have begun because of Armenian-Muslim antipathy, ⁷⁸it soon became a general revolt in

which Russian laborers were the most prominent element. The British Vice-Consul on the spot in Baku, A. E. McDonell, reported that most Muslims took no great part in the riot, "as a people in general they formed merely passive spectators." He remarked that if the Muslims had joined wholeheartedly in the battles, no Armenian would have survived.⁷⁹ Consul Stevens said that it was estimated that "275 Tartars, 150 Russians, 95 Armenians, and about 100 soldiers have been killed,"⁸⁰ but that those figures were probably only a small proportion of the actual number killed. When Russian soldiers were sent to once again enforce order, they did so in bloody fashion. As might be expected, Muslim villages suffered the greatest force of their attacks.⁸¹

Intercommunal warfare was not restricted to cities. Armenians and Turks were also massacring each other in the south of Erivan Province. Hundreds were killed in Nahcivan in May. By June of 1905, Armenians and Muslims were killing each other on a large scale:

The massacres of Armenians and Tartars at Nahichevan, Erivan, and all the villages situated in the districts of the two mentioned towns during the past few days have assumed very alarming proportions. I regret to say, the parties who have delivered themselves to the butchery are so determined to do each other the gravest possible injury, that in some localities whole villages have been completely leveled to the ground by incendiarism.⁸²

Isolated murders continued to occur through October.⁸³

-124-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 124.

Because the confused and dangerous conditions in the Caucasus kept observers from reporting accurately, little is known of the intercommunal warfare in the villages. It is known that in areas where Turks and Armenians had lived together for centuries the uneasy peace between them finally broke down in 1905. The following account was perhaps typical of the actions of the time:

An hour later a rumor spread through the village to the effect that the Tartars, on leaving, had met an Armenian woman and child on the outskirts of the village, that they had killed the child and taken the woman away with

them. Our people [i.e., Armenians] became greatly excited upon hearing this news, and desired to attack our Tartar neighbors in revenge. During the day the Cossack soldiers would not permit such reprisal; however, when night came, this is what happened: The six Cossacks entered an Armenian house and asked for food; they were given bread and tea; they conferred and then, summoning the head men of our village, said, "During the daytime we are on duty and can not permit you to attack the Tartars; now we are no longer on duty; we are in this house and will not know what you do." Our men armed themselves, gathered together and advanced on the Tartar section of the village. There were no lights in the houses and the doors were barred, for the Tartars suspected what was to happen and were in great fear. Our men hammered on the doors, but got no response; whereupon they smashed in the doors and began a carnage that continued until the last Tartar was slain. Throughout the hideous night, I cowered at home in terror [he was a young boy], unable to shut my ears to the piercing screams of the helpless victims and the loud shouts of our men. By morning the work was finished. ⁸⁴

Although Russian archival evidence would be needed to prove the point, it seems probable that the Russians consciously made use of intercommunal rivalries in the Caucasus to retain possession of their territories while the Russian Empire was in the turmoil of revolution. As Hugh Seton-Watson stated, the first months of the Revolution in the Transcaucasian Provinces "were marked by fighting between Armenians and Tatars, largely engineered by the Russian authorities, a Transcaucasian version of the Jewish pogroms in the Ukraine." ⁸⁵ In the southern Caucasian provinces, there were few real partisans of the Russian crown. Many ethnic Russians were workers in the Baku oil fields or other industries and were supporters of the revolution. In fact, the only force that the Tsar

-125-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 125.

could count on in the Caucasus was his own military, especially the Cossacks, and they were relatively few in 1905, when their services were needed to fight a war and then to defeat a revolution. Therefore, by fostering (or at least doing nothing about) the antagonism between Armenians and Muslims, the Tsar insured that they fought each other rather than united against his government. When the revolution was over, Russian

authority was again forcibly asserted and open intercommunal warfare was not seen in the Caucasus for the next thirteen years.

THE VIOLENCE TO COME

To the inhabitants of the Ottoman East and the Caucasus, the events spanning the years between 1877 and 1914 must have appeared exceptionally disastrous. The Muslims saw much of their lands lost to the Russians, the Armenian revolutionaries claiming what remained. The Armenians saw the failure of Russians to take and hold much of the lands in Anatolia that they claimed as Armenian. They also saw the failure of Armenian revolution -- in the case of the Adana rebellion, a failure that led to a horrible response.

In 1895 in Anatolia and in 1905 in the Caucasus, intercommunal warfare broke out. Prior to that time, Muslims and Armenians had supported either the Russian or the Ottoman empires. Now the Muslims and Armenians had set about killing each other in their villages and cities. This war was not a thing of armies, but of peoples. It had been building for almost a century, brought about by Russian invasion, Armenian nationalism, and Ottoman weakness. By 1910, the polarization that was soon to result in mutual disaster was probably inevitable. Blood had been shed and revenge was expected and desired. Whatever their individual intentions, Muslims knew they were at risk from the Armenians, and Armenians knew they were at risk from the Muslims. Once World War I began, each side naturally assumed the worst of the other, and acted accordingly.

-126-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 126.

NOTES

1. Material for this short description of the war was drawn from *Caucasian Battlefields*, pp. 105-217.
2. *F.O.*65-978, no. 115, Ricketts to Derby, Tiflis, 29 August 1877.

3. According to the statement of the Russian Consul, Obermüller (*F.O.*195-1140, Zohrab to Elliot, Erzerum, 8 January 1877). Consul Zohrab believed the enrollment to be a good idea, because it "might have been of much benefit to the Christians, by habituating them to the use of arms and by accustoming the Mussulmans to see Christians in the uniform of soldiers."
4. See, for example, the report of bribery in *F.O.*65-978, no. 92, Ricketts to Derby, Tiflis, 10 June 1877.
5. *F.O.*65-978, no. 113, Ricketts to Derby, Tiflis, 22 August 1877. See also *F.O.*65-978, no. 92, Ricketts to Derby, Tiflis, 10 June 1877.
6. The Russian government made an attempt to put the blame for the Ardahan massacre on the Karapapaks, whom the regular Russian troops were "powerless to stop" -- a convenient target because the Karapapaks were Muslim. It was later proven that Cossacks and regular troops had been prominent members of the group that pillaged and massacred the Ardahan Muslims. The Karapapaks were, in any case, under the control of Russian commanders throughout the war (*F.O.*65-978, no. 92, Ricketts to Derby, Tiflis, 10 June 1877). The Karapapaks were a relatively small tribal group who lived in Kars Province and in Russian Azerbaijan. See Karapapakh in *E.I.*², Vol. IX, p. 627 (*W. Barthold-R. Wixman*).
7. *F.O.*65-978, no. 125, Ricketts to Derby, Tiflis, 15 October 1877. Consul Ricketts in Tiflis was a particularly accurate commentator on the situation in the Caucasus. This is fortunate, because the geographically closest British consul in the Ottoman Empire, Consul Zohrab in Erzurum, was as prejudiced and bad a witness as possible. For example, in the same period as the Ardahan massacre Zohrab reported that everyone was pleased with the Russians: "As Russian army advances villagers, Mahometans and Christians, go to meet it with pleasure" (*F.O.*195-1140, Telegram from Zohrab to British Embassy in Constantinople, Erzerum, 6 May 1877). Russian troops also deliberately fired on the Ardahan hospital when they took the city, as witnessed by European doctors at the time (*F.O.* 19511187, letter from Kwiatkowski, the consul of Austria and Hungary at Trabzon to Vice-Consul Biliotti, Trebizond [

Trabzon], 13 October 1877).

8. L. Bernhard, *Les Atrocités Russes en Bulgarie et en Arménie pendant la guerre de 1877*, Berlin, 1878, pp. 61-64. The British consul for the Caucasus, Ricketts, mentioned evidence given by Russian soldiers of the Russian bayonetting of Muslim women and children (*F.O.65-977*, Ricketts to Derby, Tiflis, 29 May 1877).
9. *F.O.195-1187*, no. 21, Biliotti to Layard, Trebizond, 22 January 1878. Biliotti obtained his information from one "Dr. Rosenthal, an Austrian surgeon in the Turkish service," who had been in the city when it fell. He described a thorough robbery of all the city's inhabitants, including Armenian Christians.
10. *F.O.65-1016*, no. 8, Ricketts to Derby, Tiflis, 5 February 1878. Ricketts also mentioned the Russians deliberately firing into the Kars hospital with artillery.
11. *F.O.65-1016*, no. 1, Ricketts to Derby, Tiflis, 1 January 1878.

-127-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 127.

12. *F.O.65-978*, no. 137, Ricketts to Derby, Tiflis, 26 November 1879. Ricketts feared that few Turkish prisoners would survive.
13. Charles Williams, *The Armenian Campaign*, London, 1878), p. 280.
14. Major Kamsaragan[*sic*] (*F.O.195-1237*, no. 42, Trotter to Layard, Erzeroum, 7 June 1879).

15. *F.O.78-2845*, no. 101, Biliotti to Salisbury, Trebizond, 14 August 1878.
16. *Turkey No. 53 (1878)*, no. 213, Layard to Salisbury, Therapia, 16 September 1878, in Bilâl N. Öimşir, *British Documents on Ottoman Armenians II*, Ankara, 1982, no. 92.
17. *F.O.195-1237*, no. 2, Trotter to Salisbury, Erzeroom [Erzurum], 13 November 1878. Trotter felt that the same could not always be said for the villages in which soldiers were quartered, because poor officers sometimes allowed their men to get out of hand. See also the analysis of Consul Biliotti, who came to the same conclusions as Trotter (*F.O.78-2845*, no. 117, Biliotti to Salisbury, Trebizond, 6 September 1878).
18. See the numerous references in *F.O.195-1237*, correspondence of Clayton to Trotter.
19. Consul Ricketts at Tiflis gave descriptions of the causes of Armenian migrations. (See *F.O.65-978*, no. 121, Ricketts to Derby, Tiflis, 2 October 1877.)
20. *F.O.195-1237*, no. 2, Trotter to Salisbury, Erzeroom, 13 November 1878.
21. *F.O.65-978*, Ricketts to Derby, Tiflis, 28 November 1877. See also, *F.O.65-978*, no. 139, Ricketts to Derby, Tiflis, 29 November 1877.
22. The estimate of H. Pasdermadjian in *Histoire de l'Arménie*, 3rd ed., Paris, 1971, p. 311, which is probably only a guess. See also *F. O.424-63*, no. 77, Ricketts to Derby, Tiflis, 28 November 1877, *British Documents I*, no. 49.
23. Consul Biliotti made a careful study of the boats delivering Muslim immigrants who landed in Trabzon in 1877, before either the war or the migration were complete. He estimated approximately 30,000 "who landed in or passed through Trebizond. To this list must be added that of

the emigrants who went direct from the Caucasian coast to other Turkish ports . . . about 15,000, thus giving a total of 45,000 emigrants" (*F.O.195-1141*, no. 72, Biliotti to Layard, Trebizond, 3 September 1877). Consular agent Doulers, in Samsun, notified Biliotti that approximately 8,000 had landed in Samsun, 7,000 in Ünye, Fatsa, and Terme (*F.O.195-1141*, no. 74, Biliotti to Layard, Trebizond, 7 September 1877). The previous figures did not include any who crossed overland or anyone who arrived by sea after September 1877, so a figure of 60,000 total is, if anything, an underestimate.

24. *F.O.195-1237*, Trotter to Layard, Erzeroum, 7 October 1879. Given their origin, these figures are probably fairly reliable.

25. Official return of refugees from Kars in Sivas Vilâyeti (1881): 27,712 (*F.O. 78-3281*, W.S. Richards to Wilson, Siwas, 23 June 1881). See also *F.O.78-3280*, Richards to Wilson, Siwas, 29 May 1881, for Richards' lower personal estimate, made before the official figures were released.

26. On difficulties of refugees settling in and lack of Ottoman funds, etc., see *F.O.78-3280*, Richards to Wilson, Siwas, 29 May 1881.

27. *F.O.195-1237*, Clayton to Trotter, Mush, 31 July 1879; *F.O.195-1141*, Biliotti to Layard, Trebizond, 8 August 1877.

-128-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 128.

28. *F.O.78-2582*, no. 964, Layard to Derby, Therapia, 20 August 1877. Ambassador Layard goes on to describe some of the tortures inflicted on Muslims. Consul Ricketts reported that Muslims of the Caucasus who had rebelled during the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 were put down by the Russians with great ferocity. Whole tribes were exiled to Siberia and numbers of women and children, as well as the rebels, killed (*F.O.65-*

978, no. 121, Ricketts to Derby, Tiflis, 2 October 1877).

29. *F.O.78-3137*, Biliotti to Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Trebizond, 15 June 1880.

30. The pull of their homeland must have been strong. There are reports of some few who actually did return, even though Russian rule continued. Why the Russians allowed them to return is unknown. See *F.O.78-3137*, Biliotti to Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Trebizond, 15 June 1880. See also *F.O.78-2845*, no. 118, Biliotti to Salisbury, Trebizond, 7 September 1878.

31. *F.O.78-3281*, Marlow to Dufferin, Therapia, 28 June 1881.

32. *F.O.65-1092*, no. 23, Lyall to Granville, Tiflis, 14 July 1880.

33. *F.O.65-1092*, no. 23, Lyall to Granville, Tiflis, 14 July 1880.

34. *F. O.78-3281*, Marlow to Dufferin, Therapia, 28 June 1881.

35. See *F.O.195-1187*, no. 130, Biliotti to Layard, Trebizond, 5 September 1877.

36. Consul Biliotti felt that "The population of Lazistan would be a valuable addition to Turkey; they are far superior in character to the Circassians and Abazians" (*F.O.78-2845*, no. 118, Biliotti to Salisbury, Trebizond, 7 September 1878).

37. Consul Biliotti's description of the Laz situation is an admirable summary of the difficulties inherent in the Laz immigration (*F.O.78-3137*, Biliotti to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Trebizond, 20 April 1880).

38. *F.O.78-2845*, Biliotti to Salisbury, Trebizond, 5 September 1878.

39. Ottoman government statistics, quoted in *F.O.78-380*, Biliotti to Dufferin, Trebizond, 5 January 1882. Paul Henze has very properly pointed out to me that many Laz remained behind, perhaps identified as "Adjar" in the Soviet censuses.
40. Troops were quartered in villages and towns, partly to protect the Christian population, immediately after the settlement of the war. See *F.O.195-1237*, no. 2, Trotter to Salisbury, Erzeroom, 13 November 1878 (also entered in *F.O.782846*).
41. Perhaps the best analysis of the region in this period is that of Mark Sykes. Sykes was not one to choose a polite phrase when an intemperate one would do, but his analyses of the psychology of revolution and massacre seem to be very close to the mark. I suspect he is seldom quoted on the Armenian-Turkish question because his writing makes each side look bad -- the Armenians for creating their own troubles and the Turks for believing the claims of the Armenian revolutionaries and acting accordingly. See *Dar ul-Islam: a Record of a Journey through Ten of the Asiatic Provinces of Turkey*, London, 1904, pp. 72-78, 115-17, 126-27, and 130-31. There is much of interest in Altan Deliorman, *Türklere Karşı Ermeni Komitecileri*, Istanbul, 1973, including quotes from major Armenian and Turkish figures. De,

-129-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 129.

liorman, however, includes no citations or footnotes and so the book's usefulness is considerably diminished.

42. Many Armenians felt that, despite past persecutions of the Armenian Church, Russia would grant the Armenians self-government. See, for example, *F.O.424-122*, no. 32/1, Clayton to Trotter, Van, 13 December

1880, in British Documents II, no. 56.

On early Russian support for the Armenian revolutionaries, see *F.O.424-106*, no. 246/1, "Memorandum by Lieutenant-Colonel Wilson on Anatolia and Necessary Reforms", in *British Documents II*, no. 15; *F.O.424-107*, no. 212, Clayton to Trotter, Van, 9 November 1880, in British Documents II, no. 41; *F.O.424-122*, no. 53/1, Clayton to Trotter, Van 15 February 1881, in British Documents II, no. 62. Consul Eyres, writing in 1883, felt that the Russians were not leading the Armenian revolutionary movement, but were supporting revolutionary outbreaks (*F.O.424140*, no. 27, Eyres to Windham, Erzeroum, 6 April 1883, in British Documents II, no. 202).

43. On the openly expressed sympathies, see *F.O.4241107*, no. 213, Everett to Trotter, Erzeroum, 24 November 1880. See also *F.O.424-122*, no. 1/1, Memorandum of Lt. Chermiside, Smyrna, 22 December 1880 in British Documents II, no. 47, and *F.O.424-141*, no. 16/1, Eyres to Everett, Van, 16 March 1884, in British Documents II, no. 227.

44. *F.O.195-1237*, no. 3, Trotter to Salisbury, Diarbekir, 17 June 1879. Also *F.O.195-1237*, Clayton to Trotter, Van, 19 August 1879.

45. *F.O.424-68*, no. 639, Layard to Derby, Constantinople, 18 March 1878, in British Documents I, no. 64.

46. Louise Nalbandian has written an excellent analysis of the aims and actions of Armenian revolutionaries -- *The Armenian Revolutionary Movement: The Development of Armenian Political Parties through the Nineteenth Century*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1963. See also the excellent descriptions in Salahi Ramsdam Sonyel, *The Ottoman Armenians*, London, 1987, pp. 109-54, and Esat Uras, *Tarihte Ermeniler ye Ermeni Meselesi*, Ankara, 1950, pp. 423-60.

47. An American in Sivas, Dr. Jewett, stated that local Armenians were caught between "two governments," one the Ottoman government, the other the quasigovernment of the Armenian revolutionaries. Both, according to him, oppressed the Armenians (*F.O.78-4683*, Jewett to Nicolson, Sivas, 10 September 1893). The British identified Jewett as "an American Consul," but this seems unlikely. See also *F.O.78-4683*,

no. 547, decipher from Mr. Herbert, Constantinople, 28 October 1895.

48. William Langer quoted in Kamuran Gürün, *The Armenian File*, London, 1985, p. 128. See also Sonyel, pp. 156 and 157.

49. The place of Russian agents in the early development of the Armenian revolutionary movement is little known. That Russia played an active part in the movement was accepted by contemporaries. See *F.O.424-132*, no. 101, Everett to Trotter, Mamakhatun, 5 June 1882 in British Documents II, no. 189, and the enclosures in *F.O.424-132*, no. 36, Dufferin to Granville, Constantinople, 11 February 1882, in British Documents II, no. 167.

50. *Turkey no. 7 (1880)*, no. 3, pp. 2-8, Layard to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Constantinople, 27 April 1880, in British Documents I, no. 354.

-130-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 130.

51. In unrest in Van Vilâyeti in 1892, Armenians were killed by Kurds, Kurds by Armenians, and Turks (soldiers and officials) by Kurds (*F.O.78-4683*, no. 17, Fitzmaurice to Graves, Van, 20 June 1892). This period in Turkish-Armenian relations is covered in Sonyel, pp. 155-99.

52. Gürün, pp. 139-42. Sonyel, pp. 155-59.

53. Gürün, pp. 150-54.

54. "Zeitunlis have surrounded the Turkish troops between Marash and Zeitoun" (*F.O.78-4683*, no. 565, decipher from Herbert, Therapia, 31

October 1895, quote from H.M. Consul in Aleppo; Herbert said that the Turks might be defeated).

55. The Ottoman general in charge estimated Armenian rebels in the ZeytunMaraş area at 8,000 (*F.O.78-4683*, no. 610, decipher from Herbert, Therapia, 5 November 1895, quote from H.M. Consul in Aleppo). See also Sonyel, pp. 158-72, and the numerous letters from Ottoman Ambassador, enclosing telegrams from Istanbul, on Armenians starting the 1895 troubles in Adana Vilâyeti, in *F.O. 78-4683* and *F.O.78-4683*, no. 534A, decipher from Currie, Therapia, 27 October 1895, evidence of H. M. Consul in Aleppo. Although the revolutionary impetus of the rebellion seems clear, contemporary Armenian sources blamed the disturbances in Zeytun in the 1890s on everything possible, including an alleged Ottoman plot to inject poison into Armenian children when they were given vaccinations (*F.O.78-4683*, *F.O.* summary of notes by Mr. Campbell of 8 January 1891).

56. Gürün, pp. 154-56. See also Sonyel, pp. 172-73. For a detailed picture of the Van Rebellion of 1895-96, see General Mayewski (*Consul Général de Russie à Van puis à Erzeroum*), *Les Massacres d'Arménie* (found in the British Library -- 9134.q2). This copy, dated 1916, states that it is a "painstaking transcription" from his report titled *Statistique des Provinces de Van et de Bitlis*, which was published in limited number by *L'Imprimerie Militaire à Pétersbourg*. The copy used is in Russian and French, and the section on the Van Rebellion is pp. 33-49. Other than this copy, I have only seen the Ottoman Turkish translation of the complete original, *Van ve Bitlis İstatistiği*, Mehmet Sadik, trans., Istanbul, 1330.

Mayewski offers many interesting insights on the Armenian revolutionaries, whom he excoriates, but he imputes most of their support to the British!

57. Also called Muşeg and Mushech.

58. Gürün, pp. 166-70 and Sonyel, pp. 281 and 282. See also United States National Archives, Department of State Records (hereafter U.S.) 867.4016/13, Rock hill to Secretary of State, Constantinople, 26 February 1913. *La Situation des Arméniens en Turquie, exposé par des documents, 1908-1912*, vol. III, the Report of "the late Babiguan Effendi, deputy from Adrianople," on the Adana Massacres. This is a

booklet published by the Armenian Patriarchate. On page 19, the author cites significant differences in the totals given for the numbers massacred. Armenians and some foreign journalists, according to Babikian (Babikian) said 25,000 to 30,000, but the government said approximately 6,000. He quotes Ottoman figures of 1,487 Muslims and 4,196 non-Muslims killed, a total of 5,683, but says many more were not registered. (The figure of 5,683 was reportedly taken from an analysis of the government population registers.) On the problems of the Armenians, see the various other publications in the same series in U.S. 867/4016/13, 17, 20, 21 (same title as basic series above). It is interesting that the Ottoman

-131-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 131.

government seems not to have stopped the printing and transmission of these Armenian propaganda documents. For a presentation of the Armenian historiography on this period, see the sources in the bibliography in Sarkissian, Hovannisian (*Road to Independence*, pp. 24-39), Ternon, and Pasdermadjian. There are, in addition, a great number of pro-Armenian books by Westerners printed at the time. For a representative sample of these, see the sources quoted in Richard G. Hovannisian, *Armenia on the Road to Independence, 1918*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1967, pp. 265-71.

59. *F.O.78-4483*, Graves to Nicolson, Erzeroum, 5 October 1893. Consul Stevens reported that families of Armenians moved from the Eleékirt region to Kars and whole villages were expected to move soon (*F.O.78-4683*, no. 22, Stevens to Rosebery, Batoum, 23 August 1893).

60. *F.O.78*, 3137, Biliotti to Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Tripoli, 1 October 1880.

61. *F.O.78-3137*, Biliotti to Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Fatsa, 1 August 1880. Consul Biliotti spoke to Greek emigrants from Gümühane who were leaving for Russia because of the closure of the Ottoman mines and the need for work (*F.O.78-2992*, no. 39, Biliotti to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Trebizond, 24 April 1879).
62. *F.O.78-3137*, no. 14, Biliotti to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Trebizond, 29 May 1880.
63. This is demonstrated by the fact that some Armenians who had fled to Russia in 1877-78 returned to the Ottoman Empire with Russian passports (*F.O. 78-2992*, Biliotti to Salisbury, Trebizond, 24 February 1879).
64. Many Armenian villagers spoke of emigrating who did not do so and probably had no intentions to do so. Their motives for spreading rumors of their imminent departure ranged from securing better treatment from local beys to forcing the Ottoman government not to settle Lazes in their villages (in which case, they stated, they would emigrate). See *F.O.78-3137*, Biliotti to Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Trebizond, 14 May 1880.
65. On the Russian use of disinformation and psychological pressure to foster Armenian emigration, see *F.O.424-74*, no. 436, Plunkett to Salisbury, St. Petersburg, 19 September 1878 in British Documents 1, no. 213, and *F.O.424-72*, no. 211, Layard to Salisbury, Therapia, 14 July 1878 in British Documents I, no. 182.
66. After noting how ready Russia was to accept and facilitate the immigration of most Christians from the Ottoman East, consul Biliotti added, "But the Russian Government seem to object to destitute Christians from Turkey being allowed to proceed to Russia, and orders to that effect have been forwarded to the [Ottoman] Valis (*F.O.78-3137*, Biliotti to Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Fatsa, 1 August 1880).
67. Actually "Fatsa, Uniah, Therme, and Tsharchembe".

68. *F.O.78-3137*, Biliotti to Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Uniah, 15 August 1880. Another example from Consul Biliotti: "The Caimakam of Ordoo reported to him [the "Governor General" of Trabzon Vilâyeti] not long ago that the inhabitants of three Greek villages in his district having manifested the intention to leave

-132-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 132.

the country, he had enquired from some of the natives as to the motives of their intended departure, and that they did not conceal from him that they were doing so at the instigation of the Russian Consular Agent at Kerassond, who had promised them money, lands, and other advantages in Russia" (*F.O.78-3137*, no. 6, Biliotti to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Trebizond, 30 April 1880).

69. *F.O.78-3137*, Biliotti to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Trebizond, 30 April 1880. The Ottoman policy of restricting emigration and, at the same time, investigating the causes of Armenian complaints was applied in other areas, as well. See *Turkey no. 1 (1890-91)*, no. 37/6, Lloyd to White, Erzeroum, 1 May 1890, in *British Documents II*, no. 350.

70. Biliotti enumerated the Christian emigrants in his district. See *F.O.783137*, Biliotti to Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Fatsa, 1 August 1880.

71. *F.O.424-145*, no. 66/1, Wratislaw to White, Erzeroum, 24 May 1888, in *British Documents II*, no. 286.

72. *F.O.78-3132*, no. 7, Trotter to Salisbury, Diarbekir, 3 March 1879.
73. *F.O.195-2992*, Biliotti to Her Majesty's Principle Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Trebizond, 9 May 1879.
74. Firuz Kazemzadeh, *The Struggle for Transcaucasia*, New York, 1951. References here are to the 1981 reprint, pp. 16-19. Kazemzadeh states that the Russians "played an infamous part in the Armeno-Azerbaijani riots. They had the power to prevent bloodshed, but instead abstained from interfering in the feud of the two peoples" (p. 19). On the intercommunal war, see Tadeusz Swietochowski, *Russian Azerbaijan, 1905-1920*, pp. 41-43. Luigi Villari (*Fire and Sword in the Caucasus*, London and New York, 1906, pp. 144-99) considers the same issue, with some interesting comments (i.e., pp. 145 and 196), but his accounts are so often at odds with all others and his opinions so one-sided that it is impossible to count him as a credible source.
75. *F.O.65-1714*, no. 7, Stevens to Landsdowne, Batoum, 25 February 1905.
76. *F.O.65-1714*, no. 9, Stevens to Landsdowne, Batoum, 1 March 1905.
77. *F.O.65-1714*, no. 15, Stevens to Landsdowne, Batoum, 10 March 1905.
78. "The disturbances seem to have arisen owing to the murder of a Mohammedan by Armenian soldiers and an attack on a respectable Mohammedan in the open street by Armenians" (*F.O.65-1699*, no. 142, Hardy to Landsdowne, St. Petersburg, 26 February 1905).
79. *F.O.65-1714*, "Report on the Situation in Baku from October 15 to 31 (o.s.)", 1905" by A. E. Randal McDonell, Acting Vice-Consul, transmitted in Stevens to Landsdowne, Batoum, 22 November 1905.
80. *F.O.65-1714*, no. 43, Stevens to Landsdowne, Batoum, 12 September 1905. Consul P. Stevens was no friend of those he called Tartars. Although he attempted to report events accurately, he constantly

avored the Armenian cause. For example, "Its superiority of intellect and its frugality [of what he called the 'Armenian Race'] has been able to work up a competition against which the Tartars can never aspire to cope with any degree of success" ([ibid](#)).

81. *F.O.65-1714*, Stevens to Landsdowne, Batoum, 20 June 1905.

82. *F.O.65-1714*, no. 33, Stevens to Landsdowne, Batoum, 20 June 1905.

-133-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 133.

83. *F.O.65-1714*, Stevens to Landsdowne, Batoum, 9 October 1905.

84. Leonard Ramsden Hartill, *Men Are Like That, Indianapolis*, 1928, pp. 20-21. This volume is the story of Ohanus Appressian in the years of the 1905 to 1921 wars in the Caucasus, as told to the American Hartill. Although Hartill undoubtedly "spruced-up" Apressian's story, the details and, in particular, his prejudiced opinions of the Tatars are too typical of Armenians of his age to have been made up by an American. Some of Appressian's descriptions are also accurate in a way that could not have been falsified. For example, his description of the fall of Kars to the Turks gives an accurate description of the precipitous Armenian retreat something that has only recently been accepted as historically accurate in the light of new evidence. If Hartill had drawn on the literary sources available to him at the time, he would have produced a very different account, one that depicted a gallant defense of the city.

85. *The Russian Empire, 1801-1917*, Oxford, 1967, p. 611. Firuz Kazemzadeh blames the Russian authorities for inaction without speculating on their purposes: "The Russian authorities played an infamous part in the Armeno-Azerbaijani riots. They had the power to prevent bloodshed, but instead abstained from interfering in the feud of

the two peoples. [Viceroy] Vorontsov-Dashkov himself admits that during the massacres of February 1905, the authorities remained almost completely inactive" (p. 19).

-134-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 134.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE BALKAN WARS

IN CONSIDERING MUSLIM LOSSES in the Balkan Wars, it should first be understood that Muslims were the majority community in the Ottoman Balkans before the wars began. Although the population was ethnically and religiously mixed, Muslims were the largest single religious community. They were, like other inhabitants of the Balkans, scattered throughout the region

TABLE 7. THE POPULATION OF OTTOMAN EUROPE, 1911, BY PROVINCE AND RELIGION (MILLET).*

Province	Muslim	Greek	Bulgarian	Total†
Edirne	760,000	396,000	171,000	1,427,000
Selanik	605,000	398,000	271,000	1,348,000
Yanya	245,000	311,000	-	561,000
Manastir	456,000	350,000	246,000	1,065,000
İškodra	218,000	11,000	-	349,000
Kosova	959,000	93,000	531,000	1,603,000
Total	3,242,000	1,558,000	1,220,000	6,353,000

* Rounded to the nearest thousands, with some rounding error.

† Includes groups not detailed in the table, such as Jews and Roman Catholics.

SOURCE: McCarthy, "The Population of Ottoman Europe". ¹

([Table 7](#)), with sizeable communities in every area. ²In many districts and three entire provinces -- Edirne, İşkodra, and Kosova -Muslims constituted an absolute majority, not merely a plurality.

By 1911, a de facto population exchange had already taken place in Ottoman Europe. Beginning as far in the past as the Christian reconquest of Hungary, Muslim migrants had been leaving

-135-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 135.

outposts of the empire and coming to other Ottoman lands. Large numbers of Caucasian Muslim refugees had been settled in the Balkans as well. In the period from 1875 to 1879, Muslims had left Bulgaria and Serbia and Bulgarians had emigrated from the Ottoman Empire to Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia. ³Thus Muslims were a greater percentage of the population of Ottoman Europe in 1911 than in the same area before 1877. They were an absolute, if slight, majority in Ottoman Europe ([Table 8](#)).

TABLE 8. OTTOMAN EUROPE IN 1911. PERCENTAGE POPULATION BY MILLET.

Muslim	51%
Greek	25%
Bulgarian	19%
Other	5%

SOURCE: McCarthy, "The Population of Ottoman Europe".

The demographic statistics, while they should be of interest to those who espouse the principle of self-determination, were in fact of no importance in deciding political realities in the Balkans. The Balkan Wars settled the issue

of who would rule and populate Ottoman Europe, not by a concept of majority rule, but by force of arms.

Treaties drawn up in the Spring of 1912 decided the ultimate fate of the Ottoman Empire in Europe. In them, Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece, and Montenegro, "with the active assistance of Russian diplomatic agents,"⁴ decided upon the dismemberment of the European Ottoman Empire. The allies could not agree on the final disposition of the conquered lands;⁵ but they agreed to first force the Ottomans from Europe, then divide the Ottoman territory. On 8 October 1912, Montenegro declared war on the Ottoman Empire and attacked Ottoman territory. The other Balkan states followed.

The First Balkan War (1912-13) was a much quicker defeat than the Ottomans had suffered in 1877-78. Outnumbered by two to one, still at war with Italy in Libya, denied the use of sea lanes by the Greek fleet, and hampered by Sultan Abdülhamid II's lack of military preparedness, the Ottoman Empire was easily defeated

-136-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 136.

by its former vassals. On 22 October, the Bulgarians, who were to bear the brunt of the fighting against the Ottomans, defeated them at Kirk Kilisse, then at Lüleburgaz (28 October to 3 November). The Ottomans were forced back to the Çatalca Line, their last redoubt before Istanbul. In the west, the Serbians defeated the Ottomans at Kumanova (24 to 26 October) and advanced to the Adriatic. Manastir fell to them on 18 November. The Greeks, relatively unopposed by Ottoman forces, advanced through southern Macedonia and took the great port city of Salonica on 8 November, one day before a Bulgarian detachment reached the city. The only areas still under Ottoman control in December of 1912 were the cities of Üsküdar (Scutari), Yanya (Janina), and Edirne, all under siege. In just two months of fighting, virtually all of Ottoman Europe had been lost. By April of 1913, the three cities had fallen as well -Yanya to the Greeks (5 March), Edirne to the Bulgarians (26 March), and Üsküdar to the Montenegrins (22 April).⁶

The Çatalca Line held against Bulgarian attack, saving the Ottoman capital, but it was only the falling out of the allies and the ensuing Second Balkan

War (1913) that enabled the Ottomans to salvage a small amount of their lost territory. While Greece, Montenegro, Serbia, and, later, Romania fought Bulgaria, Ottoman armies recaptured western Thrace, including Edirne and Kirk Kilisse.⁷

THE WARS AND THE BALKAN MUSLIMS

Generally speaking, more or less acute distress exists throughout Macedonia wherever a Muslim population remains, but in considerable sections of the country I doubt whether any Mussulman population does remain outside of the large towns.⁸

In their effect on the Muslim peasantry and Muslim city dwellers of the Balkans, the Balkan Wars were very similar to the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78. In both wars, murder, rape, and pillage drove Turks and other Muslims out of their homes and into what remained of the Ottoman Empire. In both wars, the end result was a great diminution of the Muslim population -- a diminution caused by murder, starvation, disease, and migration -- and the creation of majority Christian states.

-138-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 138.

There were also differences between the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 and the Balkan Wars of 1912-13. The earlier war had been guided by one hand, that of Russia. Russia had one singleminded intent -- the creation of a great Bulgarian state in the Balkans, a Slavic state denuded of Muslims and a bulwark for Russian interests in the region. By 1912, Russian affection for Bulgaria had cooled, and the hand of the Tsar was not seen in the Balkan Wars.⁹ Instead, Greece, Serbia, Montenegro, and Bulgaria each fought its own war against the Ottomans. The only real unity among the Balkan allies in the First Balkan War lay in the choice of an opponent. The fate of Balkan Muslims was affected by the confusion of allied plans. In 1877-78, the Russians had implemented an efficient plan to force Muslims to migrate. In the Balkan Wars, each of the victors also wished to see an end to the Muslim presence in the lands they had conquered. They were, however,

neither well-organized nor capable of unified action in gaining their goal. Rather than driving the Muslims out of the Balkans, they often drove them from the territory conquered by one Christian country into the territory conquered by another, and sometimes back again. The effect on the Muslims was, if anything, worse than in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78. Mortality among them was greater than it had been in 1878.

The speed of the conquest also greatly affected Balkan Muslims. Only those Muslims who left their villages at the very beginning of the First Balkan War could hope to flee while the lands through which they travelled were still safely held by the Ottomans. The remainder of the refugees was forced to flee through lands already conquered by troops of the Balkan allies, harried by Christian guerrillas. Naturally, many of them did not survive. Often only half of those who left the villages arrived at coastal cities, hoping for transportation out of the Balkans. ¹⁰

The shock troops who led the attack on the Turks of Bulgaria in 1877, who massacred Turks in the initial onslaughts and caused Muslims to flee, were the Cossacks, aided by Bulgarian villagers and insurgents. In the Balkan Wars, the lead was taken by the *komitajis*, nationalist guerrilla bands who had long been fighting in Ottoman Macedonia. ¹¹ They often had the active support of the states whose cause they espoused. Of the various komitaji groups, the most numerous and most dangerous were the Bulgarians, followed by the Serbians; Greek guerrilla bands were few. Because

-139-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 139.

the wars against the Ottomans were so quickly won, the komitajis were little needed in battle. From the beginning of the First Balkan War, their job was instead to attack villages and towns and enforce the dominance of their own ethnic group behind the lines. How many of their orders came from the Bulgarian or Serbian governments is unknown, but it is well-documented that official agents of those governments did nothing to stop komitaji depredations. There was probably little need to give orders to those who attacked Muslims; they simply had to be set free to do their work.

MURDER

Compared to the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78, the massacre of Muslims in the Balkan Wars was disorganized, but no less lethal. Bulgarians, Greeks, Serbians, and Montenegrins had little of the efficiency and military discipline of the Russians (as had been exemplified, for example, by the pattern of Cossacks disarming a Muslim village, then surrounding the village while Bulgarians plundered and murdered the inhabitants). The murders committed during the Balkan Wars were of the type that contemporaries called "race war." It is doubtful if komitaji groups, unlike the Cossacks, were part of a well-considered plan. They did not consider the political benefits of terror as they pillaged and massacred in Muslim villages.

Despite the differences between the two wars, the descriptions of individual massacres contained in consular records of 1912-13 are strikingly similar to those written in 1877-78. Substituting "Cossack" for "komitaji," descriptions such as the following British consular report could as easily have been for 1877 as for 1912:

It may be said without exaggeration that there is hardly a Turkish village in the districts of Cavalla and Drama which has not suffered at the hands of the Bulgarian Comitadjis and of the local Christian population. In many, scores of males have been massacred; in others, rape and pillage have taken place.

In the Cavalla region, apart from the murder of Cavalla Turks by comitadjis, already reported, the massacre of some 200 Turks is announced from Pravishta, and of an equal number at Sarishaban. In the Drama District, Chatalja, Doxat and Kirlikova have been the scene

-140-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 140.

of murders of Turks. Most of these murders took place shortly after the Bulgarian occupation, but some have been of more recent occurrence. ¹²

All the Christian allies engaged in large-scale massacres of village Muslims. For example, in the region of Avret-Hissar and Doyran, Bulgarians carried

out extensive massacres: in Rajanova, "scarcely a male Muslim has been left alive." ¹³All of the males of the village of Kurkut, along with many of the women and children, were collected in the mosque and in barns and were burned to death. ¹⁴In Demir Hissar, 64 Turks were gathered together and burned to death in a coffee house. ¹⁵Serbian komitajis flogged the Muslim villagers of Drenova to death. ¹⁶In the two districts of Ljouma and Dibra alone, more than 2,000 Muslims were massacred by Serbian troops. ¹⁷Western observers estimated that approximately 5,000 Albanian Muslims were killed "between Kumanova and Üsküb" and 5,000 in the Priştina area. ¹⁸In Doyran, 59 Muslims were killed when the city surrendered, without resistance, and many more were murdered in the surrounding countryside. ¹⁹Mass burning was also the method of execution chosen by Bulgarians for the Muslim inhabitants of Rainovo, Kilkis, and Plantza. ²⁰Turkish Muslims in Thrace were murdered in great numbers, which some Western European observers put at more than 200,000 (a figure that included some Greeks murdered by Bulgarians as well). ²¹Greeks, for their part, took Turks from all over the kaza of Pravišta to the ravine of Kasrub, murdered them there, and left the bodies as witness to the deeds. ²²It must be said, however, that not all Muslim villages were so treated.

Among the causes of Muslim mortality were starvation and disease -- the results of pillage, theft of land and crops, and the refugee state, all of which left Muslims with neither food nor housing.

Ottoman officials and Ottoman soldiers who had surrendered were especially ill-treated. In the case of the Ottoman soldiery, a great deal of ill-treatment might have been the result of hatred directed against those who had recently fought against the Christian armies, perhaps killing friends and family. Turkish soldiers were also a symbol of Ottoman authority, which the Christian countries intended to destroy. For example, Turkish prisoners were attacked at Stara-Zagora by Bulgarian civilians, with 500 to 600 killed and

-141-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 141.

250 wounded; ²³approximately 100 disbanded Ottoman soldiers were killed at Avret Hisar. ²⁴But in some cases soldiers were slowly murdered by starvation, part of a deliberate policy of allied governments, as seen in the case of Edirne. The selective murder of Muslim officials and city and village

leaders must also have been officially countenanced, as British Consul Lamb in Salonica reported: "Throughout the districts of Kilkish, Doiran, and Ghevgheli nearly all the leading Mussulmans have been put to death in one form or another, their property pillaged or destroyed and their farms and dwelling-houses burned. Their women also have been subjected to indignity and often worse." ²⁵

As might be expected, detailed accounts of massacres in villages were relatively few; events moved too fast for accurate reporting. The Western observers who were the main source of information on the atrocities seldom were able to visit Muslim villages while they were being sacked. Most reports simply mentioned once-thriving villages that were now empty, usually pillaged and burned. The Ottoman general İzzet Paşa, for example, listed some of the villages on the route of the Thracian Railroad in which the Muslim quarters had been destroyed: "Izzedine, Soubachi, Papasbourgas, Kestanlik, Tchanakdja, Ogluli, Indjeiz, Gueukjé, Cabakli, Mezel Bounar, Veli Keuy, Veli Meché, Gheckerler, Beyazkeuy, Akmankeuy, Mestanli, Soldjilar, Demiler, Tcherkesskeuy, Turbéderé, Akdjikeuy, Hatchilar, Jeniler, Pounar Bachi, . . ." ²⁶ Unfortunately, lists of empty and destroyed villages give little descriptive information on the fate of the villagers. Better-documented examples of the actions of the Balkan Allies toward Muslims can be found for the cities of the Ottoman Balkans: "Several hundreds" of Muslims were massacred when the Bulgarians entered Drama. ²⁷ The wounded Turkish soldiers left in Drama were almost all killed. ²⁸ In Dedeğaç, 140 "Macedonian Volunteers" took the city without resistance on 12 November 1912, in advance of the Bulgarian army. "Part of the Moslem Quarter was pillaged and wrecked, over a hundred Moslems were massacred, and some idea of the amount of robbery may be gathered from the fact that over 14,000 francs (in Turkish gold) was paid into the foreign post-offices for transmission to Bulgaria. Fearful devastation has been wrought in the surrounding country and many villages have been annihilated." ²⁹ The main mosque of Dedeğaç was bombed and burned, and observers saw piles of

-142-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 142.

Muslim bodies, especially in the neighborhood of the mosque. ³⁰ The cities of Edirne, Cavalla, Strumnitsa, Serres, and Dedeğaç provide a detailed view of the sort of pillage and death that accompanied conquest by the Balkan

allies, as follows:

Edirne. During the siege of Edirne, the city suffered from intensive Bulgarian shelling, much of which was directed at purely residential areas, but the greatest danger to the citizens was starvation. The stocks of food available to the city dwellers were depleted quickly. Some 20,000 refugees had come to the city in advance of the Bulgarian encirclement -- 20,000 more to divide what little was available. ³¹As the shelling demolished buildings, refugees from destroyed houses in Edirne joined the refugees from outside in buildings that "held twice as many as anyone would have believed they could." ³²During the siege, sugar, which was seldom available at all, increased thirty times in price, as did salt. Beans, lentils, peas, and rice, as well as other foodstuffs, were five times or more as expensive as in peacetime. ³³Toward the end of the siege, prices were meaningless, because food was unavailable.

Of course, suffering due to siege conditions is not the same as suffering visited upon an unarmed populace. The latter was to follow the Ottoman surrender of the city. Edirne fell on 26 March 1913. The victorious Bulgarians gave the city over to three consecutive days of unrestricted pillage before some order was restored. Houses and shops of Turks were primary targets of plundering by soldiers and the native Christian populace. ³⁴Much of the plundering seems to have been done by local Greeks, and there were reports of Bulgarian regular army officers who unsuccessfully attempted to stop the looting. There were also reports of the more usual practice of Bulgarian military patrols who cooperated with the thieves for a share of the spoils. ³⁵

As was usual in towns captured by Bulgarians, rape and murder accompanied the pillage. ³⁶Murder of civilians was far less in Edirne than in other conquered cities, however, perhaps because komitajis were not present or perhaps because the siege and capture of the city were relatively well-covered by European reporters. Neither factor aided the Ottoman soldiers who were in the city. When Edirne fell, the large Ottoman garrison was disarmed, imprisoned, and left without food or shelter. Gustav Cirilli, who had witnessed

entire siege of the city and its fall described the fate of the soldiers:

Long lines of prisoners pass on the streets, their officers leading them. They are gaunt, dejected, emaciated from starvation. They are driven like vile beasts by blows from fists, boots, and rifle butts. These unfortunates are penned in a place known as Eski Saray, a wooded island on the Toundja [River], outside of the city, where they are left to die of cold and starvation, unless a bullet puts an end to their suffering. Their unburied bodies pile higher each day, to the point where they are a danger to public health. And, in fact, cholera is once again within our walls.

The number of soldiers who have defended this place is known. Allowing for those who have died, 40,000 to 50,000 prisoners fell to the conquerors. Some of those, knowing the fate that awaited them, have tried to run away and hide. Woe to those who are recaptured, and to those who hide them! If it is suspected, even on the slightest evidence, that anyone is harboring a fugitive prisoner, the house is searched from the ground to the rafters, the fugitive is arrested, along with his accomplice, and both are shot. It is a manhunt, a hunt for Turks, with all the refinements of cruelty. Day and night the machine-guns rattle -these are the executions. The bodies are thrown in the streets, in the fields, in the rivers, and I have seen many of them lying on the road to Karağaç. ³⁷

On the island where the soldiers were interned, observers commented on corpses lying in heaps, men sleeping in the open in winter, the great incidence of cholera, and all the other horrors that had been inflicted on them. What seemed to cause the greatest impression upon Western Europeans, however, was the fact that all the trees on the island of detention had been stripped of their bark "as far as a man can reach." ³⁸ The sight of a forest denuded as high as a man's reach spoke eloquently of the starvation of those who had eaten the bark.

By April of 1913, approximately one-half of the prisoners remained alive -- 6,000 in the camp on the island, another 15,000 to 20,000 on the banks of the river. Two hundred were dying each day. Others were being marched off to an uncertain fate. ³⁹

Cavalla. Cavalla was a relatively small port city in southern Macedonia, the center of the Kavalla Kazasi of Drama Sancağı. During the First Balkan War, its population swelled with Turkish

refugees who fled to the city first from the southern slopes of the Rhodope Mountains, then from cities such as Drama and Praviĭta. The city was thus crowded when Bulgarian forces arrived, even though some refugees had gone on to Egypt, Istanbul, and Anatolia. ⁴⁰The first Bulgarians to arrive were komitajis, who pillaged as they had pillaged cities elsewhere. The pillage did not stop when Bulgarian regular soldiers under the command of one Major Zetchef arrived. They joined in the sack and the torture and murder of Turks, approximately 200 of whom were killed during the first days of the Bulgarian occupation. British Consul Young commented on one town: "At the village of Sarashaban I am told that out of 220 families, 181 Turks were killed. The women were divided among the captors. The place is now a desert. A Bulgarian mayor has been installed." ⁴¹

The Ottomans estimated that 7,000 Muslim refugees were killed in the Cavalla region alone. ⁴²The events in Cavalla demonstrate that, while Bulgarian regular soldiers may not have been the prime murderers of Muslims, the Bulgarian government was nevertheless an accomplice. No attempt was made, at Cavalla or elsewhere, to stop the komitaji's marauding. ⁴³Either because of sympathy with the actions of the komitajis or because of orders from their superiors, Major Zetchef and his fellows all over the Balkans were content to watch the destruction of Muslims.

Strumnitsa. The city of Strumnitsa was in north-central Macedonia, in an area claimed by both Serbia and Bulgaria. It was occupied first by Bulgarians, then Serbians. Of the two, the Serbian occupation was the more fatal to the Muslim population. Knowing of Bulgarian atrocities elsewhere, however, one cannot generalize from the case of Strumnitsa that Serbians were in general any worse than Bulgarians.

There was no defense of Strumnitsa. Situated as it was at a point almost equidistant from Serbian, Bulgarian, and Greek forces, and with no hope of help from Ottoman forces, Strumnitsa immediately capitulated to the first conquerors who appeared, the Bulgarians, who seem to have only engaged in plunder. They were soon replaced by Serbian troops, who had been allotted the town. In two weeks of November 1912, more than 500 (557 were recorded) Turks were ordered killed by a commission of Serbs, Greeks, and

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 145.

Bulgarians set up for that purpose by the authorities. Consul Lamb reported:

All the Turks in that place, between the ages of 20 and 50, were arrested in daily batches and brought before the Commission, which examined them separately and then decided their fate by votation [i.e., by vote]. If six out of the seven members of the Court declared him to have been a good man, the "suspect" was released, after being relieved of everything of value that he might happen to have upon him. If not, he was conducted to prison. After one or two days' confinement, the prisoners were first stripped to their shirts, then driven at the point of the bayonet to the slaughter-houses on the outskirts of the town, and finally shot or bayoneted to death. Amongst the victims were a number of soldiers (probably Redifs) who had laid down their arms, and refugees from Radovishta and Osmanie, who had fled before the advancing foe. Many of these had previously enjoyed an excellent reputation. . . . Many of the victims were atrociously mutilated by their executioners, before or after death. ⁴⁴

In addition to the murders in Strumnitsa itself, it was estimated that 150 Turks had been killed by Serbian bands in the outlying villages of the Strumnitsa district. What is especially significant is that the killers were "the bands of Tchakoff and Hadji Manoff, [who were] entrusted with the policing of the district." ⁴⁵

As elsewhere, the new authorities in Strumnitsa were deeply involved with plundering Muslim belongings. The Serbian prefect of the city personally sent 80 cartloads of stolen goods to Belgrade. ⁴⁶

Serres. In Serres, a town in southern Macedonia situated between Salonica and Drama, Muslims once again surrendered peaceably to the Bulgarians. Once again Bulgarian regulars did nothing to stop the pillage and murder of Muslims. Turkish and Greek sources list great numbers of dead from the Serres massacres (600 to 5,000 killed). ⁴⁷ The following British consular account is probably more accurate:

Serres -- Here the Heads of the Christian and Mussulman Communities had signed, before the Bulgarians came into town, a bond of mutual protection and support. On the approach of the Bulgarians the town surrendered to a band under the command of Tchetnik Tzankoff -- the

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 146.

Mutesarrif, together with the kaimakams of several of the dependent kazas and many notables of the town, taking refuge with their families at the residence of the Greek Archbishop. The bandits immediately set to work to plunder the Mussulman quarters, literally stripping the better-class houses and committing many acts of violence against women and girls. The arrival of regular troops failed to change the situation, and a few days later (November 16th, see my dispatch No. 161 of the 24th) a few shots fired by an "agent provocateur" provided the desired pretext for a general massacre of the Turks, which would almost certainly have been carried out, if it had not been for the prompt intervention of Mgr. Apostolos, the Greek Metropolitan, who rode at once to the Bulgarian headquarters and pleaded the mutual undertaking above alluded to. As it was, in the space of about two hours, between 150 and 200 Turks were slaughtered and nearly every Mussulman house or shop was pillaged. ⁴⁸

The incidents at Serres confirm the impressions drawn from other occupied cities. The pattern is plain: The Ottoman army gone, cities surrendered peacefully to komitajis, who pillaged and murdered Muslims. The regular army eventually arrived, but this had little effect on the ongoing massacre, rape, and pillage. Serres differed only in that the city luckily possessed a Greek metropolitan of courage and honor. All too often the history of the Balkan Wars featured priests and bishops for whom an enemy's different religion or ethnic group was an absolution from Christian morality. The Greek Metropolitan of Serres was an example of one who could more properly be called a Man of God.

The unfortunate people of Serres also suffered greatly from the typhoid fever and famine that accompanied the invasion. The Ottoman government estimated that 1,700 to 2,000 died from both causes. ⁴⁹

Dedeagac. The situation in Dedeagac (Alexandroupolis) was similar to that in Serres -- peaceful surrender to the Bulgarian komitajis, followed by plunder and murder. Perhaps 3,000 Muslim citizens of the city and refugees were killed. Dynamite was employed to destroy Muslim houses and mosques. The Greek bishop was notable for protecting whichever Muslims he could, yet the Greek citizenry joined the Bulgarians in the pillage of Muslims. ⁵⁰

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 147.

PILLAGE AND DESTRUCTION

The obvious intention of those who murdered Muslims and forced their exodus was to "de-Turkify" the Balkans. Inspired by partially assimilated ideas of nationalism on the one hand and by the desire to take Muslim lands and belongings on the other, Balkan Christians pursued policies that would insure that Muslim refugees would not return and that those who had not left would do so. The most successful of these policies were the destruction of Muslim housing and the theft of livestock and food -- Muslims living in villages would be forced to leave to find food and shelter when all their cattle had been stolen and their houses destroyed, even if they, themselves, were allowed to survive. Both komitajis and regular army troops were agents of destruction. Even in the midst of rapid conquests, some Christian armies paused to destroy every Muslim village in the vicinity; more often, the destruction was left to irregulars who accompanied the armies. Speaking of the Bulgarian army, British Vice-Consul Young at Cavalla remarked, "The track of the invading army is marked by 80 miles of ruined villages." ⁵¹

Albania. The Montenegrin soldiers who invaded Albania seem to have destroyed everything in their path. Catholic as well as Muslim villages were destroyed. ⁵² They felled so much timber on their line of march that after they had finally withdrawn, returning refugees could not find wood to put roofs on what few houses remained. ⁵³

A large region of Albania "was invaded and devastated by the Serbs and the Montenegrins about the same time." ⁵⁴ The passing of the armies literally left nothing for the survivors. Tens of thousands became refugees in Üsküdar (İşkodra) and other cities. Many of those who had survived had been spared death by massacre only to die a slow, more terrible death by starvation. ⁵⁵ Even had the Albanian Muslims been able to return safely to their homes, they would have found no roofs or walls to keep out the cold, nor any food to eat, nor any seed to plant for future harvests.

Because Albania was far removed from ordinary communications lines with the outside world and foreign observers were few, information on the

Albanian Muslims is scarce. What evidence exists indicates that the Greek invaders in southern Albania treated Albanian Muslims with much more humanity than did the Serbians

-148-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 148.

and Montenegrins in the north and west. ⁵⁶ Nevertheless, Greeks did burn and pillage Muslim villages, drove Muslims from their homes in towns to make way for Greek soldiers, and imprisoned or deported from the occupied territories local Muslim notables. ⁵⁷ Observers on the European Commission of Control, which had been sent to Albania to oversee events there, reported incidents of mass murder of Muslim civilians. ⁵⁸ There were numerous other claims by local Muslims of massacres of villagers by Greeks, but these were uncorroborated by neutral witnesses. ⁵⁹

The European Commission of Control, which had been sent to Albania to supervise events there and watch over the creation of a new Albanian state, collected information on the effects of the Balkan Wars on Albanian Muslims. In one report, the British representative Lamb included a table of Muslim losses in 102 villages of "the eastern districts of Albania (Liuma and the two Dibras)," which included 2,044 people massacred, 2,800 houses burned, and 25,000 animals carried off. The statistics, which had been drawn up during two tours of inspection by the Italian Colonel Muricchio, only included sheep that had actually been carried off from villages by Serbian troops. Most of the animals had been taken into the Macedonian plain for winter by their shepherds, who were killed and their sheep taken. Lamb estimated that 700,000 sheep were thus lost to the Muslims, forcing starvation on them. ⁶⁰

Manastir. The Province of Manastir provides a good example of the type of destruction that was visited upon Muslim villages throughout the Balkans. The Muslims of Manastir Vilâyeti were slightly more than 40 percent of the total population and were the largest single religious group. Yet the majority of Manastir Muslims were either killed or were forced to flee when the Serbians and Bulgarians invaded the province ⁶¹:

[British consul Greig in Manastir] The war has caused great distress in the Monastir district. It is believed that about 80 per cent. of the villages

inhabited exclusively by Moslems, and of the Moslem quarters of villages with a mixed population, have been sacked and partially or wholly destroyed, or both, throughout the kazas of Monastir, Kirchevo, Florina, Serfidjé, Kailar, Kozhani, Elassona, Grevena, Naselitch, and Kastoria. Considerable distress is also reported amongst both Christians and Moslems in the Gorcha and Dibra districts.

-149-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 149.

Subsequent enquiry will probably show that the irregulars troops attached to the contending armies and parties of marauders from neighboring Christian villages were mainly responsible for the work of destruction.

The destruction has not been limited to Moslem villages. In the kaza of Florina the Christian population suffered severely, especially around Sorovitch, Banitsa, and Eksisou. But, so far as is known, enough villages have everywhere survived to harbour all the [Christian] refugees. No place has been heard of where the Christian villagers are in any danger of starvation. In many cases they have actually been enriched by plunder from their Moslem neighbors. ⁶²

In practice, this meant that Muslim refugees had nowhere to go. Aid to Muslim refugees in Manastir and other cities was very limited, and there was no way in which Muslims could live in their old villages, which were uninhabitable. It would have taken an effort of the Serbian government to provide the refugees with seed, farm implements, and animals so that they could begin farming once again in their villages. No such aid was forthcoming. Consul Greig wrote that the crops (and, most importantly, seed for planting) of Muslims had been taken, as had their cattle and even the wooden roofs of their houses. The Serbian government provided them no assistance, but insisted on collection of all their taxes. ⁶³

It is difficult to say if the Serbians had any master plan that governed the sack and destruction of Muslim houses and villages. Perhaps hatred of Muslims and sheer greed would have been enough motivation. Muslims were indeed driven out of Serbian-held lands -driven west to Albania or south to the Aegean. ⁶⁴ Both Serbian regulars and komitajis pillaged and destroyed Muslim villages and small towns in northern Macedonia and in Albania. In

the "Krchevo-Krushovo" district of Manastir Vilâyeti, 19 of the 36 Muslim villages were plundered and wholly or partially destroyed. Large sums were extorted from rich Muslims who had survived the "wanton massacre of men, women, and children by officially organized bands of Bulgarian komitajis." ⁶⁵ Poorer peasants were relieved of grain, seed, animals, and all else they possessed. Six hundred houses in the district were destroyed and 503 men, 27 women, and 25 children killed. Those who remained alive were either refugees in the town of Krchevo or were still in their villages, "starving in the ruins." ⁶⁶

-150-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 150.

In Serbian-occupied areas, taxation was also used as a weapon against Muslims. In addition to illegal confiscations of all sorts, Muslim peasants were subject to the old Ottoman taxes and certain new ones. ⁶⁷ This would not necessarily have been inequitable, were the taxes not collected on land that produced nothing. Serbian officials in the Manastir area, for example, attempted to collect from refugees taxes on farms from which the refugees had been driven and from which they naturally harvested no crops. ⁶⁸ For many peasants, the only way to escape such taxation was emigration.

Bulgarian Conquests. After the Bulgarians had assumed control of Cavalla, they issued instructions that Muslim peasants were to return to their lands (away from the eyes of Western Europeans), under the pain of flogging if they remained in the city. The peasants did return to their homes in the mountains south of the old Bulgarian border; however, when they arrived they found nothing: "Most of the inhabitants fled before the advancing Bulgarian troops at the beginning of the war, and on returning some time later to their villages found them burnt, their flocks carried off, and their means of subsistence gone." ⁶⁹ Knowing the plight of the returned refugees, foreign relief agencies attempted to assist them. The Bulgarian authorities refused to allow them to help. ⁷⁰

The Bulgarians destroyed entire regions of Turkish villages. Concerning Macedonia, Consul Lamb at Salonica reported that Bulgarians had destroyed the Muslim quarters of the town of Melnik and had sacked most of the Muslim villages in the region, as they had done in Radovišta. ⁷¹ Bulgarian actions were the same farther east, in Thrace: "With the exception of the

districts lying between the Maritza River and the Uzunkeupru-Keshan road, practically all the Moslem villages west of the Chatalja lines were destroyed during the recent war between Turkey and the Allies." ⁷²

Cities. Cities were, of course, pillaged as well, but in cities looting was more common than outright destruction. It would have made little sense for the Christian occupying powers to have allowed the destruction of major cities such as Salonica and Edirne that had become theirs. They did, however, allow, even foster, the robbery of Muslims. Greek soldiers and civilians plundered Salonica for weeks after its capture. ⁷³ The Greeks also burned down the Turkish

-151-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 151.

and Gypsy quarters of Dedeşaç before turning the city over by agreement to the Bulgarians in the First Balkan War. Muslim and Bulgarian moveable property was carried away by the army to Greece. ⁷⁴ This pillaging by Greeks, Bulgarians, and Serbians in occupied cities has already been described. It was a constant feature in the conquest of each Balkan city.

The result of the destruction of Muslim houses and theft of crops and farm animals was starvation. Stocks that should have fed peasants over the winter were stolen. If they survived the winter, the peasants still had no seeds to plant for the next year's harvest, because the seeds, too, had been stolen or eaten. If some seed still existed, there were no animals to plow the land. Because of this, in 1913 there was much starvation in the provinces of Kosova and Manastir and elsewhere. ⁷⁵

FORCED CONVERSION TO CHRISTIANITY

During the Balkan Wars the Bulgarians carried out a selective policy of forcibly converting into the Bulgarian Orthodox Church those whom it conquered. For Greek Orthodox Christians, this involved a translation from Greek to Bulgarian Orthodoxy and a change in ecclesiastical loyalty from Greek to Bulgarian bishops. It was paralleled by similar forced translations

of Bulgarian Christians to Greek Orthodoxy in territories conquered by Greeks and Serbs. ⁷⁶In all of the conquered territories, there were Christians who lost their Church positions and sometimes their lives for their refusal to accept the dominant sect. ⁷⁷In general, however, conversion was relatively easily and bloodlessly accomplished. The Greek Orthodox in Macedonia were often Slavophone Christians who, while they might not have relished entering the Bulgarian Church, found conversion to be a theologically easy process. Doctrinal differences between the two churches were few. ⁷⁸The real difficulty for the convert was that by accepting a new religious identification he was also accepting a new ethnic and national identity. The Ottoman concept of religiously defined millets was strong in the minds of the Christians of the successor states.

For Muslims, the process of conversion was much more difficult. A Turkish Muslim who converted renounced his ancestry,

-152-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 152.

many of his customs, his ethnic identity, and his family, as well as his religion. To a believing Muslim, to accept baptism was to accept eternal damnation. ⁷⁹Therefore, conversions of Muslims were very much a thing of force. As had the Muslims and Jews in Spain in the fifteenth century, Muslims of the Balkans went to any lengths to escape the possibility of forced conversion. Their primary response was, of course, flight, but Muslims caught behind Bulgarian lines could be forced to choose between conversion and **death**.

Bulgarians attempted to forcibly convert many Turkish Muslims. For example, in the Eski Kavalla area, forcible conversions in some regions caused a general exodus of the area's Turks to Cavalla, ⁸⁰and in Osmaniye only the Turks who converted were not killed. ⁸¹It was the Pomaks of the Rhodope Mountains who were especially singled out by the Bulgarians for conversion. The Pomaks were Slavic-speaking Muslims who had converted to Islam centuries earlier, but had kept many of the same customs as their Bulgarian neighbors. They were obvious candidates for conversion, since Islam was the one factor that kept them from assimilating into the Bulgarian nation. Bulgarian Orthodox priests were sent into Pomak villages, accompanied by armed soldiers and komitajis, "to compel the Pomak

population to embrace Christianity." ⁸²Here is an example of the methods of conversion:

At Pechtchévo (Malèche plateau) a special committee has been formed, with the Bulgarian Sub-prefect, Chatoyev, as its President, and among its members John Ingilisov, the director of Bulgarian schools, and the priest, Chatoyev, the brother of the Sub-Prefect. This committee was instituted to convert all the Turks of Malèche to Christianity. By order of the committee, 400 peasants of the place were armed with muskets and sticks; they attacked Turks of the neighboring villages and forcibly led them into the church at Verovo, where they were all baptized. ⁸³

And here is another example:

The Moslems were ranged in groups. Each group was given some baptismal name, generally a name honored in the Bulgarian church or in Bulgarian history. An exarchist pope [sic, probably a priest] then passed from group to group and took aside his catechumens *sui generis*; and while sprinkling his forehead with holy water with one hand, with the other he compelled him to bite a sausage. The holy water represented baptism, the piece of sausage renunciation of the Moslem faith, since the Koran forbids the eating of pork. The conversion was completed

-153-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 153.

by the issue of a certificate adorned with a picture of the baptism of Jesus, the price of which varied between one and three francs. A friend who arrived today from Thrace told me that what is happening in Macedonia is also happening there. He showed me two baptismal certificates. He added that the converted were obliged to give up their fez, and the converted women to walk in the streets with their faces uncovered. ⁸⁴

The long-term success of these forced conversions cannot have been great, due to the steadfastness in the religion of the Pomaks and Turks. ⁸⁵The descendants of the Muslims who survived the horrors of 1912 and 1913 still form a Muslim minority in their homeland today. ⁸⁶

CHRISTIAN SUFFERING

Muslims were by no means the only ones who suffered in the Balkan Wars. In a volume dedicated to the description of Muslim losses, Muslim sufferings have naturally been described here in detail. However, Bulgarians, Greeks, and, to a lesser extent, others were also the victims of atrocities. Most of these atrocities came in the Second Balkan War, when former Christian allies attacked each other. The Bulgarian massacres of Greeks in Serres, Demir Hisar, Doxato, and other towns have been recounted at length elsewhere,⁸⁷ as have the Greek massacres of Bulgarians at Kukuş and at numerous Bulgarian villages.⁸⁸ In like fashion, the Bulgarians and Serbians each assaulted the civilian populations of the other in the Second Balkan War. Ethnic hatred recently directed against the Turks was enlarged to include Bulgarians, Greeks, or Serbs. The documentation on atrocities among the erstwhile allies is extensive, primarily because Western European observers were much more aghast at Christian killing Christian than they had been at Christian killing Muslim, and thus recorded their feelings at length.⁸⁹

Although isolated instances of Muslim outrages against Christian villagers at the beginning of the First Balkan War were recorded, they were few. Whether Muslim soldiers and villagers would have massacred Christians in the first war is unknown. There simply was no time. The speedy defeat of the Ottoman forces left no chance for anything but flight. Large-scale Muslim atrocities against Chris-

-154-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 154.

tians⁹⁰ only arose in the Second Balkan War, when the Turks were given a chance at revenge.

At the outbreak of the first Balkan war the Turkish ablebodied male population of Kirka [a village in eastern Thrace], before setting forth to fight, consigned its old men, women, and children to the care of the Greeks of the village, who, on the news of the Turkish defeats, massacred them all. When the Turks re-entered Thrace they slew the [village's] entire Greek population and gutted the village. The charred remains of many of the

victims were still to be seen in the church last month. ⁹¹

In the second war, throughout eastern Thrace, Ottoman soldiers and returning refugees treated Christians, especially Bulgarians, as they, the Muslims, had been treated. ⁹² Some Bulgarian villages were destroyed, others sacked. ⁹³ For example, when the Bulgarians invaded, the Turkish quarter of Havza was destroyed. Upon the Turkish reconquest, all the Bulgarian houses of a nearby Bulgarian village were razed in retaliation. In Tekirdağ, Malkara, and other cities, Christians were raped and killed: "The results were nineteen corpses buried in Rodosto [Tekirdağ] and eighty-one victims disappeared and evidently slain in the fields." ⁹⁴ Bulgarian refugees were harried as they fled and many were killed.

A large number of Greek and Bulgarian refugees fled eastern Thrace during both Balkan Wars. When the Bulgarians initially took the region, a certain number of Greeks set out for Greek-held territory in western Thrace and Macedonia. More Greeks fled in 1913 when Ottoman troops reclaimed eastern Thrace. In all, perhaps 20,000 Greeks, approximately five percent of the prewar Greek population of the Edirne Vilâyeti, migrated. ⁹⁵ A much greater percentage of the Vilayet's Bulgarian Christians fled. More than 50,000 may have left the area reconquered by the Ottomans, which comprised more than half the Bulgarian population of the area. ⁹⁶

Of the two Christian groups, the Bulgarians suffered the worse fate. Greeks leaving eastern Thrace could expect to find land in Greek Macedonia. Since Greece had won the wars, much property of evicted Muslims and Bulgarians was available. Bulgaria, on the other hand, had lost. The conquered lands given to Bulgaria at the Treaty of Bucharest, which ended the Second Balkan War, were small in area and often mountainous, and Bulgarian refugees from eastern Thrace had to vie with Bulgarian refugees from lands taken by Serbia and Greece. The Bulgarian government listed more than 100,000 refugees from all areas who had gone to Bulgaria. ⁹⁷

-155-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 155.

MUSLIM REFUGEES

The entire population of the countryside is fleeing southwards. Not only the population of the district held by the Bulgars; nor of the regions in which actual fighting is taking place. The entire population. ⁹⁸

During the First Balkan War, Muslims fled in great waves to three gathering points of refugees -- Albania and the cities of Salonica and Edirne. Ethnically Albanian Muslims were forcibly driven from the Ottoman vilâyet of Kosova into Albania by Serbian troops, joining other Muslims who had fled ahead of the armies. ⁹⁹ Some Muslims of Yanya Vilâyeti, taken by Greece, also fled to Albania. However, the number of refugees to Albania remained small, a much smaller group than those who fled elsewhere, because Albania was too poor to support refugees. Refugees to Albania had few places to go for succor. Some probably survived and became part of the Muslim population of the truncated Albanian state. Given the generally poor conditions in Albania, however, most of them probably perished. ¹⁰⁰

The refugees in Albania, of whom there were approximately 60,000, had fled from the regions of Debre (Dibra), Kirçova (Kirtchevo), and Görice (Koritzza) in Manastir Vilâyeti after a futile attempt to resist the Serbs. Others came from the region of Yakova (in Kosova Vilâyeti), again refugees from the Serbs and Montenegrins. ¹⁰¹ By November of 1918, 9,000 Muslim refugees were in Üsküdar alone. ¹⁰² Perhaps 30,000 to 40,000 were in the district of Elbessan. ¹⁰³ Many were in the mountains, usually without food, and most of those must have died. The refugees seem to have especially feared the Montenegrins, who burned down each Muslim village they reached, whether they met resistance or not. ¹⁰⁴

The refugees in Salonica fared better than those in Albania. Salonica became the depot for Muslim refugees from areas taken by all three Christian powers -- Muslims of the vilayets of Kosova, Manastir, and Selanik. In Salonica, there were no organized assistance programs for Turkish refugees, and disease and starvation claimed many, but groups such as the Salonica Islamic Committee did arrange for ships to take many to Anatolia. Immediately after the wars, the Greek government organized convoys of the remaining refugees and sent them to Ottoman lands. ¹⁰⁵

Refugees from the area south of the old Bulgarian border, from Nevrekob, Rubçuz, and Razlog, as well as from the Drama, Pravishta, Sarşaban, and Cavalla regions, fled into the city of Cavalla as soon as the war began. Some 10,000 refugees had gathered in Cavalla by November of 1913. Some of these were removed by boat. The Khedive of Egypt arranged the passage of 5,000 to Egypt aboard his private yacht. As more refugees arrived, they were gradually shipped off to Istanbul and İzmir, perhaps 15,000 in all. ¹⁰⁶

Muslim refugees were attacked on the roads as they fled. Due to the rapid collapse of the Ottoman armies, refugees often had little time to reach places of relative safety before they were overcome by Bulgarian or Greek troops. Even if no regular troops reached the refugees, there was great danger from groups of Bulgarian komitajis. The komitajis operated behind Ottoman lines and, when the Ottoman armies broke up or surrendered, the komitajis outpaced the regular armies in reaching Turkish villages and groups of refugees. They seized or extorted all they could from the refugees, physically assaulting and raping and often killing many or all in a refugee group. "Of some 1500 Mussulmans who endeavored to escape to Cavalla [from Drama], barely half are believed to have reached the latter place. For 8 or 10 days afterwards the road is stated to have been quite thickly strewn with unburied corpses." ¹⁰⁷

Disease was a major cause of mortality among the refugees. In addition to the expected cases of typhus and typhoid, which ravaged the refugees of the Balkan Wars, just as these diseases had those from earlier wars, cholera appeared in the refugee camps outside of Istanbul. Attempts were made by Ottoman and Western relief agencies to assist the victims, but, once again, the speed of the Ottoman loss made it difficult to organize relief measures. ¹⁰⁸

Cessation of fighting did not mean safety for Muslim refugees. They were torn between emigration to an unknown, but Muslimruled, land or waiting for the chance to return to their villages, now under Christian rule. Many chose the latter. The lands they hoped to retain had often been in the possession of their families for centuries. Moreover, their experiences as refugees cannot have made them desirous to continue in refugee status, and travelling to Anatolia or elsewhere, to a place where they had no land or history, must have seemed to be a promise of continued life as a refugee. In the face of migration to an unknown land, the chance of return

Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 157.

to their homes must have had great appeal. Despite their bitter knowledge of the hatred of their neighbors, the danger from the komitajis, and the animosity of the new governments, many Muslim refugees must have told themselves that all would be well if somehow they returned home. For all peoples, the image of Home has a powerful magic.

It was often the case, of course, that refugees had no option of further flight. Unable to escape to what remained of the Ottoman Empire, driven from their refuges by the conquerors, they had no choice but to try to return home:

Notice had been given by means of public criers that all the refugees from the surrounding country, who had collected in the town [Serres], should return freely to their villages. A large number of Turks from the Melnik district accordingly set out to return, but, on arriving in the neighborhood of Petrich, they began to learn that their villages had in the meantime been [destroyed] as above related. They therefore halted in the town of Petrich where, on the 4-17th November the Bulgars fell upon them and massacred over 200. Twelve hundred (?) more are said to have been massacred at Orman Tchiftlik on the banks of the Strouma Karasou, into which their corpses were mostly flung. 150 more were murdered at the village of Gjurgjevo, from which also 1200 head of cattle and 13,000 goats were looted by the neighboring Bulgarian villagers. Six women were forcibly converted to Christianity. On the 20 [November]-2 December a public crier invited all the Mussulmans still remaining in Petrich to assemble before the Sub-Governor. They accordingly presented themselves to the number of 364, who were dispatched to the barracks escorted by soldiers with fixed bayonets. 160 of these were at once put to **death**, the remainder being temporarily spared, but a few days later another hundred of them were also put to **death**.

The villagers of Katountza, who had actually returned to their village under safe-conduct from the authorities at Serres, were first plundered of what little they had left and then massacred by a band of 15 irregulars, after they had been three or four days in their homes. ¹⁰⁹

There were many similar occurrences elsewhere. For example, columns of Muslim refugees from Strumnitsa and Radovišta were fleeing toward Salonica when they were overtaken by Bulgarian soldiers. Their opportunities limited, the refugees turned around. They had reached Kostorino, half-way between Doyran and Strumnitsa, when they were

attacked by local Bulgarians. Between 700

-158-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 158.

and 800 were reportedly massacred and 400 died of cold and starvation. ¹¹⁰

Not all refugees from occupied areas fled during the wars. A certain number of Muslims in areas such as Strumnitsa and Melnik managed to survive the initial depredations of the Bulgarian and Greek occupations. Although the Greeks held the region at the end of the wars, by the terms of the Treaty of Bucharest, those areas were given to the Bulgarians. The Greeks insured that the Bulgarians would find a wasteland by removing the population and destroying most of the houses when they left. ¹¹¹ In Strumnitsa and neighboring villages, word was spread by Greek officials that all Muslims and Greeks would be massacred by the Bulgarians if they remained -- given past events, a credible threat. Moreover, they were told that their houses would be burned by the Greek army as it retreated. Those who still wished to remain, mostly Muslims and Jews, were forced out at bayonet point. From 21 to 23 August 1913, Greek soldiers burnt the houses vacated by the refugees. The Greek press and government, in an effort at swaying European opinion, declared that the refugees had burnt their houses down "with their own hands," rather than remain under Bulgarian rule. Greek refugees from the Strumnitsa region were given the houses and farms of Bulgarians and Muslims who had been evicted (or had died) in the Kukush region taken by Greece. The Muslim refugees were given nothing. ¹¹²

TABLE 9. MUSLIM REFUGEE NUMBERS.

Salonica	30,000	9 March 1913 ¹¹³
Manastir	9,000	9 March 1913 ¹¹³
	8,000	30 November 1913 ¹¹⁴
Serres	4,000	9 March 1913 ¹¹³
Drama	1,000	9 March 1913 ¹¹³
Gevgili	1,000	9 March 1913 ¹¹³

Üsküdar	8,500	28 October 1913 ¹¹⁵
	9,000	18 November 1913 ¹¹⁶
	2,500	20 December 1913 ¹¹⁷
Cavalla	20,000	8 November 1912 ¹¹⁸
	10,000	26 August 1913 ¹¹⁹
Biga	30,000	23 December 1912 ¹²⁰
İzmir	65,000	18 July 1913 ¹²¹

-159-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 159.

Table 9 gives a rough idea of the refugee numbers in cities, as estimated by European observers at various times. The figures give little more than an approximate impression of refugee numbers. Many of the refugees had already passed through the cities when the numbers were estimated; many never stopped in the cities at all; and many of those listed in Table 9 died before they reached a safe refuge. Moreover, a large number of refugees moved back and forth across the Balkans, following their own hopes that they would once again be received in the villages from which they had fled or following the changing luck of the Ottoman armies. Edirne, for example, had received the Turkish refugees of western Selanik Vilâyeti (western Macedonia) and Edirne Vilâyeti (eastern Thrace). The refugees who escaped to Edirne were forced to flee once again when the Bulgarian armies conquered Edirne Vilâyeti. They went to Istanbul and Anatolia, some returning with the Ottoman armies when much of Edirne Vilâyeti was reconquered in the Second Balkan War.

Although difficult to believe, many Muslims seem to have remained on their lands during the First Balkan War, or to have returned to them soon after the war, only to be finally driven out in the second war. When the American Carnegie Commission of Inquiry visited Salonica during the Second Balkan War they found that 135,000 Muslims had already come to the city during the second war alone, and more were arriving. ¹²²

Bulgaria and the Ottoman Empire signed a convention (October 1913) for the exchange of Thracian Bulgarians and Bulgarian Turks, after which more Turkish refugees entered the Ottoman Empire. ¹²³At the same time, Greece and Turkey entered into a partial de facto population exchange, in which Turks from Greece replaced Greek migrants from Thrace and Anatolia.

It is impossible to divide statistically those who were refugees during the Balkan Wars from refugees of the World War I period. The short period of time that passed between the Balkan Wars and the onset of World War I precluded the taking of censuses and publication of statistics. Only after the World War and the Turkish War of Independence were finished did accurate statistics become available. For that reason, a certain (relatively small) number of later refugees to the Ottoman Empire from the Balkan countries are included in the statistics in Table Four. (As the dates indicate, the figures in [Table 10](#) do not include Muslims exchanged in the later Greco-Turkish Population Exchange.)

-160-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 160.

TABLE 10. MUSLIM REFUGEES FROM THE BALKANS, 1912-20, WITH AREAS OF SETTLEMENT.

Vilâyets		Independent Sancaks	
İstanbul	3,609	İzmit	6,771
Edirne	132,500	Eskişehir	9,088
Adana	9,059	Bolu	258
Ankara	10,008	Canik	3,875
Aydın	145,868	Çatalca	7,500
Haleb ¹²⁴	10,504	Karasi	14,687
Hüdavendigâr	20,853	Biga	4,033
Sivas	10,805	Kayseri	6,140

Suriye	3,187	Karahisar	280
Kastamonu	257	Menteşe	855
Konya	8,512	Maraş	5,031
Mamuretülaziz	242		
		Total	413,922

Source: Turkish Ministry of Interior statistics. ¹²⁵

The figures in [Table 10](#) were compiled from records of the Ottoman Refugee Commission (Muhacirin Komisyonu). They do not include soldiers and Ottoman government officials who fled the Balkans. With few exceptions, Muslim refugees from the Balkans were recorded by the Refugee Commission ¹²⁶. The Commission oversaw the settlement of the emigrants all over Thrace and Anatolia ([Table 10](#)), although the greatest number were settled in eastern Thrace and western Anatolia. A total of 413,922 refugees was recorded.

POPULATION CHANGE IN THE BALKANS

By the end of 1913, through a process of **death** and forced migration, Muslims had become a minority all over the Balkans. However, in the conquered regions, Muslims had been an absolute majority before the Balkan Wars began ([Table 11](#)).

-161-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 161.

TABLE 11. REGIONS OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE TAKEN BY THE BALKAN ALLIES. POPULATION IN 1911, BEFORE THE BALKAN WARS.

Greek Conquest	Bulgarian Conquest	Serbian Conquest
-------------------	-----------------------	---------------------

Muslim	746,485	327,732	1,241,076
Greek	797,118	29,255	285,985
Bulgarian	145,186	204,701	781,769
Jewish	75,522	920	9,866
Other	8,419	19,044	22,122
Total	1,772,730	581,652	2,340,818

Source: McCarthy, "The Population of Ottoman Europe".

Before the Balkan Wars, the Greeks had a slight plurality in the entire area they were to take from the Ottoman Empire. The Greek predominance was regional. Certain of the districts taken by Greece, such as those from Yanya Vilâyeti, were indeed heavily Greek. Others were overwhelmingly Muslim. The areas taken by the Greeks from Edirne Vilâyeti had almost three times as many Muslims as Greeks. Drama Sancağı of Selanik, taken by Greece, had seven times as many Muslims as Greeks. In fact, the Greek population was centered in the western section of the area Greece took from the Ottomans. If a north-south border had been drawn west of the city of Salonica in 1911, the area to the west of the border would have been heavily Greek, the area to the east heavily Muslim. ¹²⁷

In 1911, the Ottoman areas that would later be taken by Bulgaria were 56 percent & Muslim. In the section Bulgaria took from Edirne Vilâyeti, only one small kaza, Tirnova, had a Bulgarian majority (72 percent) ¹²⁸ But the areas to be taken by Bulgaria from Selanik Vilâyeti -- the northern kazas of Siroz Sancağı -- had a true Bulgarian majority (54 percent). (These statistics include a large amount of out-migration of Bulgarians and in-migration of Muslims after the troubles of 1876-78.)

Muslims were 53 percent of the region taken by Serbia. Only in Manastir Sancağı, of Manastir Vilâyeti, had there been a Christian majority, and, by religious identification at least, most Chris-

tians of Manastir Sancađi had identified themselves as Bulgarian. ¹²⁹ Despite this, the areas taken by Serbia from Manastir Vilâyeti had indeed been largely Christian (65 percent) in 1911, whereas the other areas taken by Serbia had been largely Muslim (59 percent). ¹³⁰

Muslim demographic predominance in the Ottoman Balkans ended with the Balkan Wars, but many of Greece's Muslims did not leave for Turkey until World War I; more went in the Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey in 1923. Thus the emigration from Greece did not end until more than ten years after the end of the Balkan Wars.

Table 12 lists the population of the conquered areas of the Balkans as they were when Bulgaria, Greece, and Yugoslavia (the successor to Serbia) took their first censuses after World War I. Because Albanian population statistics do not exist for this period, ¹³¹ no attempt has been made to include Albania in the figures. ¹³²

TABLE 12. POPULATION AFTER THE WARS. AREAS OF GREECE, BULGARIA, AND YUGOSLAVIA TAKEN FROM THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE.

	Greece	Bulgaria ¹³³	Yugoslavia ¹³⁴
	1923	1920	1921
Muslim	124,460	179,176	566,478
Greek	1,773,964*		949,366*
Bulgarian		192,552*	
Jewish	65,569	704	6,103
Other	7,467	898	18,277
Totals	1,971,460	373,330	1,540,224

* Listed only as "Orthodox."

Sources: Greek, Bulgarian, and Yugoslavian censuses for the years listed.

Seventeen percent of the 1911 Muslim population of the area taken by Greece remained there in 1923. The Christian population of the same region had doubled. Muslim population in the districts taken by Bulgaria and Yugoslavia also greatly declined. In the lands conquered by Serbia/ Yugoslavia, 46 percent of the pre-war Muslims remained, in the Bulgarian conquests, 55 percent. (Both areas also showed decline in the Christian

population -- 11 percent

-163-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 163.

in the lands conquered by Serbia, 17 percent in the lands conquered by Bulgaria -- both partly due to wartime deaths and partly to migration). ¹³⁵ Overall, 62 percent of the Muslims were gone from the region.

TABLE 13. MUSLIMS IN OTTOMAN AREAS TAKEN BY GREECE, BULGARIA, AND YUGOSLAVIA AND MUSLIMS REMAINING IN THOSE COUNTRIES.

	Muslims in 1911	Muslims Remaining	Difference
Greece	746,485	124,460	622,025
Bulgaria	327,732	179,176	148,556
Yugoslavia	1,241,076	566,478	674,598
Totals	2,315,293	870,114	1,445,179

Source: McCarthy, "The Population of Ottoman Europe".

Of the 2,315,293 Muslims who had lived in the areas taken from the Ottoman Empire in Europe (excluding Albania), 1,445,179 (62 percent) were gone. Of these, 413,922 were migrants to Turkey during and after the Balkan Wars (1912-20); and 398,849 came to Turkey between 1921 and 1926, most as part of the Greek-Turkish Population Exchange. ¹³⁶ But 812,771 Muslims from Ottoman Europe had survived as refugees. The remaining 632,408 were dead. ¹³⁷ Twenty-seven percent of the Muslim population of conquered Ottoman Europe had died.

NOTES

- ^{1.} Justin McCarthy, "The Population of Ottoman Europe Before and After the Fall of the Empire", *Proceedings of the Third Conference on the*

Social and Economic History of Turkey, edited by Heath W. Lowry and Ralph S. Hattox, Istanbul, 1990, pp. 275-98.

2. For a detailed consideration of the population of Ottoman Europe, see McCarthy, "The Population of Ottoman Europe".

3. See Justin McCarthy, *Muslim Refugees in Turkey: The Balkan Wars*,

-164-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 164.

World War I, and the Turkish War of Independence," in *Humanist and Scholar: Essays in Honor of Andreas Tietze*, Istanbul, 1993, pp. 87-111.

4. Barbara Jelavich, *History of the Balkans*, vol. 2, Cambridge, 1983, p. 97. By the time the Balkan allies had finished their plans for war, Russia, now justifiably fearful that a general European war might be kindled in the Balkans, had changed its policy. In a joint note with Austria (8 October 1912), Russia demanded the maintenance of the status quo. It was too late. On the history of the Balkan Wars, see: Charles and Mary Jelavich, *The Establishment of the Balkan National States, 1804-1920*, Seattle and London, 1977, pp. 216-21. Stanford J. Shaw and Ezel Kural Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, vol II, Cambridge, 1977, pp. 293-98. Turkey, Genel Kurmay Başkanlığı, *Balkan Harbî Tarihi*, 7 vols., Istanbul and Ankara, 1938-45. Yusuf Hikmet Bayur, *Türk İnkilâbî Tarihi*, v. II(II), Ankara, 1943, reprinted 1983. L. S. Stavrianos, *The Balkans Since 1453*, New York, 1958, pp. 533-40. E. C. Helmreich, *The Diplomacy of the Balkan Wars, 1912-1913*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1938. Oberstleutenant Immanuel, *Der Balkankrieg, 1912/13*, Berlin, 1914.

5. Bulgaria and Serbia in their treaty of 13 March 1912 did agree on the

division of some Ottoman land, but left much in contention.

6. On 3 May, Montenegro was forced by Austria to give up Üsküdar.
7. The Treaty of Bucharest ended the Second Balkan War on 10 August 1913. The Ottoman Empire signed a separate peace with Bulgaria, the Treaty of Constantinople, on 29 September 1913.
8. *F.O.371-1762*, Lamb to Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Salonica, 9 March 1913.
9. The Russians did make futile efforts to ensure that Montenegro kept Üsküdar and Serbia kept Durazzo, but Austrian interests triumphed and both were surrendered.
10. *F.O.195-2438*, no. 6650, Lamb to Lowther, Salonica, 3 December 1912.
11. For a description of the komitaji mentality, see Hermengild Wagner, *With the Victorious Bulgarians*, London, 1913, pp. 244-46.
12. *F.O.195-2438*, no. 7076, Morgan to Lowther, Cavalla, 28 December 1912.
13. *F.O.195-2438*, no. 6650, Lamb to Lowther, Salonica, 3 December 1912.
14. *F.O.195-2438*, no. 6650, Lamb to Lowther, Salonica, 3 December 1912.
15. *F.O.195-2438*, no. 6866, Lamb to Lowther, Salonica, 13 December 1912.
16. *F.O.371-1762*, no. 55161, Greig to Crackanthorpe, Monastir, 19 November 1913.

17. *F.O.320-2*, Report of Lt.-Colonel Muricchio, an official Italian observer, in Lamb to Grey, Valona, 20 April 1914.

18. Reports of Austro-Hungarian consuls given by the correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph*, *Les Atrocités des Coalises Balkaniques*, no. 1, Constantinople, 1913 (hereafter quoted in *Les Atrocités I*), pp. 14-18. Like the other participants in the Balkan Wars, the Ottomans published books that detailed the atrocities of their enemies. The ostensible authors were identified as Le Comité de la Défense Nationale or Le Comité de Publication

-165-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 165.

D.A.C.B. In reality, they can be viewed as governmental publications. As propaganda, they are poor specimens, simply copying reports from Western journalists and official Ottoman reports. This makes better historical sources. In addition to no. 1, cited above, at least five small books were published: *Les Atrocités des Coalises Balkaniques*, no. 2, Constantinople, 1913 (hereafter *Les Atrocités II*). *Les Atrocités des Coalises Balkaniques*, no. 3, Constantinople, 1913 (hereafter *Les Atrocités III*). *Les Atrocités des Bulgares en Thrace*, no. 4, Constantinople, 1913. *Les Atrocités des Grecs en Macedoine*, no. 5, Constantinople, 1913. *Come Over Into Macedonia and Help Us*, Constantinople, 1913.

19. Report of the correspondent of the *Koelnische Zeitung* (*Les Atrocités I*, pp. 20 and 21).

20. Based on the reports of Father Gustav Michel, who gave the same account of the massacres at Kurkut as did Consul Lamb. His statements were corroborated by Protestant missionaries (Rev. M. Brunau of the German Evangelical Mission, Rev. P. Toekhuvianian of the Armenian

Evangelical Mission, and Rev. A. Mitsopoulos of the Greek Evangelical Mission), who surely had no reason to exaggerate Muslim losses (*The Crimes of Bulgaria*, Washington, 1914, pp. 12-15). During and after the Second Balkan War, Greece and Bulgaria published "atrocities books" to support their positions. Each painted the other in black, as murderers of civilians, violators of the rules of war, etc. There was much material available for such propaganda, because both sides had such awful records. Interestingly, the Greek publications made a great point of describing Bulgarian crimes toward Muslim civilians, not only toward Greeks. The Bulgarians were content to list Greek attacks on Bulgarians. The Greek atrocity books are valuable sources on how Bulgarians treated Muslims. Perhaps because the Bulgarian record was so obvious, the Greeks seldom felt the need to exaggerate Bulgarian atrocities, and Greek accounts closely correlate with consular sources. Because of the propagandistic nature of the books, however, material drawn from them has only been used here if it is so corroborated. Prominent among the volumes describing these atrocities are: Dr. Lubomir Miletitch , *Atrocités Grecques en Macedoine pendant la Guerre Greco-Bulgare*, Sophia, 1913; Commission d'enquête de l'Association Macedonienne, *Atrocités Bulgares en Macedoine (Faits et Documents)*, Athens, 1913; University of Athens, *The Crimes of Bulgaria in Macedonia*, Washington, D.C., translated from Greek, 1914; Greece, *Les Cruautés Bulgares en Macedoine Orientale et en Thrace*, 1912-1913, Athens, 1913; "Les Professeurs de l'Université de Sophia," *Réponse à la Brochure des Professeurs des Universités d'Athènes*, *Atrocités Bulgares en Macedoine*, Sophia, 1913. The Greek volumes all generally reproduced the same material, each often using the exact same words as the others. Some of the raw material for these propagandistic books is contained in British consular reports. See, for example, F.O.371-1840, no. 40191, O'Reilly to Grey, Sophia, 20 August 1913 and no. 44222, 24 September 1913 for letters purporting to be captured letters from Greek soldiers boasting of atrocities, etc. Photostats are given and, if forgeries, the letters are very good forgeries. I believe them to be genuine.

21. Based on the report of René Puaux of the Paris Temps, corroborated by L. Magrini of the Milan Secolo and Captain Trappman of the London Daily Telegraph (*The Crimes of Bulgaria*, p. 5 and p. 19). The figure was also quoted by the British (F.O.371-32494-32838, Elliot to Grey, Athens, 11 July 1913) probably from the same source. ". . . At the outbreak of the war the press of Europe kept almost systematically silent regarding the reported horrors, but reports coming in every day both from the Greek and Mohammadan populations, contain the most horrible details concerning the treatment inflicted upon them by the Bulgarians. Thousands of refugees arriving here daily are confirming these reports. . . ." Signed by Crawford Price of the *London Times*, Emil Thomas of the *Paris Temps*, P. Tiano of the *Paris Journal*, Luciano Magrini of the Milan Secolo, P. Donaldson of the Reuter Agency, G. Turbe of the Havas Agency, Captain T. A. Trapmann of the *London Daily Telegraph*, A. Grohmann of the *Frankfurter Zeitung* and the *Neue Freie Presse* of Vienna, and M. Bessantchi of the *Vienna Zeit* (*The Crimes of Bulgaria*, pp. 5 and 6). These estimates were reproduced in an official propaganda book of the Greek government, but seem to be well-substantiated. Another figure from a Greek source seems realistic, but was not substantiated: "In official circles in Constantinople they estimate more than a terrifying figure of 300,000 as the number of Muslims butchered [égorgés] in Macedonia and in Thrace by the Bulgarian army during the occupation of the provinces" (*Les Cruautés Bulgares en Macedoine Orientale et en Thrace*, 1912-1913). I have seen no Ottoman source that mentions such a figure, but it fits well with the Muslim deaths as calculated in this chapter.

22. The report of the Carnegie Commission of Investigation (pp. 282-83) lists men taken to the ravine from the villages of Samalcol, Mouchtian, Ahadler, and Esirli (their spellings) and lists many from other villages killed "by the Greeks of Casroub," no place of death listed, 195 in total. The *Report of the International Commission to Inquire into the Causes and Conduct of the Balkan Wars* (Washington, D.C., 1914), while it contains a great deal of useful material and often attempts (but seldom attains) impartiality, has a definite proBulgarian, anti-Greek, and anti-Turkish prejudice. The Report's prejudices against Turkish Muslims are typical of those widely held in Europe and America at the time (and long after). The Ottoman Empire is throughout viewed as an "Oriental" state that is worthy of notice only insofar as its actions affected Greece, Bulgaria, or Serbia. In the book, officials of the Christian states were interviewed and their opinions given great weight; Ottoman officials were not consulted. Detailed statistical material was provided for each of the Christian states, none for the Ottoman Empire. The only views of the

Ottoman Empire and its government came from what the successor states had to say of them -- as might be imagined, an unflattering picture. The prejudices of the Report derive from the prejudices and ignorance of the authors. The principal author, Baron d'Estournelles de Constant, readily described his love of Bulgaria and "the noble effort of growth and progress of the material, intellectual, and moral culture of Bulgaria" (p. 2). In his introduction, he accused Greece of "militarism," but did not mention Bulgarian militarism. Of the Ottoman Empire, his general introductory comments made no mention at all. One member

-167-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 167.

of the Commission, Professor Milioukov, was so well-known as a Bulgarian partisan that his presence on the Commission became a contemporary cause-célèbre, and numerous Serbs and Greeks, including government officials, refused to talk with him. The members of the Commission were mostly politicians. What scholars were among them were professors of education or law who had little or no experience or knowledge of the region, with the exception of Professor Milioukov, who knew the Balkans (and was also a member of Nicholas II's Duma, not an advertisement for impartiality). No member spoke Turkish, so they never interviewed Turkish refugees and soldiers without the presence of a Bulgarian, Greek, or Serbian official interpreter. The lack of linguists and historians on the Commission is apparent at every turn. Because of this lack, nonsense such as the following was seen all too often: "Many Turks have been under the Bulgarian regime since the origin of the kingdom; they seldom had to complain of their new masters" (p. 157). Despite all this, the Carnegie Report is of some value to a study of Balkan Muslims, because the suffering of Muslims was so glaring and evident that even prejudiced observers occasionally had to admit and record the wrongs done to them. Especially valuable are the lengthy interviews drawn from Europeans and Balkan Muslims who were on the scene of massacres and atrocities (and who, when the interpreters were Bulgarian, were allowed to say what they had experienced at the hands of the Greeks, and vice versa).

23. *F.O.371-1840*, no. 44575, no consular officer listed, Sofia, 24 September 1913, "Notes Taken by Two Members of the Balkan Relief Fund."
24. *F.O.195-2438*, no. 6650, Lamb to Lowther, Salonica, 3 December 1912.
25. *F.O.195-2438*, no. 6650, Lamb to Lowther, Salonica, 3 December 1912.
26. *F.O.195-2453*, no. 3223, "Traduction du télégramme reçu aujourd'hui du généralissime de l'armée ottomane Izzet Pacha à Tchorlou."
27. On 5 November 1912 (*F.O.371-1762*, Young to Bax-Ironside, Cavalla, 21 December 1912).
28. "After the occupation of Drama by the Bulgarians on November 5th, as reported in the enclosure in my dispatch no. 156 of the 15th, the military authorities are declared to have sanctioned a general pillage of the Moslem portions of the town." Local Christians were formed into "a sort of militia" and sent to disarm local Muslims. Atrocities, pillage, etc. resulted. Most of those where arms were found died. "Nearly all the wounded soldiers were killed by the Christian mob" (*F.O.195-2438*, no. 6650, Lamb to Lowther, Salonica, 3 December 1912).
29. *F.O.371-1762*, Young to Bax-Ironside, Cavalla, 21 December 1912.
30. *F.O.195-2438*, no. 6558, Badeth to Eyres, Dedeagatch, 21 November 1912.
31. Gustave Cirilli, *Journal du Siège d'Andrinople*, Paris, 1913, pp. 106 and 141. Cirilli's accounts were corroborated by the Russian journalist Maschov, writing for *Novoye Vremya* (copied in *Les Atrocités des Bulgares en Thrace*, no. 4, Constantinople, 1913).

32. Cirilli, p. 142.

33. Cirilli, p. 145. Cirilli gives a detailed list of the price of foodstuffs, gasoline, etc. He does not mention wheat in his list, a strange omission in a land where bread was the staple of the diet. Perhaps it was not available. He does mention milk, at a comparatively low markup (from .5 francs per liter to 1.5 francs per liter), which is also odd, because one would assume that cows had been eaten.

-168-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 168.

34. Cirilli, pp. 154 and 155.

35. Carnegie, p. 114. The locals had a much better idea who had what property and where it might be hidden, so the relationship of soldiers and local looters was symbiotic.

36. See Carnegie, pp. 326-30, for a Russian description of the state of Edirne, which includes the rapes, etc.

37. Cirilli, pp. 155 and 156. See also *F.O.371-1763*, no. 15649, Young to Grey, Philippopoli, 5 April 1913.

38. Carnegie, p. 111.

39. *F.O.371-1762*, no. 17618, Letter to Ameer Ali, of the British Red Crescent Society, from G. D. Turner, in charge of aid at Adrianople, Adrianople, 4 April 1913.

40. See pp. 156 and 157.

41. *F.O.371-1762*, Young to Bax-Ironside. Philippopoli, 2 January 1913. See also *F.O.371-1762*, Young to Bax-Ironside, Cavalla, 21 December 1912.

42. *Les Atrocités II*, p. 9.

43. In the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 Russian officers who tried to stop Bulgarian attacks on Muslims did exist. Consular records mentioned a number of them. I have not been able to find similar records of Bulgarian officers who attempted to end komitaji massacres of looting.

44. *F.O. 195-2438*, no. 6762, Lamb to Lowther, Salonica, 11 December 1912 (other copies are in *F.O.371-1763* and 424-236). British Consul Morgan stated that Bulgarian regulars were seldom responsible for these massacres, but they did nothing to stop the komitajis and locals from massacring. Speaking of Bulgarian releases to the Press deploring the atrocities, he observed that Bulgaria's avowed "indignation" at the massacres was only based on "saving Bulgaria's reputation in the eyes of Europe" (*F.O.195-2438*, no. 9076, Morgan to Lowther, Cavalla, 28 December 1912). The Ottoman account was the same in all particulars (*Les Atrocités I*, pp. 8-11).

45. *F.O.195-2438*, no. 6866, Lamb to Lowther, Salonica, 13 December 1912.

46. *F.O.195-2438*, no. 6762, Lamb to Lowther, Salonica, 11 December 1912. *F.O.195-2438*, no. 6866, Lamb to Lowther, Salonica, 13 December 1912.

47. The Ottomans estimated 4,700 dead, but this included large numbers of refugees who died in the area (*Les Atrocités I*, p. 6).

48. *F.O.195-2438*, no. 6866, Lamb to Lowther, Salonica, 13 December 1912.

49. *Les Atrocités I*, p. 7.

50. The report of Yusuf Kenan Bey, director of the Turkish kolej in Dedeğaç, and the official report of the French general Baumann, Chief Inspector of the Macedonian Gendarmerie, in *Les Atrocités II*, pp. 8-14.

51. F.O.371-1762, Young to Bax-Ironside, Cavalla, 21 December 1912.

52. F.O.371-1842, no. 34936, Durham to Nevinson, Scutary [sic], 21 July 1913.

53. There was a lucrative business in charcoal, for which the Serbians were busily felling trees in Manastir Vilâyeti. Perhaps the Montenegrins did the same.

54. F.O.371-1762, Lamb to Grey, Vallona, 21 November 1913.

55. A report on the Albanian survivors by a relief agency official, Miss Durham:

"I rode out to Kopliklu yesterday and found it much larger and in far worse state than I had any idea of. I ought to have gone there before. But there were such masses of others.

"Kopliklu is awful. And short of feeding the people through the winter I see no way of saving them. They have not been able to sow any ground worth speaking of -- are absolutely destitute -- in rags, everything burnt

and plundered. . . . Since the wretched people returned to their wrecked homes 176 have died -- of diarrhoea largely, caused probably by eating grass and such like. . . ." Miss Durham felt that the European Powers, who had occupied Üsküdar in order to help in the creation of a new Albanian nation, were ignoring the real problem: "What rot it seems for 5 powers to be spending Lord knows what on keeping all these ironclads -- Admirals -- soldiers, etc. -- hanging about for the ultimate benefit of a population which is starving outside Scutari. By the time the Powers have decided what to do a lot of the poor devils will be dead -- as the Montenegrins intended they should" (*F.O.371-1842*, no. 36364, Durham to Nevison, Scutari, 28 July 1913).

56. *F.O.320-2*, Lamb to Grey, Valona, 25 October 1913. Descriptions of some Greek offenses are included. See also *F.O.320-1*, Lamb to Grey, Valona, 7 November 1913, and *F.O.320-2*, Lamb to Grey, Vallona, 3 April 1914.

57. *F.O.371-1840*, no. 49288, Lamb to Grey, Vallona, 25 October 1913, and no. 51544, 7 November 1913 and *F.O.320-2*, Lamb to Grey, Vallona, 6 February 1914.

58. *F.O. 320-2*, Telegram from General de Veer to the International Commission of Control, Durazzo, 5 May 1914, copied in Lamb to Grey, Durazzo, 6 May 1914. The same dispatch includes local reports of anti-Muslim atrocities.

59. See, for example, *F.O.371-1846*, no. 46303, letters to and from Aubrey Herbert, October 1913. The Italian delegate on the Albanian Commission of Control declared that the Albanian accusations against the Greeks were true and it seems probable that a certain number of Muslims must have been massacred and some villages destroyed. However, it must be recognized that Italy had its own interests in Albania and that it was in Italy's interest to portray the Greek occupation in a bad light.

60. *F.O.320-2*, Lamb to Grey, Valona, 20 April 1914.

61. See the calculations on pp. 163-64.

62. *F.O.371-1763*, no. 9120, enclosure no. 2 in Greig to Lowther, Monastir, 4 February 1913.

63. *F.O.371-1840*, no. 43260, Greig to Marling, Monastir, 9 September 1913. One month later Greig, the British Consul at Manastir, reported, "There is a considerable and steadily increasing distress amongst Moslems here. It is most marked in the case of women and children. Apart from the ordinary inhabitants of the town, many of the refugees of last year are still here, no effort having been made to rebuild their villages. To these are added refugees who are beginning to arrive from the villages recently destroyed. They are even more destitute than last winter and are likely soon to be quite as numerous. The Mufti believes that the persons in urgent need of help already amount to some 3000. With the approach of winter large numbers of men who have contrived to pass the summer in the roofless ruins of their homes are certain to take refuge here" (*F.O.371-1762*, no. 50886, Greig to Crackanthorpe, Monastir, 29 October 1913).

64. Consul Greig arrived at an interesting theory to explain Serbian actions toward Muslim villages: "It is probably the intention of the Servian Government

-170-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 170.

to compel the Moslems to abandon their villages, expropriate their land, and settle on it a number of Servian emigrants at present in America. Colonel Jivanovitch, commandant of the Monastir garrison, recently told me that this is the policy to be pursued. To this end -- apart from butchery, the burning of houses, rape, and ruinous fires -- a peculiarly effective means has been found in the prohibition to cut wood, which is being applied in all parts of this district" (*F.O.371-1762*, no. 55161, Greig to Crackanthorpe, Monastir, 19 November 1913). While the Serbian intention to get rid of the Muslims is unquestionable, the return

of large numbers of emigrants from America to take farms in Manastir Vilâyeti seems unlikely.

65. *F.O.371-1762*, no. 50886, Greig to Crackanthorpe, Monastir, 29 October 1913. Greig also stated, on 19 November 1913, "Acts of wholesale destruction of property, pillage, and massacre of men, women, and children are committed by Servian komitajis with direct official connivance in Moslem villages in this district" (*F.O.371-1762*, no. 55161, Greig to Crackanthorpe, Monastir, 19 November 1913).

66. *F.O.371-1762*, no. 55161, Greig to Crackanthorpe, Monastir, 19 November 1913. Greig possessed detailed lists, village by village, of massacres and destruction, and included them in this correspondence.

67. "At the present moment arrears of Turkish taxes are being demanded in many cases for as much as ten years" (*F.O.371-1762*, no. 43274, Greig to Crackanthorpe, Monastir, 9 September 1913.)

69. *F.O.371-1762*, no. 40690, Morgan to Onslow, Salonica, 26 August 1913.

70. *F.O.371-1762*, no. 40690, Morgan to Onslow, Salonica, 26 August 1913.

71. *F.O.195-2438*, no. 6866, Lamb to Lowther, Salonica, 13 December 1912.

72. *F.O.195-2456*, no. 2810, Samson to Mallet, Adrianople, 30 June 1914. Samson goes on to state, "Many of the Bulgarian villages shared a similar fate at the hands of the army of re-occupation."

73. *F.O.195-2438*, no. 6380, Lamb to Lowther, Salonica, 19 November 1912, and *F.O.195-2438*, no. 6229, 23 November 1912, telegram from Lamb, Salonica, 27 November 1912.

74. *F.O.195-2456*, no. 155, "Report on the Situation in Western Thrace by Consul Heard," Sophia, 23 December 1913. Consul Heard was obviously

pro-Bulgarian, but this evidence seems reliable.

75. *F.O.371-1762*, Lamb to Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Salonica, 9 March 1913.

76. See, for example, *Carnegie*, pp. 176 and 177.

77. The Carnegie Report gives a number of examples. Because of the book's prejudices, however, it leans heavily toward exoneration of the Bulgarians and blame of the Greeks and Serbians.

78. The Bulgarian Exarchate, declared by the sultan in 1870, became formally independent of Greek Orthodox authority in 1872 by Ottoman decree. Before that date, those who were to become members of the Bulgarian church were all Greek Orthodox, so there was little time for doctrinal divergences to emerge. The differences lay in authority, not creed.

79. Despite some religious rulings that temporary conversion to save one's life was acceptable.

-171-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 171.

80. *F.O.371-1762*, no. 40690, Morgan to Onslow, Salonica, 26 August 1913. See also *F.O.195-2452*, no. 773, Lamb to Lowther, 5 February 1913.

81. *F. O.195-2438*, no. 6865, Lamb to Lowther, Salonica, 13 December 1912.

82. *F.O.*195-2452, no. 773, Lamb to Lowther, 5 February 1913.

83. "An official report to the sub-Prefect of Kavadar, on 2 March 1913 [by Mr. Drakolovits]" (Carnegie, p. 156).

84. A despatch of August 21 from the Athenian correspondent of the *Times*, quoted in Carnegie, pp. 155 and 156.

85. For example: "The inhabitants of the villages above-mentioned complain that since the beginning of the year, when they sent their petitions to the [Bulgarian] Ministry, appealing against their forced conversion to Christianity, no attention has been paid to their complaints, and that they have been subjected to various sorts of ill-treatment, such as beating, insults to women (tearing off of veils, forcible intrusion into women's baths, etc.), compulsory attendance at Church 'at the bayonet's point,' and general ill-usage and threats on the part of priests and others. "The extent of their ill-treatment may perhaps best be gauged by the fact that they have ventured to petition the government and thus exposed themselves to the retaliation on the part of their oppressors which is likely to ensue if the former continue to ignore their appeals. "The petitioners vehemently protest against their forcible conversion to the Orthodox Faith and beg that their Mosques may be reopened. Otherwise, they say, they cannot remain in Bulgaria any longer and state their intention of emigrating elsewhere [petitions signed by 301 from one village, 169 from another]" (*F.O.*371-1840, no. 44219, O'Reilly to Grey, Sofia, 24 September 1913). See also Carnegie, pp. 77, 78, 155-58. Evidence of forced conversions by Bulgarians is well-documented. See the many mentions in the British archival reports, especially *F.O.*424-242 (numerous mentions throughout the class) and *F.O.*424-113-5970, *F.O.*424-248-7327, *F.O.* 424-6405-2508, *F.O.*424-351-8124, *F.O.*424-248-7327. For American evidence, see U.S. 867.00/490, Rockhill to Secretary of State, Constantinople, 21 February 1913.

86. One can theorize that such conversions were stopped soon after the Balkan Wars out of political necessity, because Bulgaria and the Ottoman Empire were soon allies in World War I. It may also have been that Bulgaria realized that such policies, aimed at creating a truly "Bulgarian" populace, were having the opposite effect, creating hatred rather than national identity. Given the continuing history of Bulgarian

efforts to Bulgarize ethnic Turks and Pomaks in Bulgaria, an effort that continued into the 1980s, the latter reason seems doubtful.

87. See the sections on those cities in this chapter.

88. See Carnegie, pp. 95-106.

89. For example, most of the Carnegie Report is devoted to inter-Christian conflicts. However, such feelings also sometimes caused indignation at the Christian massacre of Muslims. Consul Lamb at Salonica was particularly upset because he accepted the "moral inferiority of the Crescent to the Cross," and he felt the atrocities appeared to negate that principle (*F.O.*195-2438, no. 6650, Lamb to Lowther, Salonica, 3 December 1912).

90. There were, of course, some small-scale attacks against Christians during

-172-

Questia Media America, Inc. ***www.questia.com***

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 172.

the first stage of the first war, but these were very limited, as was the first stage of the war (i.e., before the Ottoman defeat).

91. *F. O.*195-2456, no. 288, O'Reilly to Grey, Sofia, 1 January 1914, enclosure, Heard's "Report on the Situation in Western [sic] Thrace."

92. For example, on the activities of Ottoman soldiers and irregulars near Dedeağaç, see *F.O.*371-1840, no. 46837, Badetti to Eyres, 30 September 1913 and no. 47618, 8 October 1913.

93. Bulgarian sources accused the Ottomans of deliberately sending Kurdish and Arab troops into Thrace to attack the Christian populace, stating that Kurds and Arabs were murderers, etc. According to the Bulgarians, Enver Paşa was supposed to have especially chosen Kurds and Arabs to have carried out plans to exterminate Christians. No documentary or neutral evidence verifies these claims. While some Kurds did indeed have a history of pillage and massacre in previous wars, the picture of Ottoman Arabs as the worst sort of marauding murderers is one to which it is hard to attach much credence. However, the Carnegie Report was easily convinced. In support, it mentions (p. 127) one "Catholic Arab" who "admitted to one of his friends that the express orders of their captains was first to burn and ravage, then to kill all the males, next the women." The name of "his friend" is not given.

94. Carnegie, p. 129. The Carnegie Report gives detailed reports of the activities of Ottoman soldiers and Muslim peasants at this time. However, the evidence is almost solely based on the word of one or two "witnesses" in each case. The witnesses were interrogated in Bulgaria, and their evidence is seldom corroborated in the diplomatic correspondence. The pro-Bulgarian bias of the volume is, once again, very evident. Nevertheless, readers should consult pp. 123-35 of the report and make their own judgments.

95. F.O. 195-2456, no. 148, Samson to Mallet, Adrianople, 31 March 1914. Major Samson, the British Consul at Edirne, stated on 30 June that 30,000 Greeks had left (F.O. 195-2456, no. 2802, Samson to Mallet, Adrianople, 30 June 1914), but this seems an exaggeration, since he states in the same dispatch that Greek out-migration effectively ended by 28 April. For a statistical analysis of the Greeks in the Edirne Vilâyeti, see McCarthy, "The Population of Ottoman Europe".

96. Samson believed that 50,000 of the 73,000 prewar Bulgarian population "of the vilayet" had emigrated (F.O.195-2454, no. 5418, Samson to Mallet, 31 December 1913). However, the Ottoman vilâyet of Edirne had more than double that number of Bulgarians (171,000 in 1911; see Table 7). By "the vilayet" Samson might have meant the portion of the vilâyet that remained in Ottoman hands, in which case the figure is reasonable.

97. See the complete list of refugees in Bulgarian cities and cantons on 15 September 1913 in Carnegie, p. 385.

98. Reginald Rankin, *The Inner History of the Balkan War*, London, 1914, p. 303.

99. *F.O.371-1762*, no. 50886 gives detailed statistics of Muslim houses destroyed, murders, rapes, etc. in Manastir Vilâyeti. The British observers also reported 60,000 refugees from Manastir in Albania. "The state of these people is most desperate" (*F.O.371-1762*, no. 53682, Consul-general Lamb at Vallona, 21 November 1913). See also *F.O.371-1762*, no. 55161.

-173-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 173.

100. Carnegie, pp. 177-85. See note 129.

101. *F.O.371-1762*, Lamb to Grey, Vallona, 21 November 1913.

102. *F.O.371-1762*, no. 52620, Telegram from Vice-Consul Summa at Scutari, 18 November 1913. The number had increased by 500 since 28 October. See *F.O. 371-1762*, no. 49946, Summa to Grey, Scutari, 28 October 1913.

103. *F.O.371-1762*, Lamb to Grey, Vallona, 21 November 1913.

104. *F.O.195-2438*, no. 6466, Lamb to Lowther, 20 November 1912.

105.On the Greeks and Bulgarians and the refugees to Salonica see *Les Atrocités I*, pp. 12-14, the report of Nazim Paşa, vali of Selanik Vilâyeti.

106.*F.O.*371-1762, Lamb to Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Salonica, 9 March 1913.

107.*F.O.*195-2438, no. 6650, Lamb to Lowther, Salonica, 3 December 1912.

108.For an interesting short description of the suffering of the Balkan Wars' Muslim refugees in Istanbul, see Hoffman Philip [sic], *Cholera in the Near East, Santa Barbara, California*, 1947. See also H. G. Dwight, *Constantinople Old and New*, New York, 1915, pp. 459-99 and 521-33.

109.*F.O.*195-2438, no. 6866, Lamb to Lowther, Salonica, 13 December 1912.

110."It is impossible to check the estimate, but my informant himself saw hundreds of corpses on the road" (*F.O.*371-1763, no. 6762, Lamb to Lowther, enclosure no. 1, Salonica, 11 December 1912).

111.Houses in the town of Melnik were not destroyed.

112.*Carnegie*, pp. 106-8, 204-7, 217-28.

113.*F.O.*371-1762, Lamb to Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Salonica, 9 March 1913.

114.*F.O.*371-1762, Greig to Grey, Monastir, 30 November 1913. There were 8,000 who were "entered on the list kept at this Vice-Consulate." Many more were expected from villages that were "utterly destroyed." "The Servian government are doing nothing for them." (The keeping of a list is an important point in establishing the relative reliability of the figures. While many refugees may have been missed and deaths not properly entered, one can probably assume that 8,000 was at least a minimum figure for the refugees in the town at that time.)

115.F.O.371-1762, no. 49946, Summa to Grey, Scutari, 26 October 1913.

116.F.O.371-1762, no. 52620, Telegram from Vice-Consul Summa at Scutari, 18 November 1913.

117.F.O. 1, 95-2438, no. 58335, Summa to Grey, Scutari, 20 December 1913.

118.F.O.195-2438, enclosure in no. 156, Lamb to Lowther, Salonica, 15 November 1912, from the Acting Vice-Consul at Cavalla, Vartan Sohag Bey(?), a report of 8 November 1912.

119.F.O.371-1762, no. 40690, Morgan to Onslow, Salonica, 26 August 1913.

120.F.O.195-2438, no. 6945, Harris to Lowther, Dardanelles, 23 December 1912.

121.F.O.371-1842, no. 35285, Heathcote-Smith to Marling, Smyrna, 18 July 1913.

122.Carnegie, p. 151. An Ottoman source gave the following figures for refugees who "gathered in Salonica to embark for Ottoman ports." This does not mean that all of those who gathered eventually arrived alive. Nevertheless, the table appears to be fairly accurate. In the text, it is part of a group of detailed and

circumstantial accounts of wartime events, village by village, in the region of Macedonia:

November 1912	8,866	May	12,813	November	17,213
December	15,493	June	9,368	December	15,502
January 1913	12,087	July	21,045	January 1914	10,192
February	12,088	August	29,312	February	25,060
March	7,553	September	13,380	March	12,346
April	6,725	October	[unreadable, probably 14,764]		
				Total	243,807

(*Les Atrocités des Grecs en Macedoine*, p. 21)

123. See Stephen P. Ladas, *The Exchange of Minorities: Bulgaria, Greece, and Turkey*, New York, 1932, pp. 16 and 17, and France, Institut National de la Statistique et des Études Économiques, *Les Transferts Internationaux de Populations*, Paris, 1946, p. 76 and Annex IIIa.

124. Some of these refugees to Haleb may not have ultimately come to the Turkish Republic, although most probably did so. To their number should be added an indeterminate number of Muslims who came to Aleppo from Libya after the Italian conquest -- at least 1,500 by May of 1914 (Report by U.S. Consul J. B. Jackson at Aleppo, 21 May 1914, U.S. Archives 867.55/26).

125. I accept these statistics as authentic, even though they have only appeared in secondary sources. Alexandre Antoniadès (*Le développement Économique de la Thrace*, Athens, 1922, p. 217), Stephen P. Ladas (*The Exchange of Minorities: Bulgaria, Greece, and Turkey*, New York, 1932, p. 16), and Arnold J. Toynbee (*The Western Question in Greece and Turkey*, London, 1922, p. 138) all gave the same figures and listed the same source -- the Ottoman Ministry of Refugees. Moreover, Toynbee and Antoniadès gave the figures in a different form (Toynbee by year, Antoniadès by province of settlement),

but the same total figures. The figures printed by Antoniadès also have the proper form for a typical Ottoman governmental statistical table. Therefore, it is most likely that these are actual Ottoman statistics, which, like most of the Ottoman records of the period, have not yet been found in their original form.

1912-13	177,352
1914-15	120,566
1916-17	18,912
1918-19	22,244
1919-20	74,848
Total	413,922

Antoniades estimated 500,000 refugees who were not counted in the above totals, whereas Toynbee and Ladas did not. However, Antoniadès indicated that these were "les personnes aisées et les employés du Gouvernement avec leurs familles." One can, I think, assume that the "personnes aisées" were few and that most of the number were government employees and their families. As such, the latter were not included in Ottoman population registers of natives of the Balkan

-175-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 175.

provinces and thus have not been considered to be refugees here. To include them in the number of surviving refugees would be incompatible with the process of ascertaining the number of Muslim dead by subtracting survivors from the population as originally registered. Even if the "personnes aisées" and government employees were included, the figure of 500,000 is ludicrously high, unless Antoniadès included soldiers, who could be called "government employees." As a Greek apologist and official of the Greek government, Antoniadès had an interest in making the Greek government look as good as possible. This goes a long way toward explaining his spurious 500,000 refugees.

Toynbee and Ladas were more accurate and more honest.

126.The Refugee Commission (Muhacirin Komisyonu) was the Ottoman agency directly in charge of assistance to refugees. In areas in which Ottoman governmental control was strong, the Commission took detailed, family-by-family and person-by-person counts of refugees, including refugees back to the period of the Crimean War.

127.See McCarthy, "The Population of Ottoman Europe".

128.Another, Ahtabolu Kazasi, was 65 percent Greek. All the rest had large Muslim majorities. It must be stressed that these "Bulgarians" were members of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church. Their language group is not known.

129.Fifty-seven percent. Whether these Manastir Vilâyeti natives felt themselves to be Macedonians or Bulgarians will never be known. Religiously, they were Bulgarian, but the area today is part of Macedonia. In addition to the Greek and Bulgarian apologists mentioned before, see the article by Kiselinovski, "National Structure of the Population in Aegean Macedonia (1900-1913)", *Macedonian Revue*, vol. 8, no. 2, 1978, pp. 145-52, which advocates the Macedonian position.

130.For detailed statistics and analysis of the figures, see McCarthy, "The Population of Ottoman Europe". On ethnic divisions in Yugoslavia/Serbia before and after the Balkan Wars, see George W. Hoffmann, "Evolution of the Ethnographic Map of Yugoslavia: a Historical Geographic Interpretation" in Francis W. Carter, ed., *An Historical Geography of the Balkans*, London, 1977, which suffers slightly from a lack of Ottoman sources.

131.See McCarthy, "The Population of Ottoman Europe".

132.If *all* Muslim refugees to Albania had survived, the numbers of Muslim dead in these calculations would be little affected, because they were a comparatively small number. It is doubtful if many of them survived. (For evidence of this, see *F.O.371-1762*, o. 50886, *F.O.371-1762*, no.

53682, and F.O.371-1762, no. 55161.) In any case, their numbers would be more than offset by the Muslim Albanians who were killed by Serbia and Montenegro in Albania, none of whom have been counted in the numbers of Muslim dead given here.

133.The Muslim population of what had been the Ottoman kazas of Ahtabolu and Tirnova has been estimated, since breakdowns of population by religion and by district were not available for 1920. Muslims have been assumed to have been the same percentage there as in the province (Burgas) as a whole.

134.Vardarska Banovina. The borders are approximately the same and smallscale statistics for the area are unavailable.

135.It is impossible to tell which was migration, which **death**.

-176-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 176.

1 Turkish immigration statistics for the period of the Greco-Turkish 3 population exchange were similar to those kept by the Ottomans after the 6.Balkan Wars. They listed the refugees for each year by the province in which the refugees were settled. Since the recorded number of refugees corresponded closely to the numbers of Turkish refugees officially recorded by the Mixed Commission of the Population Exchange (388,146), it appears that almost all the refugees listed in Table 9 came from Greece in that exchange.

	Male	Female	Total
1921	5,488	5,591	11,079
1922	5,189	4,904	10,093

1923	25,553	25,136	50,689
1924	120,322	115,092	235,414
1925	28,353	28,170	56,523
1926	18,481	16,570	35,051
<hr/>			
<hr/>			
Totals	203,386	195,463	398,849

SOURCE: *İstatistik Yıllığı* III.

In the calculations used here, it has been assumed that all these migrants came from the areas newly occupied by Greece. This was not completely true. Many came from other areas of Greece. Some of the Turks who came from the older conquests had come there in 1912-13 from areas newly conquered, but many were inhabitants of Greece in 1911. There is no way to statistically separate them, and all are counted here as surviving natives of the region lost in the Balkan Wars. Because this procedure counts more Muslims as survivors than actually survived, the effect is to underestimate Muslim mortality.

1 I.e., the number left at the end of the period, subtracted from the number 3 present at the beginning the period. Children were born in the period, and 7 many persons died natural deaths; these were not counted in the figure of Population Loss. These numbers are not as precise as one might wish. The census figures from the Christian Balkan countries (Table 12) are from different years, Albanian Muslim mortality has not been included, and a number of the Muslims counted in the 1923 Greek census later came to Turkey and were counted as surviving refugees (counterbalanced by the numbers who came from other areas of Greece, but were counted [note 136] as refugees from the newly conquered territories).

CHAPTER SIX

THE FINAL WAR IN THE EAST

THE CONFLICT BETWEEN MUSLIMS and Armenians of the Ottoman East, which had been developing for a hundred years, came to a climax during World War I. Two wars were fought at the same time in the east -- a war between Ottoman and Russian armies and an intercommunal war between Armenians and Muslims of eastern Anatolia and the southern Caucasus. In terms of civilian and military losses, the wars fought in the east between 1914 and 1920 were among the worst in human history. ¹The result of Ottoman weakness, Russian imperialism, European meddling, and Armenian revolutionary nationalism was widespread devastation. After the wars, cities such as Van, Bitlis, Bayazit, and Erzincan were largely rubble. Thousands of villages were destroyed. ²Millions on both sides had died. The Armenians, who revolted to gain a nation, were left with a Soviet republic in which they were not their own masters. The Turks, who ultimately won the wars, were left with a country in ruins.

WORLD WAR I -- MILITARY EVENTS

The war in the east began on 2 November 1914, when Russian forces moved south to occupy the border regions of Bayazit, Diyadin, and Karakilise. ³They were forced to withdraw by the end of the month, and a small Ottoman force, which attacked near Batum, was also unsuccessful. Enver Paşa's disastrous invasion of the Caucasus began late in December 1914. By mid-January of 1915, the Ottoman expeditionary forces had been defeated, with threequarters of their men lost. The way into Anatolia was opened by

-179-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 179.

Ottoman losses. The Russians advanced south in spring; relatively few

troops stood in their way.

Armenian revolutionaries seized the city of Van from the Ottoman government on 13 and 14 April 1915 and held it against besieging Ottoman troops who had been quickly brought up from Bitlis and the Russian front. The Russians took advantage of the revolt. Against the lightly held Ottoman frontier, they sent a force made up of Armenian volunteer units (approximately 4,000 Armenians, mainly from the Caucasus), Armenian guerrilla units (from the Caucasus and Anatolia), and a brigade of Cossacks. By the middle of May, these forces had reached Van and were threatening Bitlis. When the Ottoman forces besieging Van withdrew to concentrate on the defense of Bitlis, the Russian units entered Van (31 May 1915). They were deliriously welcomed by the local Armenian population. By the end of July, however, the Ottomans had brought up strong forces that drove Russians and Armenians from Van and the surrounding area. They abandoned Van on 4 August and retreated north, followed by the entire Armenian population of the occupied region. ⁴

The Ottomans were unable to advance far and were only able to control part of the Lake Van area (i.e., Malazgirt, Ahlat, and the southern shore of Lake Van). The Ottomans reoccupied what remained of the city of Van. The situation remained stagnant throughout the remainder of 1915.

During the first year of the war, the Ottomans were occupied with Armenian revolts all over eastern Anatolia. Only the revolt in Van was successful, but the other revolts caused great loss of life and significantly harmed the Ottoman war effort. The Armenians of Zeytun, always restive under Ottoman control, rebelled in August of 1914, before the war began, primarily as a protest against conscription. Their initial revolt was suppressed, but broke out again in December with attacks on Ottoman gendarmes. From then until deportations of Armenians finally ended the revolt, the Armenians of Zeytun waged guerrilla war against the Ottomans. In June 1915, the town of Kara Hisar-i Şarki was seized by Armenian revolutionaries. They were quickly driven out of most of the town, but held the citadel against Ottoman troops. ⁵ Because of the speedy Armenian defeat, few Muslims were killed. However, Armenian bands in the countryside near Kara Hisar attacked and killed Muslim villagers. Armenian bands and local Armenian revolutionaries

rebelled in Urfa on 29 September 1915. The Armenian quarters of the city were taken and held against local gendarmerie forces, Muslim houses were burned and Muslim civilians killed. In the Urfa rebellion, it was necessary to divert Ottoman troops to the city to defeat the rebels, who were armed with machine guns. After the defeat, 2,000 Armenians were sent from Urfa to Mosul under heavy guard.⁶

The revolts in the eastern cities were reflected in the countryside of the Ottoman East. Armenian revolutionaries attacked Muslim villages, and Armenian villages were in turn attacked, primarily by Kurds.⁷

In January 1916, the Russian army advanced and defeated the Ottomans. By 19 January, they were near Erzurum, which fell to them on 16 February. Mu fell on the same day; Bitlis on 3 March. On the Black Sea front, the Russians took Rize on 8 March 1916, considerably aided by their control of the Black Sea. The Ottomans were forced to abandon Trabzon on 16 April. In July, the Russians advanced, capturing Bayburt on 17 July, then Erzincan on 25 July. The rest of 1916 was spent in "mopping-up" operations in the conquered regions. The only bright spot for the Ottomans was the reconquest of Muş and Bitlis by the Ottoman Second Army, under the command of Mustafa Kemal Paşa, in August 1916. But Bitlis was later lost again.

There can be no doubt that the Russian Revolution saved the Ottomans in the east. After the February 1917 Revolution, some Russian troops had already begun to desert,⁸ and the October Revolution and Bolshevik success in Petrograd led to the effective end of the Russian army in Anatolia. Russian officers in the Caucasus and eastern Anatolia were left in command of units made up purely of officers and of non-Russian Caucasians, particularly Armenians.⁹

During 1917, the Ottoman armies in the east regrouped. In 1918, they attacked, and, by the end of March, they had effectively regained the areas lost since 1914. Their battles were against Armenian forces, officered by Russians and Armenians, and against Armenian guerrilla forces. By April of 1918, the Ottomans had taken Batum (14 April) and Kars (25 April), extending their borders to their pre-1877 limits.

Politically, the situation in the Caucasus after the Russian collapse was in flux. At first, the three Caucasian regions of Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan amalgamated into the Transcaucasian Federation, still officially keeping to their Russian allegiance, al-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 182.

though in fact they were independent. The new Transcaucasian Federation attempted to keep what Anatolian territory it could in the face of the Ottoman advance. The Federation (officially independent as the Transcaucasian Federative Republic on 22 April 1918) attempted to negotiate with the Ottomans, but the latter imposed conditions that were unacceptable to Armenians and Georgians. The Georgians guaranteed their own position by seceding from the Federation and entering into an alliance with the Ottoman Empire's senior ally, Germany, which effectively protected them from Ottoman conquest. The Azeri Turks of the Azerbaijan Republic readily allied with their linguistic and religious brothers in the Ottoman Empire. Armenia remained an independent republic, hoping for intervention by the Allies, especially Britain and America, as its salvation. It was not to be. Neither England nor America aid the Armenians militarily.

After the defeat of the Ottoman Empire in World War I, Turkish Nationalist forces eventually united under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal. Kemal's lieutenant in the east, Kâzim Karabekir, renewed the attack. In the end, the Turkish Republic regained the Kars-Ardahan region, claimed by Armenians, which had been taken from the Ottoman Empire in 1878. The Soviets claimed Caucasian Armenia, as well as Georgia and Azerbaijan.

EASTERN ANATOLIA -- THE INTERNAL SITUATION

KURDISH TRIBES

The last decades of the Ottoman Empire saw a significant extension of Ottoman power in eastern Anatolia. Telegraph lines and new roads brought Ottoman administrative authority to Van, Diyarbakir, and the other eastern vilâyets. For the first time in the modern history of the Ottoman Empire, government officials were able to penetrate to remote villages in the east and enumerate the inhabitants for census and conscription records. ¹⁰ Law and order were established through renewed Ottoman military power. When

in World War I these military forces withdrew, civil order ended.

As the First World War began, Ottoman troops were withdrawn from garrisons in southeastern and central Anatolia and sent

-183-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 183.

to fight the Russians on the Caucasian border. Significantly, all but a minimum of the gendarmerie, the police of the rural east, were withdrawn from public security duties and organized into gendarmerie units in the army. ¹¹ These were desperately needed at the front, both for their fighting abilities and for their knowledge of the region. With the gendarmes gone and the Ottoman army dying on the Caucasian front, the Kurdish tribes were in a position to renew their raids on the civilian population.

In theory, Kurdish tribesmen should have been conscripted into the Ottoman army, but in fact they usually were not. Settled agricultural Kurds and Kurds in eastern cities were conscripted and went off to war just as did Turks; tribal Kurds did not. In order to conscript Kurdish tribesmen, the Ottomans would have been forced to send an army to first subdue the tribes -- not a practical possibility in the midst of war. Many Kurdish tribes thus took what can best be called a neutral position in the war, working to their own advantage whenever possible. Kurdish tribesmen even fought against the Ottomans in the Van Vilâyeti and in the Dersim region. ¹² In southern Van, an entire gendarmerie battalion was needed to put to flight Bedirham Abdfirrezzak, who attempted to set up a major Kurdish revolt. ¹³ The Dersim Kurds had contributed irregulars to the Ottoman army at the beginning of the war, but changed sides when the Ottomans began to lose. They attacked Ottoman convoys, slaughtered Turkish army units, and pillaged local villages. ¹⁴ Most of the tribesmen who were ostensibly fighting alongside the Ottoman army in the Ottoman campaign in Persia in 1915 ¹⁵ deserted and joined in the pillage and murder being carried out by the tribes in the region between lakes Van and Urmiah. ¹⁶

The Ottoman government recognized that many Kurdish tribesmen could not be considered loyal or compliant citizens. One month before the war began, the government attempted, unsuccessfully, to organize loyal militia and to seize arms in Kurdish hands in order "to maintain the loyalty of

Kurdish and other Moslem communities who could be misled because of ignorance," a typically understated Ottoman euphemism for treason. ¹⁷ In territories conquered by the Russians in northeastern Anatolia, Kurdish tribes usually quickly made peace with the Russians, although their animosity toward Armenians smoldered. The Kurdish tribes were to be a major source of **death** for Armenians and, to a lesser extent, Turks and settled Kurds in the war.

-184-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 184.

THE ARMENIAN REVOLUTION

Not coincidentally, the Armenian revolt in eastern Anatolia began as soon as the Russians realized that the Ottoman Empire would go to war. Before Russia declared war on 2 November 1914, Armenian guerrillas had already begun to organize into guerrilla bands. In preparation for revolt, Armenian revolutionaries had stored vast stockpiles of weapons, largely provided or paid for by the Russian government. ¹⁸ These were kept primarily in Armenian villages and were obviously well-hidden from Ottoman authorities, an indication of the lack of Ottoman control in the region before the war. For example, Ottoman investigators found "in searches conducted by the Government of Tuzlasar Village of Hafik yesterday, 16 crates of weapons, 20 bombs, and a crate of blue uniforms were uncovered and confiscated," and Armenian rifles were better than those issued to the Ottoman army. ¹⁹ Government investigators found large caches of arms in ten villages of the Pervari district. ²⁰ More arms caches were found scattered throughout the east. Great amounts of rifles and dynamite were found in the areas of Muş, Diyarbakir, and Sivas. However, subsequent events made it clear that the Ottomans had found only a very small part of the weapons collected by the Armenian revolutionaries. With weapons stored for the expected revolution, Ottoman citizen Armenians began to arm themselves and organize on both sides of the border. Bands were formed in the Kars-Ardahan-Artvin border regions (which had been taken from the Ottomans in 1878) and in Van, Erzurum, and Bitlis vilâyets. ²¹

When war was declared, the Armenian revolutionaries mobilized. Anatolian Armenians who had previously gone to Russia reentered the Ottoman

Empire and led guerrilla groups. ²²One band of more than a thousand was organized by a former Armenian deputy to the Ottoman Parliament, Garo Pasdirmajian (Armen Garo). ²³Famous guerrilla leaders such as Andranik, who had led the 1895 Armenian revolt, organized the Anatolian revolutionaries and enrolled thousands of new recruits, including Armenians from Iran. ²⁴In the Russian Caucasus, the Dashnak Party recruited members for guerrilla bands that would enter the Ottoman Empire. ²⁵The bands included both "Russian" and "Turkish" Armenians, although to the guerrillas themselves such a distinction would have been all but meaningless.

-185-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 185.

Armenian guerrilla units went through Armenian villages, recruiting men and assisting or forcing (depending on which version one ascribes to) Armenians to migrate to areas of Russian control. ²⁶The guerrilla units were joined by a great number of Armenian deserters from the Ottoman Army, who both formed guerrilla/bandit gangs in Anatolia and went off to join the Russian and Armenian forces who were preparing themselves in the Caucasus. ²⁷Great internal migrations took place; Armenians and Muslims who lived in mixed villages migrated to purely Armenian or purely Muslim villages. Large numbers went over, respectively, to either the Russian or the Ottoman lines. ²⁸Around 6,000 to 8,000 Armenian guerrillas, primarily from Muş, Van, and Bitlis, gathered in the area of Kağızman and were organized and trained by Russians. ²⁹Another group of approximately 6,000 Anatolian Armenians was trained and organized in Iğdir and formed into guerrilla bands. The Ottoman army estimated that 30,000 armed men from Sivas Vilâyeti alone joined the Armenian forces, ³⁰probably an exaggerated number, but indicative of a great and long-planned rebellion.

Perhaps the most famous Armenian resistance was in the mountainous area around Musa Daği, near Antakya, where perhaps 5,000 resisted Ottoman troops for 53 days until they were taken aboard a French warship. ³¹

At first, Ottoman military units, mail deliveries, gendarmerie posts, and recruiting units were attacked in Muş, Şitak, Suşehri, Zeytun, Aleppo, Dört Yol, and many other areas. ³²Telegraph lines were cut in the regions of Reşadiye, Karçekan, and Gevaş beginning in December of 1914 ³³and later

all over eastern Anatolia. ³⁴Between five hundred and six hundred Armenian rebels occupied the Tekye Monastery and fought a bloody, day-long pitched battle with Ottoman troops and gendarmes, escaping from Ottoman troops in the night. ³⁵Battles were also fought between rebels and the Ottoman police in the streets of Zeytun. ³⁶In Diyarbakir Vilâyeti, a combination of Armenian villagers and Armenian deserters formed bands and attacked Muslim villages and Ottoman troops. ³⁷Unprotected Muslim villages were assaulted and Muslims massacred, although the murders could not compare to what was later to befall the Muslims of the east. ³⁸

Armenian plans to take eastern cities were brought into force once the war began. ³⁹For the sake of understanding the chronology of massacre and countermassacre in the region, it should be under-

-186-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 186.

stood that these and other revolutionary activities took place well before any orders for deportation of Armenians were given. The revolts or attacks on Ottoman forces in Van, Zeytun, Muş, Reşadiye, Gevaş, and other cities and towns all began before the Ottoman order of deportation (26 May 1915). By May of 1915, eastern Anatolia was already in the midst of a civil war. ⁴⁰

THE INTERCOMMUNAL WAR

The outbreak of World War I signalled the last phase of the intercommunal war that had begun in the 1820s. Armenians and Muslims had engaged in atrocities in the Caucasus and eastern Anatolia for 100 years, but the killings of World War I were qualitatively and quantitatively different. Whereas earlier atrocities on both sides had been geographically limited, the events of World War I took place all over the east. In earlier times, massacres had been bounded by the assertion of government authority. From 1915 on, however, there was little effective assertion of any peace-keeping authority to end the violence. The effect of this on the Armenian population was great and has long been discussed. The discussion here will be of the other side of the murderous equation -- the murders of Muslims.

Evidence from Muslim survivors of the Armenian attacks indicates that a

long-term hatred was at work. Brutal rapes were everywhere evident, and torture before murder was common. Unlike atrocities against Muslims in Europe in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 and in the Balkan Wars, attacks by Armenians on the Muslims of the east during World War I seem to have been focused on murder rather than on causing flight.

There were three "sides" in the battles and massacres. On one side were the settled Muslims -- Turks, Kurds, and others -- and the Ottoman military forces. On another side were Armenians, some other native Christians, and the Russian army. On the third side were tribal Kurds, an essentially neutral force that looked for its own benefit. The first two sides were led by those who fervently advanced their cause and were committed to the total defeat of their enemies. Many civilian Armenians and Muslims, however,

-187-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 187.

were peasants and urban dwellers who were compelled to join their coreligionists in total war. Inasmuch as they were being killed because they were Muslims or Armenians, they were obliged to fight as Muslims or Armenians to defend themselves. From the first, the war was distinguished by attacks on civilian populations. The innocent and peaceful on both sides were forced to fight.

VAN

In March 1915, rebellion broke out in Van Vilâyeti. Armenian revolutionary forces gathered and organized. Armenian villagers then infiltrated the city of Van. Armenian villagers attacked Muslim villages and, in turn, Kurdish tribes attacked Armenian villages. ⁴¹On 20 April, Armenians in Van began to fire at police stations and Muslim residences. ⁴²Armenian revolutionaries had secreted enough weapons in the town and surrounding villages to stage their revolution, and the Ottomans estimated that up to 4,000 Armenian fighters had entered the city. ⁴³As the Armenians advanced and defeated Ottoman security forces, they burned the Muslim quarter and killed the Muslims who fell into their hands. By 14 April, the city was completely in Armenian hands, although under siege from Ottoman troops who arrived after the city had fallen. The Armenians held out in the city until Russian

troops from the Caucasus could arrive, forcing an Ottoman retreat on 17 May. (The Ottomans regained what was left of Van on 22 July 1915, but it was lost again to the Russians the next month.) The massacre of Muslims in Van and neighboring villages continued. With few exceptions, the only Muslims who survived were those who managed to flee, primarily those who fled with the Ottoman army. The dead included wounded and ill Ottoman soldiers who had come to Van to recover. Zeve, Mollah Kasim, Şeyh Kara, Şeyh Ayne, Zorayad Pakes, ⁴⁴Hidir, Amuk, Ayans, Veranduz, Haravil, Deir, Zivana, Karkar, ⁴⁵and many other villages not identified by name were destroyed.

In Van, the first to be singled out for assassination seem to have been Ottoman civic and religious leaders and their families. This follows a pattern seen in the Balkans -- killing first those who might have organized opposition -- and indicates a degree of planning. However, the Muslims of Van were effectively destroyed long

-188-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 188.

before they could have organized any resistance, and the hideous tortures inflicted on the notables could only have been the product of intense hatred. ⁴⁶Everything Islamic in Van was destroyed. With the exception of three antique buildings, all the mosques were burned or torn down. The entire Muslim quarter was destroyed. When the Armenian work and the battle between Ottomans and Armenians were finished, Van more resembled an ancient ruin than a city. ⁴⁷(In the entire old city of Van only a handful of buildings remained.)

When the Ottomans evacuated Van, many of those who had been able to flee were set upon by Armenian bands on the roads. Approximately 400 from one group were killed between Erçis and Adilcevaz. ⁴⁸Armenians also killed three hundred Jews who tried to escape toward Hakkâri. ⁴⁹Other refugees found their way blocked by Armenian bands and armed Armenian villagers, who attacked all Muslims passing by.

The stories told by Muslim villagers were all much the same. When the Armenians attacked Muslims' own villages or nearby villages, Muslims fled with whatever moveable property they could carry. On the road, Armenian

bands first robbed them, then raped many of the women and killed many of the men. Usually, but not always, a number of women and young children were killed as well. The surviving villagers were then left to travel to safety if they could, without food or adequate clothing. The villagers were unable to defend themselves either in their homes or on the road because most young Muslim males had been conscripted. Only very old and very young males and women were left. Armenian bands, however, were made up of young males who had never been drafted, were deserters from the Ottoman army, or who had come from the Caucasus. ⁵⁰

The following are excerpts from some of the depositions given by refugees from Van Vilâyeti who found asylum in Mamuretülaziz:

[Abdi and Reşid Molla] After the evacuation of Gevaş and Van, a mixed detachment of Cossacks and Armenians 500 men strong, guided by the Armenians Hadjo, Kechiche-Serkis, Onnik, Mako, Parso of the village of Tab, assaulted the village of Karhar in Gevaş. They directed their fire at the houses, massacring men and infants and defiling the women so badly that many among them died. Only a few dozen villagers escaped with great difficulty.

-189-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 189.

[Yusuf Kenan and Abdul Hakim] On August 5 of last year [1915] a band composed of Russians and of Armenians of Gevaş and Çatak attacked Mukus. Those who were able to save themselves fled, leaving all their goods. The women, the elderly, and the children who were not able to flee were all massacred. One could distinguish among the band Krikor of the village of Pare; the schoolmaster Karabet, Vahan, and Artin of the village of Kinekai, Kevork of Mukus, Minto Sempat, Hayastan [sic], the blacksmith Naro, Katchik, Mouhik Dikran and Bedros. These bandits mainly attacked women, heinously defiling them.

[Ali son of Halid and Salih, of Serir] All the inhabitants of the Armenian villages of Surtenin, Varshekans, Mezrea, and Pars attacked the village of Serir early in the morning. Of 60 men, not 15 remain. The rest were killed, the women taken away, and the houses pillaged.

[Behloul son of Saad and Mahmud son of Kutas, notables of the village of Sukan] The village of Sukan had a population of 680 souls. The Russo-Armenians invaded the village one night. No one was able to stop them, because the Muslim population was not armed. The executioners set fire to the houses and a number of women and children perished under the sabres of the Cossacks and the daggers of the revolutionaries. At dawn they assembled the survivors of the previous night. The girls and young women were taken off in an unknown direction. At noon they set on fire the place where the villagers were interned. Only 21 miraculously escaped the carnage. [A list of those recognized among the Armenian attackers followed.]

[Şeyh Enver and Molla Reşid, religious notables of Alan] When they were told that 100 cavalry and a strong detachment of infantry were approaching the village, the population fled. But the inhabitants of the Armenian villages of Belo, Tankas, Azerkoh, and Peronz barred their way and assaulted the women. The Russian detachment had entered the village and the houses were in flames. Those who were little able to walk, such as the old, the sick, and children were mercilessly massacred. The Cossacks flung themselves on anyone who tried to escape. Only a very few managed to evade the butchery. ⁵¹

As seen above, Muslim villagers identified Cossacks as riding with the Armenian bands as they pillaged and massacred in villages. However, it is difficult to tell if the particular bands mentioned were, in fact, advance units of the Russian army, which used Armenian guides and Armenian bands as "shock troops," or whether Cossacks were operating behind Ottoman lines with the Armenian bands. In either case, the Cossacks do seem to have participated in at least some of the massacres of Muslim villagers and refugees. ⁵²

-190-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 190.

At the same time as the Van uprising, Armenians in villages ⁵³of the Pervari region gathered together in revolt and battled Ottoman gendarmes for three days. Muslim males of nearby villages were killed and young women abducted. ⁵⁴

BITLIS

The Armenians of Bitlis rose against the Ottomans in February of 1916, immediately before the Russian advance to the city. The massacres of Muslims began then and continued until the first Russian occupation. In the city itself, Muslim men, women, and children were hunted down and killed in the streets. ⁵⁵Villages were destroyed and the inhabitants massacred by Armenian guerrilla bands operating behind Ottoman lines. ⁵⁶Others were destroyed by Armenian and Cossack bands operating as advance units of the invading Russian army. ⁵⁷Special care seems to have been taken to kill agents of the Ottoman government who were caught in the city. ⁵⁸The few Muslims who escaped from destroyed villages found it impossible to describe whether their attackers were Armenians from the Caucasus or Armenians from Anatolia -- there seeming to have been no distinction made either among the Armenians and Russians or among the Muslims. ⁵⁹

When the Ottoman government briefly retook Bitlis, it sent an investigation team to detail the destruction. Armenians had destroyed or burned the Central Mosque, the Great Mosque, and 13 others, and had converted the mosque of Hatuniye into a stable. Three dervish convents were destroyed, four religious colleges, four holy tombs, along with schools, baths, and other buildings. The city's major public buildings, including police, gendarmerie, municipality, and provincial administrative buildings, were destroyed. All major bridges were torn down. The major commercial and military warehouses and depots were burnt. In short, almost everything of religious, civil, or military importance, along with most Muslim private houses, was destroyed. ⁶⁰

THE COUNTRYSIDE

In February of 1915, Armenians in the Bitlis and Van vilâyetets began to attack Muslim villagers. Among numerous others, for

-191-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 191.

example, they attacked the villages of Kayali (Mardin Sancağı), raping

young women and killing villagers in the streets. They took prisoners from the village and killed them on the road, and did the same to a large number of refugees who were fleeing the area. ⁶¹Ottoman officials found 19 bodies in the ruins of the village of Avran in Bitlis Vilâyeti. ⁶²The two villages of Merkehu and İştucu in Van Vilâyeti reported the following statistics, which were probably typical of villages in the region:

Killed in the village of Merkehu	41 men, 14 women
Killed after having been raped	4 women
Killed in the village of Istucu	7 men, 4 women
Raped, but left alive	5 women
Wounded	3 men, 2 women ⁶³

Armenians in rural districts of Van Vilâyeti, such as Karçekan and Gevaş, revolted in December. ⁶⁴All over eastern Anatolia, gendarmes were attacked by Armenian villagers and organized bands. Telegraph lines were cut, and Muslim villagers were terrorized. ⁶⁵

THE RUSSIANS

There is no documentary evidence that Russian authorities orchestrated the initial Armenian attacks. There was no need for them to do so and the Armenians could be safely trusted to disrupt Ottoman territories on their own. The Russians, however, did all they could to facilitate the Armenian uprising, including seizing the weapons of Muslims in occupied territories and distributing them to local Armenians. Those with the most to benefit from Armenian actions against the Ottomans were the Russians. The activities of Armenian units and armed Armenian villagers allowed the Russians to free men who might have been needed in Anatolia and the Caucasus and to send them to the Russian western front.

-192-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 192.

Regarding normal military actions, the Anatolian Armenian units were most valuable behind the Ottoman lines, cutting telegraph lines and engaging in other "commando" attacks. ⁶⁶They also served as advance units of the Russian army in its 1916 campaign. ⁶⁷The Armenians, however, were far more valuable to the Russians by keeping Ottoman soldiers from the front. This was particularly true in regions such as Van, Zeytun, and Musa Dađi, where major insurrections kept thousands of Ottoman soldiers occupied. With eastern Anatolia in a state of insurrection, the Ottomans were forced to keep many soldiers far behind the lines to protect the population. ⁶⁸These soldiers were thus removed from the battles with the Russians. The Russians thus not only gained Armenian fighters for their side, but kept Ottoman soldiers from the front -- a valuable pair of assets. ⁶⁹

THE OTTOMAN RESPONSE

The Ottoman response to the Armenian Revolution was approximately the same as that taken by other twentieth-century governments faced with guerrilla war: isolate the guerrillas from local support by removing local supporters. The Ottomans knew that Armenian rebels were freely supported by Armenian villagers as well as by Armenians in the eastern cities that were home to leaders of their revolution. They, therefore, decided on radical action: forced migration of the Armenian population in actual or potential war zones. The first orders to that effect went out on 26 May 1915. The intention of the forced migration was to dilute the concentration of Armenians and keep them from war zones and important installations. Settlements were to be at least 25 kilometers from any railroad. After resettlement, no more than 10 percent of the population of any region was to be Armenian. ⁷⁰

The intentions of Istanbul were clear -- to move and resettle Armenians peacefully. The only verifiable Ottoman documents on the subject indicate at least a formal concern for the Armenian migrants. Elaborate procedures were written in Istanbul and forwarded to the provinces. These covered the sale of refugee goods, the settling of refugees in economic positions similar to those they

had left, instructions on health and sanitation, and the like. In short, all looked fine on paper. Articles 1 and 3 of the Resettlement Regulations show where the problems arose:

Article 1. Arrangements for transportation of those to be transferred is the responsibility of local administrations.

Article 3. Protection of lives and properties of Armenians to be transferred en route to their new settlements, their board and lodging and their rest is the responsibility of local administrations en route. Civil servants in all echelons are responsible for any negligence in this regard.
⁷¹

The administrators who were expected to oversee a massive movement of peoples were in the midst of a guerrilla war with the Armenian revolutionaries and a conventional war with the Russians. They had only very small peace-keeping forces at their command. The gendarmerie units remaining behind were not sufficient to battle the revolutionaries, much less guard convoys of Armenian migrants. Ottoman officials in the east were thus left with the choice of sending off well-guarded convoys of Armenians or leaving the gendarmes in place to defend the Muslims (and themselves) in their jurisdictions. It is doubtful if many human beings would have taken any course of action but the one they took; they protected their own. They must have viewed it as folly to send off their gendarmes to defend Armenians and thus allow other Armenians to attack them.⁷²

The burden of defending Armenians should more properly have fallen on the central government, but the situation of the central government was the same as that of the local governments. To send regular army troops to defend Armenian convoys would have meant detaching them from the battle against the Russians or the battle against the Armenians. The central government had no intention of doing so and, indeed, it would not have been possible for them to do so. They could have been under no illusions as to what would happen to Muslims if an Armenian state were created. The Balkan Wars had taught them what to expect. The fate of Muslim refugees from Russian-conquered territories also held an obvious lesson. The quickest way to ensure that the same happened in eastern Anatolia was to lose the war; withdrawing troops from combat duties would have greatly increased the likelihood of losing.

Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 194.

To risk such a thing in order to defend Armenian migrants would have appeared the same sort of folly to the central government as sending off precious gendarmes to accompany Armenian deportees would have appeared to local officials.

Lack of proper security opened the way for subsequent events: Some Ottoman officials were venal and stole from those in their charge. Some officials, particularly those who were from Caucasian Muslim groups that had themselves recently suffered the same deprivations, undoubtedly saw the Armenian situation as a chance to even old scores. Local citizens amassed large sums dealing in the property, and misery, of Armenian migrants. These included Muslims and Greek Christians, of whom the latter bought up Armenian lands and property in Black Sea provinces.⁷³ The greatest threat and cause of mortality to Armenians came from the nomadic tribes who raided Armenian convoys. The few gendarmes detailed to the convoys, for example, could not protect them from armed attacks by Kurds. While the tribes did not usually engage in the mass slaughter of Armenian migrants, they did kill large numbers of them and abducted their women. They probably caused the greatest mortality by stealing what the Armenians needed to subsist. Despite the regulations, little food was provided to the migrants, who were expected to feed themselves. But the tribes took their sustenance, and starvation was the result.

Some Ottoman officials themselves took part in the robbery of Armenians, sometimes even in the killing of Armenians. The Ottoman government recognized this and tried many Turks for actions against Armenians. Kamuran Gürün has found documents listing convictions of 1,397 persons for crimes against Armenians.⁷⁴ Some were executed for their crimes. While it is doubtful if the actions of those officials could have been by themselves the major factor in Armenian mortality, it is also doubtful if officials later tried by their own government for crimes against Armenians could have cared much for Armenian welfare while in office.

The decision to force the Armenians to leave was sound in purely military terms, but it caused hardship and great mortality among them, and these were deplorable. Nevertheless, it did have the desired effect: Armenian revolutionary attacks dwindled in areas still occupied by the Ottoman government. Cut off from local support, the guerrillas could not function. Whether the decision was actually needed to affect the outcome of the war will never be known. In the end, Armenian deportations did reveal the

Ottoman

-195-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 195.

state as a failure in its ability to protect its own citizens-the most important aspect of any state. It was the weakness of the Ottoman state that forced it to choose between two groups of its citizens. The blame for the deaths of Armenians in the convoys must be shared by the Ottomans -- shared with the Armenian revolutionaries and their supporters and with the Russians.

THE ARMENIAN RETREAT

The worst Armenian massacres of Muslims and destruction of Muslim villages took place in two periods at the beginning and end of the First World War. The first period began with the entry of the Ottoman Empire into the war and the beginnings of organized Armenian rebellion against the Ottomans. It ended with the Russian conquest of eastern Anatolia in 1916. The second period began as the Russian army dissolved or retreated from eastern Anatolia and ended with the defeat of the Armenian armed forces who had taken the Russians' place in the field.

For the middle period of the war, the years of Russian occupation of eastern Anatolia, from the middle of 1916 to the middle of 1917, there is very little evidence of any kind. No Ottoman investigation committees such as the ones that investigated the early atrocities were present to record the events of the Russian occupation. Scattered reports indicate that major massacres of Muslims took place, particularly in Van and Bitlis vilâyets.⁷⁵ From the large number of Muslim refugees, it is obvious that conditions were awful, but not as bad as they would become after the Russian army collapsed in 1917.

The Russian Revolution brought with it the wholesale desertion of Russian soldiers on the Anatolian front. Enlisted men and some officers simply left their units and walked home, stealing their sustenance (and anything else that was available) from villages as they passed.⁷⁶ Russian authority in eastern Anatolia was replaced by the authority of Armenian soldiers and Armenian bands, at first nominally under the control of the Transcaucasian

Federation, then as troops of the Armenian Republic. The area they ruled in Anatolia

-196-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 196.

stretched from Erzincan in the east to the Persian border and north to Trabzon and the border of Russian Armenia.

Muslim villagers suffered from the depredations of the deserting Russian soldiers, but they suffered far worse from the Armenians who were left in charge. After the Russians departed, nothing held the Armenians in check. The events of the first period of the short Armenian rule were of a type seen all too often in that time -- murder of unarmed Muslim villagers, kidnapping of villagers, who were never seen again, destruction of Muslim markets, neighborhoods, and villages, and ubiquitous plundering and rape.⁷⁷

Armenian atrocities in the region between Erzincan and Kars went on for a relatively short time. Using units that had been held in reserve for such a purpose, the Ottoman government followed the Russian collapse with an attack on the occupied territories.⁷⁸ Although they were relatively well-equipped with Russian supplies and weapons, the Armenians were outnumbered by the seasoned Ottoman troops. With the moral justification of the outrages being committed against Muslim villagers and townspeople,⁷⁹ the Ottomans attacked. The Armenian forces fell back in disarray. It was obvious to them that their cause was at least temporarily lost and that Turks would reoccupy what the Armenians had claimed as Anatolian Armenia. They set about to ensure that the Ottomans would find little when they arrived. Only the rapid advance of the Ottoman army saved many of the Muslims. Those who could not be reached in time all too often perished.

The Ottomans and later the Turkish Nationalists and, in particular, Ottoman and Turkish Nationalist generals on the eastern front lodged complaints about the way Muslims were treated by the Armenians. The Turks had difficulty in finding who was in charge of Armenian troops and guerrillas. Complaints and lists of atrocities were usually sent first to the Russian commanders who were nominally in charge, later to the generals⁸⁰ who theoretically commanded the forces of the Transcaucasian Federation. In fact, these were not the masters of the Armenians who were murdering

Muslims. Understating the case, the general commanding the Ottoman Third Army in northeastern Anatolia, Vehib Paşa, wrote, "I have regularly informed the Russian Command of these atrocities and cruelties and I have gained the impression that the above authority seems to be failing in restoring order." ⁸¹ Insofar as Armenian guerrillas in Anatolia answered to any master it was to the

-197-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 197.

Armenian Republic, which was neither sympathetic toward Muslims nor had any intention to accede to Ottoman wishes. ⁸²

Vehib Paşa received the reports of advance units that entered cities evacuated by Armenians, and he saw the evidence of Armenian atrocities with his own eyes. In his report to his superiors in Istanbul he described the sad situation:

All people old enough to use weapons were rounded up, taken to the Sarikami direction for road-building and were slaughtered. The remaining people were subject to cruelties and murder by Armenians following the withdrawal of the Russians and were partly annihilated, the corpses thrown into wells, burnt in houses, mutilated by bayonets, their abdomens ripped open in slaughterhouses, their lungs and livers torn out, girls and women hung up by their hair, after all kinds of devilish acts. The few people who were able to survive these cruelties, worse than those of the Spanish Inquisition, are in poverty, more dead than alive, horrified, some driven insane, about 1500 in Erzincan and 30,000 in Erzurum. The people are hungry and in poverty, for whatever they had has been taken away from them, their lands left uncultivated.

The people have just been able to exist with some provisions found in stores left over from the Russians. The villages round Erzincan and Erzurum are in the worst condition. Some villages on the road have been levelled to the ground, leaving no stone on stone, the people completely massacred. ⁸³

ERZINCAN

The events in Erzincan began at the end of January 1918. In the Erzincan region, Armenian soldiers who had been members of the Russian army were in control, nominally under the command of a Frenchman who had served in the Russian army, Colonel Morel. To these were added a force of Armenian guerrillas under the leadership of one "Murat," a guerrilla leader originally from Sivas. The execution of the Muslim population was mainly at the hands of these Armenian guerrillas.

As their first action, the Armenians took the more prominent male members of the Muslim community and executed them, some in the city, others in surrounding areas. ⁸⁴The remaining Muslims were slaughtered en masse, and many were burned to **death** in the town square, the barracks, and nearby houses.

Hundreds ⁸⁵of Muslims were brought from surrounding villages into the city and executed. The intent to kill as many Muslims as

-198-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 198.

possible was obvious from the actions, later repeated elsewhere, of Armenian leaders, ⁸⁶who went to surrounding villages ordering the peasants to assemble in the city. Those who did so were slaughtered.

Ten days after the slaughter began, Ottoman troops entered Erzincan, now a ghost town; the Armenians had fled, and the Muslims were dead. The Ottoman soldiers marched along a road of corpses:

[Vehib Paşa] From Çardakli-Boğaz to Erzincan I have seen all the villages destroyed to the point that not one villager's hut has escaped destruction. The trees in all the orchards have been cut down and all the villagers are dead. History has not recorded atrocities such as those committed by the Armenians in Erzincan. For three days we have done nothing but gather up the bodies of Muslims killed by Armenians then cast aside. Among these innocent victims are children not yet weaned, ninety year old men, and women cut to pieces. ⁸⁷

Vehib Paşa estimated that more than 1,000 houses had been destroyed. ⁸⁸ The public buildings of Erzincan were completely demolished, as were most

of the private houses of Muslims. Sometimes, as was the case with the military barracks, the destruction was part of the massacre of Muslims. Other buildings, such as mosques and government buildings, were destroyed as symbols of the Ottoman government or Islamic religion. From the scope of the destruction, one can assume that the Armenians did not believe that Erzincan could be held, but, on the contrary, should be destroyed rather than turned over to their enemies. The city was a ruin.⁸⁹ Ottoman soldiers who came into Erzincan reported a horrifying scene: "Erzincan is a scene of tragedy. Wells are full of the corpses of Moslems. Dismembered bodies, hands, legs, heads are still spread all over the gardens of the homes."⁹⁰ Three hundred-twelve unburied bodies were found by the soldiers;⁹¹ 606 were found buried in wells and ditches; and, of course, many more than that number had been killed. The fate of 650 Muslims who had been taken from the city, ostensibly for road building, was unknown.⁹²

BAYBURT

The events in Bayburt were similar to those in Erzincan. As in Erzincan, Armenian guerrillas (under their leader, Arshak) ordered the people of the surrounding region into the city. However,

-199-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 199.

the Muslims had heard of the very recent events⁹³ in Erzincan; they fled to the mountains. Bayburt itself was largely destroyed by Armenians forced to retreat before the Ottoman advance of 1918. Before they could leave, Armenian gangs gathered 250 Muslims into the central prison and murdered them. Approximately 400 buildings in the town were burnt down. When Ottoman troops arrived, they found an additional 200 corpses hastily buried or lying in the streets. More than 600 Muslims may have been killed.⁹⁴

TERCAN

The town of Tercan was completely destroyed by retreating Armenians. Ruined buildings, many blown up with dynamite left in a Russian

ammunition dump, were filled with Muslim corpses. Seven hundred corpses of children alone were counted by Ottoman troops who entered the ruins. The remaining Turks and the Ottoman forces blamed the Armenians for the atrocities. "The people suffered no cruelties from the Russians. All these atrocities and destruction are the work of the Armenians after the withdrawal of the Russians." ⁹⁵

ERZURUM

The position of the Turks in the city of Erzurum had been relatively good, at least when compared to other areas of the Ottoman East, until the breakup of Russian authority in the city. As Russian rule ended, the Turks began to experience at first indignities at the hands of the Armenians, then abduction and theft, and finally rape and murder. Turks were attacked in the streets and were little safer from roving Armenian bands in their homes. ⁹⁶

The final massacre of Muslims in Erzurum began on 10 February 1918. On that day, a large number of Muslims were taken under the pretext of corvée labor, then were robbed and killed before the Kars Gate, which led out of the city of Erzurum. In the town itself, houses were broken into, pillaged, and burned, and thousands were killed. Ottoman authorities estimated 8,000 killed in and around the city. ⁹⁷ They described Erzurum as "a city of ruins." ⁹⁸

-200-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 200.

It is probable that the rapid advance of the Ottoman army saved Erzurum from greater misfortunes. When units of the Ottoman army entered Erzurum, they found thousands of corpses of Muslims murdered by Armenians. Between the retaking of the city, on 12 March 1918 and 20 March, Ottoman soldiers had counted 2,127 male bodies and were continuing the enumeration and search. These were only the male bodies found in the city limits and counted in the first 8 days after the Ottoman entry into the city, only a portion of those killed. ⁹⁹

THE COUNTRYSIDE

Villages naturally did not escape the Armenians. Captain Refik in Erzincan commented, "All the villages from Trabzon up to Erzincan are piles of debris." ¹⁰⁰ Perhaps this is an exaggeration, but it is indicative of the state of Muslim villages once the Armenian forces had passed. Christian villages had generally not been touched, which corresponds with evidence from American sources. ¹⁰¹

The worst destruction was among the villages on the Armenian line of retreat from Erzincan to Erzurum and from Trabzon to Erzurum; in the latter area, Greek guerrilla bands were also responsible for some of these events. According to Ottoman military reports, in the Erzincan region, Armenian guerrillas burnt 20 houses before they fled Yenilköy and murdered 35 people at Askale. ¹⁰² Armenians escaping on the road from Hınıs to Köprüköy killed any Muslims they encountered in the villages along the road. ¹⁰³ Food supplies were destroyed and four hundred Muslims were reported dead in the town and the surrounding villages of Mamahatun (Tercan). ¹⁰⁴ On their retreat, Armenian gangs swept quickly into Muslim villages they passed and killed whomever they could find. For example, the village of Tazegül was burned, by one gang and 30 villagers killed; the same thing occurred at Öreni in the same district. ¹⁰⁵ The Ottoman Interior Ministry also reported 36 Muslims murdered in Yusufeli, 150 in Ispir, and 85 in Köprüköy. In Badicivan, 200 were killed and 385 wounded. ¹⁰⁶

The situation in the villages to the north of Erzincan was much the same as that in the east. These villages had suffered greatly from Armenian bands during the Russian occupation and suffered even more during the Armenian retreat. Not only were villages destroyed and villagers killed, but the livelihood of the survivors

-201-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 201.

was destroyed as well. Their fruit trees, which would have taken many years to mature, were cut down.

In the regions through which the Armenian soldiers and guerrillas passed, very few Muslim villages survived intact. The villagers either escaped to the mountains or were slain. A reporter for Austrian newspapers who was on the scene, Dr. Stephan Eshnanie, reported that "All the villages from Trabzon to

Erzincan and from Erzincan to Erzurum are destroyed. Corpses of Turks brutally and cruelly slain are everywhere. I am now in Erzurum, and what I see is terrible. Almost the whole city is destroyed. The smell of the corpses still fills the air. . . ." ¹⁰⁷

Muslim refugees choked the roads on which they were often attacked and killed, the women abducted and goods seized. ¹⁰⁸

A list of Muslim villages destroyed by Armenians in the last months of World War I would be long, as would be the list of the massacred. Whole regions, especially areas along the lines of march of retreating Armenian soldiers, were destroyed. Villages were burnt and dynamited, their populations slaughtered. The methods of extermination differed. For example, Armenians killed 50 Muslims of the Erkinis village north of Erzurum. The rural town of Hasankale was burned to the ground, and those who could not flee were killed. ¹⁰⁹ In villages such as Sarlipazar, Akkilise, and İnesil, near Erzincan, Armenians slowly murdered the population over a long period. ¹¹⁰ In others, such as Kukurtlu, where 300 were reportedly massacred, Armenians rode into town and massacred the Muslim inhabitants in one day. ¹¹¹

As the Ottoman soldiers recaptured eastern Anatolia from the Armenians they encountered fearsome sights. They reported what they saw in detailed reports. For example: "The Armenians took approximately 50 Muslims from the Erkinis village north of Erzurum and killed them. . . . In the villages of Hasankale and vicinity the Muslims were murdered with bullets, axes, and knives. Maidens were abominably used, some taken away by the Armenians. . . ." ¹¹²

After the Armenian retreat, much of eastern Anatolia was a graveyard.

CILICIA

The geographic designation Cilicia is as inexact as other terms used at the time, such as Palestine, Armenia, or Kurdistan. None designated a real administrative division, so their boundaries were

-202-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 202.



Cilicia.

to be found in the minds of those who used the names. Generally, the term Cilicia covered the Ottoman vilâyet of Adana, the sancak of Maraş, and nearby areas.

When dividing the spoils of war, the Allied Powers treated Cilicia as a northern extension of Syria and awarded it to France. Under the Sykes-Picot Agreement of 1916 between England and France, the French zone included most of the Ottoman provinces of Adana, northern Haleb, Diyarbakir, Mamuretülaziz, and Sivas -an area that included the cities of Adana, İskenderun, Maraş, Antep, Mardin, and Diyarbakir. By the end of the war, however, it was obvious that such a wide area could never be controlled by the French. Only Cilicia was claimed. According to the terms of the Mudros Armistice, by which the Ottomans conceded defeat in the war, the Allies were allowed to occupy ports, "to occupy any strategic points in event of a situation arising which threatens the

-203-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 203.

security of the Allies," and to occupy the Taurus railroad tunnel system. ¹¹³ None of these points (or any others in the armistice) could be interpreted to include the Allied occupation of Cilicia, but the French did not feel constrained by armistice clauses.

According to Article 16 of the Mudros Armistice, all Ottoman forces except "those necessary to maintain order" were to withdraw from Cilicia. The Ottoman Second Army withdrew slowly and by the end of 1918 had moved west of Pozanti, in the direction of Konya, leaving behind only gendarmerie as representatives of Ottoman authority. In the place of the Ottoman armies came French forces. The French were poorly organized and in insufficient numbers to patrol Syria proper, much less Cilicia. They were at first led by officers who showed little interest in peaceful settlement of wartime conflicts. It was even alleged that the purpose of the French officers in Cilicia, such as Colonel Bremond, was the amassing of personal riches through confiscation and raids on the population. ¹¹⁴ Worse, the French had

very few French soldiers under their command, so the "French" forces in Cilicia were in reality colonial troops and Armenians; the latter were only nominally under the control of French officers. The first agents of the French occupation of Cilicia were battalions of the Armenian Legion. ¹¹⁵The Armenian Legion, a part of the French Légion d'Orient, consisted of four battalions, approximately 5,000 soldiers and officers, ¹¹⁶who had enlisted in Egypt. It was made up of Armenian refugees from Anatolia, Armenians from other parts of the Middle East, and Armenians who had come from Europe and even America. From the first, the aim of the legion was clear. As Armenian officials stated, the legion's members had not enlisted as regular French units, but as a special group enrolled expressly to fight Turks (and only that). ¹¹⁷French sources claimed that Armenian units were plagued by lack of discipline and refused to follow the orders of their officers. The Armenian troops were heavily influenced by Armenian revolutionary groups. Their anti-Muslim feelings were so strong that they even battled with French Algerian Muslim troops. ¹¹⁸

In November of 1918, the Armenian Legion fought the police in Beirut, greatly embarrassing the French. The Armenians were sent north to occupy Turkish lands immediately after the debacle in Beirut. In late November, they arrived in İskenderun (Alexandretta). Some remained there and others were sent on in late December to occupy the Adana Vilâyeti. Disorders followed upon their arrival in İskenderun, Baylan, and Dörtyol. In the Dörtyol

-204-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 204.

region, Armenian villagers and Armenian soldiers combined to attack Muslim villages. The Turkish villagers took to the mountains. Property left behind was pillaged. ¹¹⁹When the French tried to repress their attacks on Muslim homes, the Armenian soldiers in Baylan mutinied. Others deserted and joined groups made up of legionnaires, local Armenians, and Armenian refugees, who attacked the towns of Arab-Deresi and Kirik Hane (January 1919). ¹²⁰

The Armenian Legion on entering İskenderun invaded Muslim houses, ostensibly looking for Armenian girls who had been taken as captives by the Turks. ¹²¹There were a number of rapes attendant on such activities, and

few of the women abducted by Armenians were, in fact, of Armenian background. ¹²² Similar events took place in Adana Vilâyeti wherever Armenian troops appeared. The Ottoman government recorded the extensive use of rifle butts as tools of occupation policy. Murders of Turks were common, although murder was small-scale compared to the contemporaneous situation in western and eastern Anatolia and the Caucasus. ¹²³ Partisan (chetté) bands were formed from local Armenian villagers, returned Armenian refugees, and deserters from the Armenian Legion. These preyed on Turkish villagers throughout the area of occupation. ¹²⁴ Turkish villagers had no recourse to law or hope of assistance, since civil authority, while theoretically in the hands of the French, was actually in the hands of Armenians. The French contended that they and the British were unable to restrain the Armenians and unable to respond to Turkish complaints, which the French General Hamelin called "complaints, unfortunately most often well-founded, against all sorts of [Armenian] excesses against the population (robbery, armed attacks, pillaging, murders)." ¹²⁵

While attacks on Turks were occurring, Armenians were migrating to Cilicia in great numbers. ¹²⁶ Most were probably refugees from various sections of Anatolia who had earlier either fled or been deported by the Ottomans. French and English authorities (the English were in charge of the region immediately after the war) assisted the migration. Eight thousand Armenians were sent to Mersin by ship, ¹²⁷ and many more arrived in Cilicia by land. Refugees from other areas of Anatolia and even Armenians who came from regions such as Kayseri, where they had remained throughout the war, went to Cilicia and what they thought would be a new Armenian land. The French and English assumed that wartime hatreds would be forgotten, or at least submerged, but they greatly miscalculated.

The effective end of the Armenian Legion came after events

-205-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 205.

beginning on 16 February in İskenderun. There the Armenians attacked French Muslim soldiers, rioted, burned and pillaged Muslim homes, and murdered local Muslims, with untold casualties. ¹²⁸ Unlike their actions in the Cilician hinterlands, the actions of the Armenian Legion in İskenderun were

done in full view of the outside world and caused an Allied reappraisal of the use of Armenian troops. The British Syrian Command, which still had overall authority over Syria and Cilicia, ordered the evacuation of Armenian troops and their replacement by British regulars. In the restrained summary of a French historian of the Cilician occupation:

Two days after the collective rebellion in Alexandretta, the [Armenian] battalions in Cilicia were replaced by British troops. . . . In Cilicia itself, the numerous acts of undiscipline -- thefts, various brutalities against Turks, kidnapping young girls to "rescue" them, abduction by force of arms -- were incompatible with the mission of the Legion. ¹²⁹

In fact, Armenian troops were relieved between 18 February and 16 March 1919 and regrouped in Adana, Mersin, and Hamidiye, where their depredations continued for a time. ¹³⁰

Despite the expulsion of the Armenian Legion, the situation in Cilicia remained volatile. Following Allied plans for division of the conquered territories among themselves, British garrisons were soon replaced by French soldiers, primarily colonial recruits from Senegal and Armenian auxiliary units. The attacks on Muslim civilians did not cease, particularly in the eastern part of Cilicia -- the Maraş Sancağı. There, Turkish bands and Armenian bands each engaged in murdering civilians of the other group. ¹³¹ Turkish villages, some armed with captured French weapons, held off French and Armenian (locals, armed by the French) attacks. ¹³² In the cities and villages of the southeast, French troops and local Armenians burned Turkish houses, pillaged buildings, raped Muslim women, and murdered Turkish civilians. Arms were confiscated from Muslims and given to Armenians. Nevertheless, the Turks as a group were armed and resisting. ¹³³ Events came to a head in March of 1920, when Turkish forces retook Maraş from the French. ¹³⁴ In the battles and massacres that accompanied the reconquest of Maraş, thousands of Turks and Armenians were killed. The city was largely destroyed, mainly by French bombardment and deliberate incendiarism. On their retreat, the French colonials and Armenians de-

-206-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 206.

stroyed all the Turkish villages in their path. In the words of American High

Commissioner Bristol:

The majority of troops were made up of French colonial [sic] and of Armenians. They burned and destroyed many Turkish villages as punitive measures in their advance and practically all Turkish villages during their retreat from Marash. ¹³⁵

The majority of the Armenians of the Maraş region fled with the French, but thousands of Armenians remained behind, guarded by the Turkish army. With the advent of Turkish Nationalist authority in the Maraş Sancağı, unrest virtually ceased and there were no further massacres there. ¹³⁶ However, fighting continued in the rest of Cilicia, and the massacre of Muslims was a real fear for the Turkish forces. The British reported that Turkish Nationalist troops held back from occupying Adana and Mersin because they feared that, if they advanced, all Muslims in the towns would be massacred by local Christians, who were all armed. ¹³⁷

Battles between the Turks and the French and murders by Armenian and Turkish bands continued until the French finally evacuated Cilicia in December 1921, taking with them approximately 30,000 Armenians. More Armenians, almost the entire Armenian population of Cilicia, soon followed. ¹³⁸ The French, as their losses mounted, showed less and less commitment to the Armenians and were unwilling to pay the necessary price to install an Armenian minority in control in Cilicia. They became, in fact, extremely critical of Armenian actions in Cilicia. Asked by the British why he had lately refused to give arms to Armenians who said they would use the guns to relieve Armenians who were under Turkish siege in Hacin [Dört Yol], General Gourad, the French commander, responded:

Previously arms had been indeed distributed to the Armenians, either to defend their villages or so that they could form auxiliary units attached to French columns operating in Cilicia. In each instance, the Armenians have taken advantage of this to treat the Turks exactly as the Armenians claim they have themselves been treated, looting and burning villages and massacring unarmed Muslims. ¹³⁹

The presence of Allied occupation armies and the swift organization by Turkish Muslims of Cilicia kept the situation there from

developing in the same way as it had in Erzurum or Erzincan. In northeastern Anatolia, the Russians had occupied the land and relinquished control to the Armenians, who perpetrated the massacres of Muslims. In Cilicia, the Ottomans had been in control throughout the war and Ottoman institutions in the area remained. Remnants of the Ottoman army, along with Ottoman gendarmerie and local Muslims, organized resistance as soon as the Armenians appeared. Aided by Turkish Nationalists, these Turks began to resist first the Armenians, then the French. Although they were not able to decisively defeat the French, they were able to make the occupation of any part of southeastern Anatolia so expensive in lives and treasure that the French could not, or at least would not, continue it. ¹⁴⁰

THE SOUTHERN CAUCASUS

The suffering of Armenians in the Caucasus during and immediately after World War I, particularly the suffering of Armenian refugees from Anatolia, is well-known and well-recorded. ¹⁴¹ Starvation and disease among them were great and mortality massive. The direct cause of mortality undoubtedly was the precipitous flight of Armenians from Ottoman armies at the end of the world war. To the toll of dead refugees must be added the deaths of Armenians caught by vengeful Ottoman soldiers or by Muslim villagers who had returned to their homes to find their Muslim brothers slaughtered. What is not generally known is the great suffering and loss of Turks and other Muslims of the region.

The history of Muslims in Caucasian Russia was closely tied to the political and military events that followed upon the Russian Revolution of 1917. The slaughter of Muslims within the borders of the Russian Empire began after the initial Ottoman invasion and defeat in the Kars region (1914-15). An example of the events was recorded in the district of Oltu (part of the Russian Empire since 1878). The Russians lost Oltu to the Ottomans in December of 1914, but soon retook it, in January of 1915. Attacks on Muslim villages followed, comparable to those occurring in eastern

Anatolia. ¹⁴² However, such slaughter was localized and generally kept in check by Russians in the borderlands. There is little evidence on the status of Muslims in Russian Transcaucasia in the quiet middle period of the war. They were surely more secure in 1916 than from 1917 to 1920.

In the spring of 1917, the Russian army was poised to complete its conquest of eastern Anatolia, ready to take Diyarbakir, Harput, and all the territories south to Iraq. However, the Russian February Revolution changed all campaign plans. Word of the revolution filtered through to the troops in Anatolia in spring, and no one, troops or officers, was willing to act before the new political situation was understood. Although Russian troops in Anatolia held on longer than those on the Russian western front, eventually they, too, began to desert en masse. After the Bolshevik Revolution (7 November 1917), there was no Russian army left. What remained were a few hundred Russian officers and the Caucasian troops, primarily Armenians. In theory, these were the troops of the newly founded Transcaucasian Federation, which included Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan, but the three new republics soon separated and the soldiers became the army of the Armenian Republic.

The soldiers of the Armenian Republic and allied Armenian guerrilla bands faced an impossible prospect between 1917 and 1918. Without the Russians, the Armenians were militarily incapable of standing up to the Ottoman army. Moreover, the Armenians were forced to organize and protect a vast Armenian refugee migration from the Anatolian provinces. (After the events of the war, the Armenians of the regions of Anatolia previously conquered by Russia could rightfully expect deadly revenge from local Muslims and returning Muslim refugees.) Because of their weakened military state, the Armenians were forced to withdraw to Russian Armenia (the old Erivan Province) and surrounding areas. They resolved to ensure that at least one region would be Armenian -- ensured by massacring or forcing the migration of resident Muslims. To the west, a similar fate was to befall the Armenians of Azerbaijan, although to a far lesser degree. Refugees crossed the borders in both directions.

By 1919, the majority of Muslims who had resided in Erivan Guberniia (Province) had either died or had become refugees outside the boundaries of the Armenian Republic. These Muslims had not easily left their homes. Even though many had been expelled

in the spring of 1918 (some as early as late 1914), some had returned to their homes several times in the hope that political events would become more settled. Upon each return, more Muslims were lost, and fewer of them remained to migrate yet again. Their farms were never returned to them. They were caught up in the last act of the great population exchange that had begun a century before. As Armenian refugees from Anatolia came into the Armenian Republic, they took the farms of the refugee Muslims. The Muslims in turn were either massacred or driven out to Anatolia or Azerbaijan. ¹⁴³There were perhaps 150,000 surviving Muslim refugees from the Armenian Republic in September of 1919, and these were rapidly dying. ¹⁴⁴Many of the survivors had in fact been forced to flee to whichever regions offered the most immediate refuge. These were often mountainous territories little able to sustain large numbers of refugees. For example, the survivors of 22 Muslim villages of Erivan Province fled to the plateaus of the Üçtepeler Mountains. ¹⁴⁵It is not possible to trace the ultimate fate of these people, but it could not have been a happy one. The Muslims who had returned to their farms in the Novobayazit area were not heard from again. It was rumored that they were massacred. The few Muslims that survived within the Armenian Republic were often in worse shape than the refugees, and no hand was raised to help them. They had no food and no seed. Through numerous forced migrations they had lost everything. ¹⁴⁶

In areas under the control of the Armenian government, the machinery of the state was brought to bear against Muslims. For instance, not only were taxes on Muslims arbitrarily raised beyond their ability to pay, but those who went to the Armenian gendarmerie to complain were never heard from again. ¹⁴⁷When possible, Muslim villagers resisted, probably armed by the Ottomans. This was particularly true in Nahcivan (Nakhichevan) and in the area of the Russian Kars Province, where Muslim Turks were a majority. ¹⁴⁸The resulting war in those regions added greatly to the casualties on both sides. Ottoman forces that invaded the Caucasus at the end of the war estimated that by May of 1918, 250 Muslim villages in the eastern Caucasus had been burnt down by Armenians. ¹⁴⁹

Local Muslims in the Kars Province formed governmental bodies after the Ottoman defeat in World War I removed for a

Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 210.

time the chance for protection afforded by Ottoman troops. These bodies made contact with the Turkish Nationalist forces that were organizing in northeastern Anatolia and provided the Nationalists with detailed lists of the destruction wrought in their region by the Armenian forces. One report from Kağzman, for example, listed more than 100 Muslim Turkish villages that had been destroyed by Armenians, along with estimates of the thousands who had been killed and the approximately 10,000 who were homeless. ¹⁵⁰

The Ottoman Army Command in the east stated in May of 1918 that "the majority of the Muslim villages of Kars, Sarikams, Erivan, Ahilkelek, and Kağzman have been destroyed by the Armenians." In their reports, they listed many villages by name (e.g., in one report, Tekueli, Hacı Halil, Kalul, Harabe, Dagor, Milanli, Ketak, Alaca, Ilham, Dangal, Ararca, Mulabi, Morcahit, etc.) ¹⁵¹, or sometimes only stated the number of villages destroyed (e.g., "in April, 67 villages of Saragil District were razed to the ground"). ¹⁵²

Even the British, who were powerfully committed to the Armenian cause and the creation of an Armenian state, formally warned Armenians about massacres of Turks in "Armenia proper" and in Baku. They told the Armenians that they would lose world sympathy if such massacres went on. ¹⁵³

KARS

Prior to the war, the city and province of Kars had been part of the Russian Empire. After the Russian Revolution of 1917, many of the Armenians of Kars Province had emigrated to the southern Caucasus, fleeing the Ottoman advance. Muslims who had earlier fled the province returned. The Muslims of Kars had unquestionably been a majority before the war. ¹⁵⁴ Upon the Ottoman defeat, they formed a Muslim National Council (the Shura) in Kars Province. The British, who began a de facto occupation of Kars on 19 April 1919, gave civil and military power in the province to the Armenians, because it was expected that Kars would become part of the new Armenian Republic; ¹⁵⁵ the Muslim majority was not consulted on this issue. Muslims were disarmed and their weapons given to Armenians, so that in effect the only armed forces in the province were Armenian bands and some Kurdish tribes. ¹⁵⁶

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 211.

TABLE 14. .

POPULATION OF KARS PROVINCE IN 1897, BY RELIGION

Religion	Population	Proportion
Orthodox	49,295	.170
Armenian*	72,967	.251
Roman Catholic	4,373	.015
Other Christian	16,963	.058
Jewish	1,204	.004
Muslim	145,852	.502
Total	290,654	

* Gregorian and Armenian Catholic.

SOURCE: 1897 Russian Census.

Muslims began to be massacred even before the British had left Kars. On 19 April, the band of the Armenian "Karch Murat" dragged 7 Muslims from a train on the Kars line and killed them. Because the British were still present, a board of enquiry was set up and Karch Murat and his band convicted, but no one would or could arrest them. ¹⁵⁷The crimes in Kars continued in this vein -plunder, robbery, devastation, and murder. In July 1919, the Armenian army began to attack and destroy the Muslim villages of the Karakurt-Sarikamş region with artillery and machine guns. ¹⁵⁸The village of Büyük Şatak was destroyed and five Muslims were killed. Thirteen villages were devastated in the Sağışık District, and 25 villages in the Horosan District. Large numbers of Muslim-owned sheep and cattle were confiscated.

The slaughter of Muslims in the Kars district was mostly contained in the agricultural areas of the province, the areas inhabited by Turkish speakers. ¹⁵⁹Armenian bands plundered Turkish villages between Kars and Oltu and plundered Akçakale, Babirguend, and other towns and villages. Sixty

Muslims of Kağzman were killed by Armenians, as were the Muslims of the village Puzant. The Turks of Iğdir were either led away by armed bands or killed. ¹⁶⁰Ali Rıza, the Turkish governor of Kağzman, compiled a list of villages pillaged by Armenians after the Muslim National Assembly in Kars was dissolved: Digur 63; Kağzman 45; Karakorun 45; Sarıkamş 46; and many more. Ali Rıza also cited the names of the leaders of the Armenian bands -- 68 names in all. ¹⁶¹A formal Turkish Commission of Inquiry sent to the areas of Shuregel and Zarshat

-212-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 212.

to investigate Armenian atrocities listed the houses destroyed in each village ("45 in Shurgel, 60 in Agnatch, 70 in İlanlı. . ."). ¹⁶²The crimes reported were sadly typical of what had been seen often in eastern Anatolia and the Caucasus -- villages pillaged and burned, flocks and belongings taken, rapes and murders. ¹⁶³Nowhere on the Kars plain, or in the Erivan region to its north were Muslim villages safe. Individual murders and pillaging of Turks living on the plain by Armenians and sometimes Greeks were frequent. ¹⁶⁴However, the mountainous areas of the province were defended by Kurdish tribes, who kept the Armenian forces from going too far beyond the plains and the cities. Kurds and Armenians fought what can only be called a blood feud -- each murdering any of the other who fell into their hands. Perhaps the only Western observer to actually see the situation, the British Colonel Rawlinson, reported that caravans of Muslim refugees were constantly leaving the Kars plain. He recorded reports of torture as well as murder, which he investigated and found to be accurate. ¹⁶⁵

Kars was also the scene of terrible suffering for Muslim refugees from Erivan Province and other areas designated as Armenian. Twenty-five thousand refugees from those areas were gathered in the Kars region in 1919. ¹⁶⁶Many of these refugees were set upon by Armenian bands and soldiers in Kars province. Many were killed at Sarıkamş after they had fled from Armenian massacres and destruction of their villages. ¹⁶⁷In a letter to King George of England the president of the Muslim *meclis* (assembly) of Kars, İbrahim, described the situation emotionally, portraying the Armenians as those "who completely destroyed and ruined more than 1,000 Mohammedan villages in the south west of the Caucasus [including the Kars region], who shed the blood of about 100,000 innocent Mohammedan women and

children, and who have left neither honour nor property unspoiled and untouched." ¹⁶⁸

Colonel Rawlinson came to the same conclusions regarding Armenian actions and intentions:

I had received further very definite information of horrors that had been committed by the Armenian soldiery in Kars Plain, and as I had been able to judge of their want of discipline by their treatment of my own detached parties, I had wired to Tiflis from Zivin that "in the interests of humanity the Armenians should not be left in independent command of the Moslem population, as, their troops being without

-213-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 213.

discipline and not being under effective control, atrocities were constantly being committed, for which we [the British, who gave Kars to the Armenians] should with justice eventually be held to be morally responsible." ¹⁶⁹

AZERBAIJAN, BAKU, AND ELIZAVETPOL

Baku felt the effect of the Russian Revolution of 1917 more quickly and more completely than other areas of the Caucasus. Workers in the oil industry and Armenians of the town were ripe for Bolshevik and Armenian nationalist revolutionary organization. Baku was thus ruled by an uneasy alliance of a Soviet revolutionary committee and Armenian Dashnaks. Such a combination worked against the Azeri Turks (or, in the Russian usage, Tatars) of the city, who were neither Armenian nor Bolshevik sympathizers. From 30 March to 1 April 1918, the Tatars were attacked. Almost half of the Muslim population of Baku was compelled to flee the city. ¹⁷⁰

Between 8,000 and 12,000 Muslims were killed in Baku alone. ¹⁷¹ On the night of 14 September 1918 as the Armenian forces had retreated from the city, local Muslims took their revenge and killed almost 9,000 Armenians. ¹⁷²

Turkish troops entered the city on 16 September, restored order, and protected the remaining Armenians. ¹⁷³

Armenian troops who entered territory claimed by the Azerbaijan Republic destroyed all Muslim villages in their path. As Richard Hovannisian has written of one guerrilla leader, Andranik:

The routes south were blocked by regular Turkish divisions. Backtracking, [the Armenian guerrilla leader and general] Andranik then pushed over Nakhichevan into Zangezour, the southernmost uezd of the Elisavetpol guberniia. Remaining there for the duration of the world war, Andranik's forces crushed one Tatar village after another. ¹⁷⁴

The Azerbaijani population was forced to feed and house, when they could, approximately 60,000 refugees who had fled into their territory by the end of 1919. Admiral Bristol, the American plenipotentiary in Istanbul, basing himself on the reports of the American representatives in the Caucasus, stated that the 60,000 refugees had come from 420 Muslim villages destroyed by the Armenians. ¹⁷⁵

-214-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 214.

American intelligence operatives and diplomatic representatives reported the usual sequence in which Armenian troops attacked Turkish villagers, often killed them, and forced them to flee, in response to which the government of Azerbaijan was sometimes able to respond. ¹⁷⁶ The Armenian Prime Minister stated to H. V. Bryan, American Liaison Officer to the Allied High Commission in Armenia, that the Armenian army was busy surrounding Turkish villages and "starving them into submission." ¹⁷⁷ The attacks were partly due to the desire of the Armenians for more extensive and secure boundaries and access to the railroad running through primarily Turkish-inhabited lands, and partly due to traditional hatreds that had surfaced in 1905. Whatever the reason, the result was that Turks were forcibly removed from their villages or killed. In London, Curzon told an eminent Armenian delegation of the "foolish and indefensible conduct of their compatriots on north-eastern frontiers of Armenia." Curzon quoted to them lists of outrages committed, which showed the Armenians had been much the worse

offenders. ¹⁷⁸

ERIVAN AND NAHCIVAN

[Admiral Bristol] I know from reports of my own officers who served with General Dro that defenseless villages were bombarded and then occupied, and any inhabitants that had not run away were brutally killed, the village pillaged, and all the livestock confiscated, and then the village burned. This was carried out as a regular systematic gettingrid of the Moslems. ¹⁷⁹

Before the war, the Muslims of Erivan Province constituted almost as large a population as the Armenians. They were among those of the Caucasus who most suffered. Evidence from Erivan, however, was fragmentary. Refugees brought out reports of villages burned and massacred, ¹⁸⁰ but few first-hand reports by others were available. The Ottoman or Turkish Nationalist armies never entered much of Erivan Province, so the Ottomans made few detailed reports on Erivan's Muslims. ¹⁸¹ The Muslim Council of Kars compiled a list of destroyed Muslim villages in part of Erivan, probably from refugee reports, which detailed by name and mortality the villages destroyed by 1 October 1919 -- 91 villages destroyed in two districts

-215-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 215.

alone. ¹⁸² The Turkish government stated that 199 Muslim villages in the Armenian Republic had been destroyed, probably not much of an exaggeration. ¹⁸³ In March of 1920, the Republic officially protested the massacres in the Armenian Republic, listing by name the villages destroyed and estimating that the Armenian state "had devastated more than 300 villages and massacred the most part of the Mussulmans populating these villages." ¹⁸⁴ Even the Persian government, which was not given to complaint because it was largely under the control of occupying British soldiers, spoke out against the slaughter. ¹⁸⁵ However, the most telling criticism came from Armenians, the Socialist-Revolutionary Party of the Armenian Republic:

To the President of the Parliament [of the Armenian Republic].

We beg you to announce to the Minister for Home Affairs the following demand: Is the Minister informed that during the last three weeks on the territory of the Armenian Republic within the boundaries of the Echmiadzin, Erivan and Sourmalin districts a series of Tatar villages, for instance Pashakend, Takiarli, Kouroukh-Giune, Oulalik of the Taishouroukh Society, Agveren, Dalelar, Pourpous, Alibek of the Arzakend Society, Djan-Fida, Kerim-Arch, Agdjar, Igdalou, Karkhoun, Kelani-Aroltkh of the Echmiadzin district as well as a series of other villages have been cleared of the Tatar population and have been exposed to robbery and massacre. That the local police not only did not prevent but even took part in these robberies and massacres, that these events left a very bad impression on the local population which is disgusted with these robberies and disorders and who wish to live in peace with their neighbors and request that the guilty be accordingly judged and punished as they are to this day left unpunished. ¹⁸⁶

The Armenian Socialist Revolutionaries had complained of the massacres both in the Parliament and in their newspaper, *The Revolutionary Banner*. Although, as might be expected, their evidence tended to lay blame solely on their political opponents, the Dashnak Party in power, their evidence completely supported the contentions of the Azerbaijan government. ¹⁸⁷

The Nahcivan region, in the south of the Russian Erivan Province, had the misfortune to be the site of the main railroad line that connected Armenia to Iran and further east. The Armenian Republic decided not only that it must hold the railroad line, but that the line would never be secure as long as the region through which it

-216-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 216.

passed was almost totally Turkish in population. Therefore, it was decided to rid the entire line of the railroad of adjacent and nearby Turkish villages, which were destroyed by Armenian regular troops. The Armenians attacked Muslim villages with artillery and machine guns, as they had earlier near Sarikamş. ¹⁸⁸Armenian partisan bands assisted in the attacks on the Turkish villages. For example, a large Armenian band of perhaps 1,200 attacked the villages of Elmah (688 reported dead) and Ağuşma (516 dead), among others in the Nahcivan region. ¹⁸⁹The villagers were either killed or forced to flee to Azerbaijan or Turkey. Admiral Bristol summarized the events and laid

political blame for the tragedy:

The Armenian government, with its regular forces, attempted to clear the Tatars away from a railroad for twenty-seven miles and this has caused Tatar refugees to the extent of many thousands. This is similar to the Greek operations in the Vilayet of Aydin. It will also be noted that the British, in encouraging the Armenians, did not act according to the principles of humanity or self-determination. They were party to a plan to conquer another race and place the minority to govern a majority when they must have known full well that the minority was not capable of governing itself, not to mention providing government for the majority. ¹⁹⁰

It was the Armenian attacks that actually cemented the resolve of the Azerbaijanis to form an army and defend the Turks. They eventually made a stand and held the Armenians, but not until the "twenty-seven miles" of villages had been lost. ¹⁹¹

TABLE 15. ¹⁹²

TURKS IN ERIVAN PROVINCE, 1914 AND 1926.

270,000	"Turco-Tatars" in 1914*
89,000	in 1926
<hr/>	
181,000	Lost (67%)

*Adjusted to postwar boundaries. ¹⁹³

SOURCES: *1915 Russian Statistical Yearbook and 1926 U.S.S.R. Census.*

The best evidence on the massacres and forced deportations of the Muslims of Erivan comes from population statistics taken before and after the wars. Table 15 presents figures for the popula-

tion of Turks (called "Turco-Tatars" in the Russian statistics) in Erivan before and after the wars. All Muslims are not included in the table, because the 1926 U.S.S.R. census did not give population by religion, and Muslim ethnic groups other than Turks were not specifically listed in the 1914 figures. The non-Turkish Muslims in Erivan can be assumed to have suffered as badly as did the Turks.

From the beginning of the First World War until the first postwar census, two-thirds of the Muslims had disappeared from Erivan Province. Many of these were refugees and many of them died. Erivan Province, which had begun as a majority Muslim province in the 1820s, had only a small Muslim minority at the beginning of the 1920s.

THE MUSLIM REFUGEES

The deaths of Muslims, like the deaths of Armenians in the same period, came primarily while they were refugees. There are few descriptions of the well-being of the eastern Anatolian and Caucasian refugees, whether Muslim or Armenian,¹⁹⁴ but one can assume their condition to have been worse than that of refugees in Europe and western Anatolia in the same period. During World War I, there were no established refugee camps for the Muslim refugees of the east. The government Refugee Commission did what it could to offer succor to the refugees, but how much could a government that could not even clothe its own soldiers do for a million refugees? Moreover, the refugees from the east moved through the worst terrain in Anatolia. The region contained neither adequate roads nor railroads. Many areas that received refugees could only be reached by horseback and pack animals. Even had food been available, transportation conditions would have insured that little of it reached the refugees.

By looking at a map of Anatolia and considering the economic state of its regions, one can see that the refugees from Van, Erzurum, or Bitlis would have been forced to make long journeys before they found adequate transportation facilities, large population centers, or fertile fields. For most, such journeys were impossible.

-218-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 218.

On the eastern Anatolia front in World War I and then later during the Turco-Armenian War there was such a mass of peoples on the move that contemporary accounts give the impression that the peoples of eastern Anatolia and the southern Caucasus were all refugees. While this is an exaggeration, it is not a gross exaggeration. The majority of eastern Anatolians, both Muslims and Christians, either died or were forced from their homes. ¹⁹⁵

REFUGEES FROM THE SOUTHERN CAUCASUS

An unknown number of Muslims from Russian Transcaucasia must have left the area during World War I to join the Ottoman armies or simply to escape the Russians. It is known that the Russians attempted to clear frontier districts of Muslims at the beginning of the war and some Muslims must have fled south at that time. The main Muslim migration, however, came after the Russian Revolution had destroyed Imperial Russia. Muslims fled as a result of persecution in the Armenian Republic. They also fled from Armenian-Turkish conflicts in the Caucasus and internal conflicts among the Georgian, Armenian, and Azerbaijan Republics. Few Muslim refugees were soldiers; most were Turkish refugees who had not participated in the wars.

Muslim refugees who fled the Caucasus proper usually fled first to Kars Province. There they were often attacked once again by Armenian (and occasionally Greek) bands. The most usual form of attack was plundering; all the cows and moveable property was taken from the refugees and they were then left to starve to death. At Sarikamş, the Muslims were killed after the plunder had been taken. ¹⁹⁶

The procedures necessary to ascertain the number of Muslim refugees from the Russian Empire ¹⁹⁷ are complicated and the answers tentative. Unless Muslim refugees from Russia passed through Istanbul, as few did, they were not enumerated. Refugees from the Russian Caucasus travelled during wartime, across unchecked borders, and settled where they could. There were no governmental agencies able to count or to assist them.

Because the number of refugees into eastern Anatolia is such a matter of estimation, and because the numbers of refugees were so great, the following evaluation consciously underestimates their

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 219.

number. Whenever a choice between a high or a low number of refugees has been available, the lower has been chosen. Therefore, the results of the following should be understood to be the lower limit of the numbers of Muslim refugees from the Russian Empire. The actual numbers were surely greater. Also, in most cases one can only estimate surviving refugees who settled in Turkey -- a much smaller number than those who set out. Those refugees who went from Erivan and nearby areas cannot be satisfactorily estimated.

The majority of Muslim refugees from Russia settled in the area of the Turkish Republic that had been part of Russia from 1878 to 1921. This area, the Russian *guberniia* of Kars, ¹⁹⁸ was the postwar Turkish-ruled area closest to the refugees' original homes and had much available land due to wartime mortality and Armenian out-migration. In 1897, the Russian census ¹⁹⁹ listed 76,521 Muslim males in Kars province, a corrected ²⁰⁰ population of 153,042 Muslims of both sexes. Projected to 1914, at the beginning of World War I, the Muslim population was 194,628. ²⁰¹ It is impossible to ascertain the exact number of Kars Muslims who died in the 1915-1921 wars, because massive migration confuses the picture. However, one can safely assume that the mortality in Kars was as bad as anywhere in the war zone, since Kars was on the invasion lines of the Russians, the Armenians, and the Ottomans. If one assumes that mortality of native Muslims in Kars was as bad as that seen in Van Vilâyeti, where the wartime experience was similar, ²⁰² 74,000 native Muslims would have survived to 1922. If one assumes the mortality to have been the same as in Erzurum Vilâyeti, 134,000 would have survived to 1922.

In the 1927 Turkish census, there were 340,399 Muslims recorded in the area that had been the Russian Kars Guberniia.

TABLE 16.

REFUGEES IN THE KARS AREA.

Muslims in Kars* in 1922	317,703
Native Muslim Survivors from 1914 to 1922	-73,959

Refugees 243,744

* The provinces of Kars and Artvin (less Yusufeli) and the kazas of Oltu, Kulp, and Iğdir.

-220-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 220.

Projected back to 1922, ²⁰³this means that approximately 318,000 Muslims were in the area in 1922. Between 74,000 and 134,000 of these, or a mean estimate of 104,000, were natives, leaving 218,000 to be counted as in-migrants? ²⁰⁴These 218,000 could theoretically have been migrants from areas other than Russia. ²⁰⁵However, the difficulties of living in Kars and the presence of abundant land in the rest of Anatolia makes such internal migration extremely unlikely. In fact, many of the refugees from Russia did not remain in Kars, but went on to other regions in Anatolia.

Many migrated and settled in a wide region bounded by the provinces of Samsun on the west and Van and Bitlis on the south. In these provinces, the Turks registered in the 1927 Turkish Census 14,480 people as having been born in Russia. Based on the experience of under-registration of the foreign-born in other provinces, it seems likely that those who were registered were only half of the actual number of refugees. Applying that admittedly inexact standard to these figures doubles the recorded Muslim refugees from Russia to the Kars area to 28,960.

TABLE 17.

*SURVIVING MUSLIM REFUGEES FROM THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE IN
NORTHEASTERN AND EASTERN ANATOLIA IN 1922.*

In the Kars region	243,744
In other provinces ²⁰⁶	28,960
	—————
Total	272,704

The enumeration of refugees in Table 17 differs from the estimates of refugees made for other areas of the Ottoman Empire and Turkey. The figures here are of refugees who survived the war period, i.e., those who lived to be counted in the census. If the refugees from Russia had been counted when they left their homes, their numbers would have been considerably greater. The extremely conservative assumption that one-third of all Muslim refugees from the Caucasus, approximately 135,000, died ²⁰⁷ would leave an initial refugee migration of more than 400,000.

-221-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 221.

INTERNAL REFUGEES

In the Ottoman eastern provinces, there were Muslim refugees in two periods. The first period began in April 1915, with the Armenian revolt in Van, and ended when the Russians retreated in the summer of 1915. The second came with the more successful Russian invasion of 1916, which ultimately led to the Russian occupation of the Ottoman province of Erzurum and of much of the provinces of Van, Diyarbakir, Mamuretülaziz, and Trabzon.

The result of the Russian invasions and intercommunal war between Muslims and Armenians was naturally a great exodus of the pacific rural population, both Muslims and Christians. As a result, cities and provinces to the south and west that were under more firm Ottoman control swelled with Turkish refugees. Of these, the refugees from the northern Trabzon Vilâyeti and northeastern Erzurum Vilâyeti were the most fortunate; they escaped to central and western Black Sea provinces -- relatively stable areas under closer central government control. ²⁰⁸ From there, some were sent to central Anatolia, as were refugees from southern Trabzon and Erzurum provinces. Those who fled from more eastern areas were less fortunate. They fled south into the provinces of Mamuretülaziz, Diyarbakir, and Van, where they could have found little succor. Many of these refugees were forced to flee in stages, leaving their homes, settling in one area until the Russians and Armenians advanced, then fleeing once again. Often refugees from Erzurum were forced to escape to areas as far from their homes as Maraş and Adana,

travels of more than 600 kilometers on foot.

No accurate count of internal refugees in eastern Anatolia was ever taken. Given the situation of the region, no census would have been possible. However, the relief agency of the Ottoman Interior Ministry did estimate the numbers of refugees who had been given assistance, transportation, or housing by the government. In the document from which the data in Table 18 has been taken, ²⁰⁹it is impossible to know if the Interior Ministry statistics were drawn from actual enumerations or from estimates made by local officials. ²¹⁰Most probably it was both. It must be noted that the figures in [Table 18](#) are only of officially noted refugees; the document indicates that many refugees were not included in the numbers.

Since the prewar Muslim population of the area taken by the Russians was 2.3 million, ²¹¹a figure of 660,000 indicates that a

-222-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 222.

TABLE 18.

EASTERN ANATOLIAN MUSLIM REFUGEES RECEIVING ASSISTANCE, TO OCTOBER 1916.

From	To*	Refugees
Trabzon and Eastern Erzurum	Samsun	79,100
Erzurum	Sivas	300,000†
Eastern, Southern Erzurum, & Van	Mamuretülaziz	80,000
Van and Bitlis	Diyarbakır	200,000
Other		43,800
Total		659,100

* Many went on farther into Anatolia.

†"Exceeding 300,000."

SOURCE: Ottoman Interior Ministry.

minimum of more than one-fourth of the prewar population had by 1916 become refugees. A later report of the Ministry of Refugees gave a figure of 868,962 Muslim refugees by the end of World War I. ²¹²When one considers that these data only included officially recorded ²¹³refugees and that great numbers of Muslims had died before refugees took to the roads, the proportion of refugees becomes much higher. More than one-half of those who survived the first battles and massacres must have become refugees. Judged on the basis of the general wartime mortality of the Ottoman eastern provinces, more than one-half of the internal refugees in eastern Anatolia must have died. ²¹⁴

THE REPORT OF NILES AND SUTHERLAND

Few outsiders saw the situation in eastern Anatolia immediately after World War I. Of those who did, one group, American missionaries, were almost completely unreliable as witnesses to Muslim suffering. With the Armenians gone from eastern

-223-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 223.

Anatolia, the life work of the missionaries had been destroyed, and their one-sidedness and understandable bitterness made them unreliable observers. While they were capable of documenting in great detail actions against Armenians, they were with few exceptions incapable of mentioning actions against Muslims. Another group, Westerners, were agents of the British and American governments, suffered from some of the same disabilities as the missionaries, and were also prejudiced. Some of them, however, rose above their prejudices to become accurate observers.

Captain Emory Niles and Mr. Arthur Sutherland were Americans ordered by the United States government to investigate the situation in eastern Anatolia. Their report was to be used as the basis for granting of relief aid by the American Committee for Near East Relief (ACNRE, more usually "Near East Relief"). The two men were quite unusual. Like Lt. Dunn, who provided Admiral Bristol with much accurate intelligence, Niles and Sutherland decided simply to ride through the area until they saw what was needed. Also, like Dunn, they did it with a minimum of support and with great courage. Their courage extended to their report, for they set down what they actually saw and heard, not what their prejudices dictated to them. For Americans in Anatolia, this was a rare phenomenon. The remarkable fact is that they were concerned about Muslims, not as Muslims but as human beings who were in need of relief. Perhaps naively, they assumed that their orders covered reporting all those in eastern Anatolia who were in need of relief, not only Christians, and they did so. Most of those in need were Muslims, and the suffering they reported was mainly Muslim suffering. It may be for that reason that their report was never included in the papers of the American Investigation Commissions; only a partial copy of it can be found in the American Archives, well-hidden among documents on very different topics, luckily not destroyed, but only buried.

[215](#)

In most cases, Niles and Sutherland simply reported what they saw, without comment. However, as they began to observe what was actually happening, they also began to change what had been their typical Western opinions about Turks and Armenians:

[Region from Bitlis through Van to Bayazit] In this entire region we were informed that the damage and destruction had been done by the Armenians, who, after the Russians retired, remained in occupation of

-224-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 224.

the country, and who, when the Turkish army advanced, destroyed everything belonging to the Musulmans. Moreover, the Armenians are accused of having committed murder, rape, arson and horrible atrocities of every description upon the Musulman population. At first we were most incredulous of these stories, but we finally came to believe them, since the

testimony was absolutely unanimous and was corroborated by material evidence. For instance, the only quarters left at all intact in the cities of Bitlis and Van are the Armenian quarters, as was evidenced by churches and inscriptions on the houses, while the Musulman quarters were completely destroyed. Villages said to have been Armenian were still standing, whereas Musulman villages were completely destroyed. ²¹⁶

Niles and Sutherland were not pro-Turkish or pro-Muslim observers. On the contrary, they came to eastern Anatolia with all the usual American prejudices in place. Although they had never seen evidence of Muslim massacres of Armenians, they believed them to have taken place and to have been as awful as was commonly believed in the West. They commented, "We believe that it is incontestable that the Armenians were guilty of crimes of the same nature against the Turks as those of which the Turks are guilty against the Armenians." The difference, of course, is that they had seen the evidence of the Armenian crimes, not the Turkish-the one charge is based on evidence, the other on hearsay. However, this makes it more reliable concerning what they actually saw, because, despite their prejudices, they reported the evils perpetrated by Armenians.

The two Americans reported on the condition of eastern Anatolia after the war. The picture they painted was of a desolate place where crops, houses, and human lives had been destroyed. In the area between Erzurum and Bayazit, they found that the surviving Muslims had no milk, meat, or grain. The Muslims lived on wild grain and wild vegetables, "neither of which has much food value." The Muslims blamed their fate on the Armenians and the Americans agreed:

In this region [Bayazit- Erzurum] the racial situation is intensely aggravated by the proximity to the frontier of Armenia, from which refugees are coming with stories of massacres, cruelty and atrocities carried on by the Armenian Government, Army and people against the Musulman population. Although several hundred Armenians are actually living

-225-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 225.

in the vilayet of Van, it would seem impossible that Armenians could live in the rural regions of the vilayet of Erzerum, since the utmost hatred of them

is manifested by all. Here also the Armenians before retiring ruined villages, carried out massacres, and perpetrated every kind of atrocity upon the Musulman population and the doings of the Armenians just over the frontier keep alive and active the hatred of the Armenians, a hatred that seems to be at least smoldering in the region of Van. That there are disorders and crimes in Armenia is confirmed by refugees from Armenia in all parts of the region and by a British officer at Erzerum. ²¹⁷

In the region between Erzurum and the Armenian frontier, the destruction had been nearly complete. Retreating Armenians had destroyed every possible village on their line of retreat. Two-thirds of the housing had been destroyed, as had most of the Muslim population: "The region ²¹⁸ has between one-third and one-fourth of its former population, varying in certain districts. Those cities and villages on the line of retreat of the Armenian army suffered most." ²¹⁹ "All the villages and towns through which we passed showed the marks of the war. Most of them were completely ruined." ²²⁰

The most eloquent evidence given by Niles and Sutherland was statistical -- enumerations of surviving Muslim villages and houses. In considering Van and Bitlis, for example, they found that in 1919 both cities had 10 percent or less of their pre-war population. The Armenians had destroyed all but a few Muslim houses (Table 19). All the public buildings and Muslim religious structures were gone.

TABLE 19.

DESTRUCTION IN THE CITIES OF VAN AND BITLIS.

		Houses	
		Before Wars	August 1919
Van	Muslim	3,400	3
	Armenian	3,100	1,170
Bitlis	Muslim	6,500	--
	Armenian	1,500	1,000

SOURCE: Niles and Sutherland.

A similar situation was found in other villages. Most Muslim villages were simply gone, whereas Armenian villages had survived. Niles and Sutherland gave examples from the vilxâyet of Van and the sancak of Bayazıt ([Table 20](#)).

TABLE 20. .

VILLAGES IN VAN VILÁYETI AND BAYAZIT SANCAĞI, BEFORE AND AFTER THE WAR AND ARMENIAN OCCUPATION

	VAN		BAYAZIT	
	Before War	August, 1919	Before War	August, 1919
Muslim	1,373	350*	448	243
Armenian	112	200†	33	33
Mixed	187			
	<hr/>			
Total	1,672	550	481	276

* Repaired with materials from other villages.

† Both Armenian and mixed villages.

SOURCE: Niles and Sutherland.

Although they did not see the Caucasus nor have first-hand knowledge of the fate of Muslims in the territories that had been Russian, Niles and Sutherland repeatedly heard the same stories of atrocities from refugees and Muslims of the border regions. Judging partly on what they had seen in Anatolia, they believed the tales to be true.

It was at Bayazıt that Musulman refugees from the Caucasus made their strongest appeal on account of atrocities committed by Armenians upon them and those Musulmans who remain. The notes taken at the time show what the Armenians are doing now in the Caucasus and what they did at Bayazıt during their occupation. There is a most intense bitterness and

thirst for revenge against the Armenians here. ²²¹

Niles and Sutherland accurately summarized the history of the eastern Anatolian Muslims in the conclusion of their report:

Although it does not fall within the exact scope of our investigation one of the most salient facts impressed on us at every point from Bitlis to Trebizond was that in the region which we traversed the Armenians

-227-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 227.

committed upon the Turks all the crimes and outrages which were committed in other regions by Turks upon Armenians. At first we were most incredulous of the stories told us, but the unanimity of the testimony of all witnesses, the apparent eagerness with which they told of wrongs done them, their evident hatred of Armenians, and, strongest of all, the material evidence on the ground itself, have convinced us of the general truth of the facts, first, that Armenians massacred Musulmans on a large scale with many refinements of cruelty, and second that the Armenians are responsible for most of the destruction done to towns and villages. The Russians and Armenians occupied the country for a considerable time together in 1915 and 1916, and during this period there was apparently little disorder, although doubtless there was damage committed by the Russians. In 1917 the Russian Army disbanded and left the Armenians alone in control. At this period bands of Armenian irregulars roamed the country pillaging and murdering the Musulman civilian population. When the Turkish army advanced at Erzindjan, Erzerum, and Van, the Armenian army broke down and all of the soldiers, regular and irregular, turned themselves to destroying Musulman property and committing atrocities upon Musulman inhabitants. The result is a country completely ruined, containing about one-fourth of its former population and one-eighth of its former buildings, and a most bitter hatred of Musulmans for Armenians which makes it impossible for the two races to live together at the present time. The Musulmans protest that if they are forced to live under an Armenian Government, they will fight, and it appears to us that they will probably carry out this threat. This view is shared by Turkish officers, British officers, and Americans whom we have met. ²²²

MUSLIM MORTALITY IN THE EAST

No one counted the dead of the wars in the Caucasus and eastern Anatolia. To estimate their numbers one can only list the differences between the populations of the east before and after the wars. The result is not strictly "war deaths," because births and natural deaths (i.e., deaths that would normally have occurred without war) are included in the figures. Nevertheless, one can assume that births and natural deaths roughly balanced each other

-228-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 228.

out, ²²³ leaving a fairly accurate estimate of wartime mortality. (Deaths of Muslim soldiers who were native to those areas and thus entered in the population registers are necessarily included in the figures.) More serious complications arise from the effects of migration. The exodus of Muslim refugees from the Caucasus added to the postwar population of Erzurum Vilâyeti by as much as 10,000, ²²⁴ for example. There is some evidence of Kurdish migrations into Van, Bitlis, and Erzurum, somewhat replacing the Armenians gone from those provinces. ²²⁵ These migrations artificially lowered the number of wartime deaths listed in [Table 21](#). Because the figures in [Table 21](#) are in fact the result of subtracting the population in

TABLE 21.

MUSLIM POPULATION LOSS IN THE OTTOMAN EASTERN PROVINCES, 1912-22.

Province ²²⁶	Population	Percentage
	Loss	Lost
Van	194,167	.62
Bitlis	169,248	.42

Erzurum	248,695	.31
Diyarbakir	158,043	.26
Mamuretülaziz	89,310	.16
Sivas	186,413	.15
Haleb*	50,838	.09
Adana	42,511	.07
Trabzon	49,907	.04

* The portion that remained in the Turkish Republic.

SOURCE: McCarthy, *Muslims and Minorities*. ²²⁷

1922 from the population in 1912, the inclusion of immigrants in the 1922 figures makes it appear as if there were fewer Muslim deaths than there were. The problem is particularly acute for Trabzon Vilâyeti and, to a lesser extent, for Adana Vilâyeti. The Trabzon region was and is one of the most salubrious and economically important in Anatolia. It would be extremely unlikely that Turks from other areas of Anatolia did not migrate to Trabzon, Rize, and Samsun to take the place of the dead. ²²⁸ The mortality for Trabzon, therefore, must have been considerably greater than indicated in the table.

-229-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 229.

The figures in [Table 21](#), then, are actually undercounts of Muslim mortality in the east. Despite that, the catastrophic results of the Muslim-Armenian War speak for themselves: 62 percent of the Muslims of Van Vilâyeti lost, 42 percent of the Muslims of Bitlis, 31 percent of Erzurum. ²²⁹

TABLE 22. TURKISH AND MUSLIM POPULATION LOSS IN THE TRANSCAUCASIAN REGION.*

Turks

Muslims

Population in 1914	2,171,000	2,743,000
Population in 1921	1,844,000	2,330,000

* Baku, Elizavetpol, Kutais, Tiflis, Kars, and Erivan Russian provinces.

† Extrapolation from figures for Turks.

SOURCES: Russian and U.S.S.R. Statistics. ²³⁰

Muslim losses in the Caucasus, in which there was less actual warfare, were not as great as those in eastern Anatolia. Yet the mortality was surely significant -- 15 percent of the southern Caucasian Muslims were dead. In some areas, especially Kars, Erivan, Baku City, and western Azerbaijan, the mortality must have been much greater, but the type of statistics available makes it impossible to identify Muslim losses by provinces and districts. As in Anatolia, migration considerably clouds the picture. ²³¹

The precise numbers of Muslim dead are not in themselves important; their importance lies in their depiction of the enormity of the Muslim loss in the east. In the provinces in which the war was primarily fought -- Van, Bitlis, and Erzurum -- at least 40 percent ²³² of the Muslims were dead at war's end. The depth and breadth of the suffering that such figures imply is beyond comprehension. The **death** rate is well beyond that of most of the great disasters in world history, such as the Thirty Years' War and the Black **Death**. Of course, Muslims were not the only ones to die. The Armenian **death** rate was at least as great, and Armenian losses cannot be ignored. But the world has long known of the suffering of the Armenians. It is time for the world to also consider the suffering of the Muslims of the east and the horror that it was. Like the Armenians, Muslims were massacred or died from starvation and disease in stupefying numbers. Like the Armenians, their deaths deserve remembrance.

-230-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 230.

NOTES

1. See for comparisons, J. David Singer and Melvin Small, *The Wages of War 1816-1965: A Statistical Handbook*, New York, 1972. *The Wages of War* is usually and understandably wrong on the mortality of Middle Eastern wars, but one can assume more accurate figures for Europe.
2. See the various reports that follow, especially those of Niles and Sutherland (notes 47, 216-24).
3. The historical writing on World War I in eastern Anatolia and the Caucasus is surprisingly sparse, and most of it has been written from a decidedly biased viewpoint. Some general sources were available for my research. For instance, most of the details of military actions in the section that follows were taken from the best purely military history of the Caucasian Wars, W. E. D. Allen and Paul Muratoff, *Caucasian Battlefields*, Cambridge, 1953. Also consulted were General C. Korganoff, *La Participation des Arméniens à la Guerre Mondiale sur le Front du Caucase (1914-1918)*, Paris, 1927; Commandant M. Larcher, *La Guerre Turque dans la Guerre Mondiale*, Paris, 1926; A. Poidebard, "Rôle Militaire des Arméniens sur le Front du Caucase", *Revue des Études Arméniennes*, I, 1920, pp. 143-61; Genelkurmay Başkanlığı, *Harp Tarih Dairesi, Türk İstiklâl Harbi*, Ankara, 1962-1968.

Despite an unquestioning and unfortunate acceptance of "the facts" (as traditionally given) of Armenian-Ottoman relations, Norman Ravitch has written an interesting analysis of the historiography of the Armenian Question (Encounter, vol. LVII, no. 6, December 1981 pp. 69-84). His article may be viewed as a summary of Western writing on the subject up to ca. 1980. Much has, of course, been written since that time, and much by Turkish and Armenian historians whom Ravitch does not consider. It is not inappropriate here to list, without comment, representative works that have been consulted on the issue:

Arthur Beylerian, Les Grandes puissances, l'Empire Ottoman et les Arméniens dans les Archives Françaises (1914-1918), Paris, 1983.

Yusuf Hikmet Bayur, Türk İnkilâbt Tarihi, volume III, parts 1-4, Ankara, 1953,1955,1957,1967.

Kamuran Gürün, The Armenian File, London, 1985.

Mehmed Hocaoğlu, ArŞiv vesikalartyla tarihte Ermeni Mezâlimi ve Ermeniler, Istanbul, I 1976.

Richard G. Hovannisian, Armenia on the Road to Independence, Los Angeles, 1967.

Richard G. Hovannisian, The Republic of Armenia, 2 vols., Berkeley, 1971 and 1982.

Kâzım Karabekir, İstiklâl Harbimiz, Istanbul, 1969 (a later edition is also available: Istanbul, 1988).

Firuz Kazemzadeh, The Struggle for Transcaucasia (1917-1921), New York, 1951 (citations are to Hyperion reprint, Westport, Connecticut, 1981).

Akdes Nimet Kurat, Türkiye ve Rusya, Ankara, 1970.

Akaby Nassibian, Britain and the Armenian Question, 1915-1923, London, 1984.

İnayetullah Cemal Özkaya, Le Peuple Arménien et les tentatives de réduire le peuple Turc en servitude, Ankara, 1971.

-231-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 231.

H. Pasdermadjian, Histoire de l'Arménie, 3rd edition, Paris, 1971.

Esat Uras, Tarihte Ermeniler ve Ermeni Meselesi, Ankara, 1950.

Throughout this book I have used European sources whenever possible. This has been partly due to the difficulty of finding appropriate Ottoman archival sources, but the main reason has been the scholarly prejudice that has long existed whenever Muslim-Christian relations in the Ottoman Empire have been considered. Quite simply, European sources are more likely to be believed, despite the fact that Ottoman propaganda that was deliberately false was almost nonexistent, and even Ottoman "atrocities books" have been shown to be accurate.

For most of the history examined here there has been but minimal disadvantage in using European sources. European records were copious

and European factual observations could be used, while European prejudiced analyses could be avoided. For the Ottoman East, especially in World War I, this has not been possible. Those upon which I have relied especially for earlier chapters -- the British-were terrible sources for the east during and after World War I. Because Britain was at war with the Ottoman Empire, there were no British consular sources for that period. Moreover, what was written by the British, the French, and the Americans during the war comes under the heading of "wartime propaganda." Worse even than the scurrilous propaganda directed against the Germans in the same period, it was neither accurate nor usable. Thus there were no honest sources on Muslims in the Great War other than Ottoman sources.

Luckily, Ottoman military sources on the World War I period have begun to appear. I have checked these sources in both their Ottoman Turkish originals and in translation and I am convinced that they are accurate portrayals of the Muslim condition. They are genuine reports from observers who were "on the spot." They are also consistent with contemporary Ottoman printed sources (e.g., the Ottoman Investigation Commission Reports quoted elsewhere). While they cannot be used for a history of Muslim activities against Armenians, they are a fine source on Armenian activities against Muslims, and that is the story I wish to relate. Their focus on Muslims in no way diminishes their value. Armenian and pro-Armenian sources are readily available.

In 1982 the Askeri Tarih Belgeleri Dergisi began the transliteration and publication of documents relating to Ottoman-Armenian relations during the period of World War I and the Turkish War of Independence. The documents have been published both in photocopied form and in Modern Turkish transliteration. Four volumes have appeared to date. Three of the volumes have been translated into English, and whenever possible I have referred to the English translations in these notes. Unless names of villages and towns are readily known in modern forms, they have been left as they appear in Belgeler and other sources. References are to document numbers, not pages. The original volumes and translations are as follows:

Askeri Tarih Belgeleri Dergisi, no. 81, Ankara, 1982 (Prime Ministry, Directorate General of Press and Information, Documents, Ankara, 1982, hereafter Belgeler I).

Askeri Tarih Belgeleri Dergisi, no. 83, Mart, 1983 (Prime Ministry, Directorate General of Press and Information, Documents on Ottoman Armenians, volume II, Ankara, 1983, hereafter Belgeler II).

Askeri Tarih Belgeleri Dergisi, no. 86 (Prime Ministry, Directorate General of

-232-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 232.

Press and Information, *Documents on Ottoman Armenians*, volume III, Ankara, 1986, hereafter *Belgeler III*).

Askeri Tarih Belgeleri Dergisi, no. 86, Nisan, 1987 (hereafter Belgeler IV).

4. Clarence Ussher described the situation of the Armenians in Van, with a number of lacunae concerning the treatment of Muslims by Armenians, in *An American Physician in Turkey* (Boston, 1917). See also the somewhat fictionalized accounts by Rafael de Nogales: *Four Years Beneath the Crescent*, translated by Muna Lee , New York, 1926, and *Memoirs of a Soldier of Fortune*, Garden City, New York, 1932.

5. *Report of Muammer*, Governor of Sivas, 5/6 June 1915. *Belgeler I*, no. 30.

Acting Governor of Karahisar Ahmet and Commander of Special Forces Lt. General Neşret to the Third Army Command, 2 July 1915. *Belgeler III*, no. 157.

Lazistan Commander Avni Paşa, 20 July 1915. *Belgeler III*, no. 158.

6. District Governor of Urfa to Ministry of Interior, Urfa, 29 September 1915. *Belgeler III*, no. 164.

"Acting Commander" Fehmi to Supreme Command, Urfa, 5 October 1915. *Belgeler III*, no. 167.

Osmanli Ordu-yu Hümayunu Başkumandanlığı Vekâleti (Semih) Süferaya, 19 Ekim 1915. *Belgeler IV*, no. 2057. Dördüncü Ordu Komutani Cemal,

Kudüs, 18 Ekim 1915. *Belgeler IV*, no. 2058.

As a matter of fact, rebellions occurred on 23 July 1915 in Boghazlian, on 1 August 1915 in Findikchik (Marash), on 9 August 1915 in the village of Germush of Urfa, on 14 September 1915 in Antakya (Musa Mountain), on 29 September 1915 in Urfa, on 7 February 1916 in Islahiye, on 4 April 1916 in Akdaghadmeni, and on 9 April 1916 in Tossia (Gürün, p. 204).

7. *Caucasian Battlefields*, p. 299.

8. *ibid*, pp. 449-50.

9. *ibid*, pp. 457-59.

10. See Justin McCarthy, *Muslims and Minorities*, New York, 1983, pp. 163-81.

11. *Caucasian Battlefields*, p. 289.

12. *ibid*, p. 426.

13. *Mahmut Kamil to Acting Supreme Commander*, Karahisar, 22 July 1915. *Belgeler III*, no. 159.

14. *Caucasian Battlefields*, p. 438.

15. *ibid*, p. 296.

16. *ibid*, p. 299.

17. Third Army, "To All Units", Erzurum, 18 September 1914. *Belgeler I*, no. 1.

"At the All-Armenian National Congress held in Tiflis in February 1913, it was revealed that the Russian government had given the Dashnaks over two hundred thousand roubles to arm the Turkish Armenians and provoke their uprising at an opportune moment" (Kazemzadeh, p. 26). Kazemzadeh states that the Russians repented their actions later, when they realized the Dashnaks had different plans for eastern Anatolia than did the Russians (pp. 26 and 27).

18. *Investigation Report to Acting Supreme Command, Ottoman Army, n.d., Van. Belgeler II, no. 99.*

19. Message from Pertev Bey, Acting Commander 10th Army Corps (Sivas), received on 20 April 1915, *Belgeler II, no. 104.*

-233-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 233.

Armenian charitable organizations had been involved with providing organizational structure and weapons for guerrillas. See the cable on the Boghos Nubar Pasha Armenian Charity Association, Tefvik to Fourth Army Command, 26 April 1915. *Belgeler II, no. 110.*

C. F. Dixon-Johnson's interesting comments on British support for the Armenian Revolution before the time of deportations: "Lord Bryce and 'the Friends of Armenia' appealing for funds to clothe and equip the Armenian Volunteers on April 2nd, almost one month before these alleged unprovoked 'massacres' " (*The Armenians*, London, 1916, p. 47).

20. *Documents sur les atrocités Arméno-russes, Constantinople, 1917, pp. 24-27. This volume is drawn from the testimonies gathered by the Ottoman investigation that visited the area between the first and second Russian occupation. It is a government publication, but its testimony corroborates in every way with the documentary evidence available.*

21. Gürün, pp. 194-96.

The *Belgeler* volumes contain much detailed information and analysis on the Armenian Revolution in eastern Anatolia. For example, see *Belgeler III*, nos. 151, 158, 159, 160.

22. *Intelligence Report*, Third Army Command, Horasan, 7/8 October 1914, *Belgeler II*, no. 91.

23. His name, like many others, is found in the sources in various forms -- Pastirmadjian, Pasdirmadjian, Pasdirmaciyān, etc.

24. *Investigation Report to Acting Supreme Command*, Ottoman Army, n.d., Van. *Belgeler II*, no. 99.

25. Hovhannes Katchaznoui, *The Armenian Revolutionary Federation (Dashnagtzoutiun) Has Nothing To Do Anymore: The Manifesto of Hovhannes Katchaznoui, First Prime Minister of the Independent Armenian Republic*, tr. Matthew A. Callender, ed. John Roy Carlson (Arthur A. Derounian), New York, Armenian Information Service, 1955.

26. *Investigation Report to Acting Supreme Command*, Ottoman Army, n.d., Van. *Belgeler II*, no. 99.

27. The position of Armenian deserters from the Ottoman Army is difficult to evaluate. Armenian historians and others have long held that Armenians went off to military service without demur, but were subsequently massacred. The Ottoman evidence is considerably different. Ottoman officials complained that Armenians were not obeying the conscription laws and that those who were caught and forcibly brought into the army often deserted. Did they desert because of fear of Turkish attitudes toward Armenians or because of nationalistic impulses? Probably both. After the original Armenian deserters began to attack Ottoman troops, the other Armenians in the military were obviously at some peril. They were surely not trusted by government or military authorities.

The attacks of Armenian deserters on Ottoman troops and Muslim villagers were frequently mentioned in the Ottoman sources, e.g.,

Belgeler I, no. 12 and 1 and 2 of no. 103.

28. *Investigation Report to Acting Supreme Command, Ottoman Army, n.d., Van. Belgeler II*, no. 99.

See also H. Pasdermadjian, *Histoire de l'Arménie, 3rd edition, Paris, 1971, p. 413.*

-234-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 234.

29. Message of Abdurrahman, Commander of the Reserve Cavalry Division at Karakilise, 25 October 1914. *Belgeler I*, no. 8.

Message from Amad Border Battalion in Eleşkirt to 9th Army Corps, 20 October 1914. *Belgeler II*, no. 92.

Memoranda to Supreme Command from Third Army General Staff, copied 23 October 1914. *Belgeler II*, no. 93.

Investigation Report to Acting Supreme Command, Ottoman Army, n.d., Van. *Belgeler II*, no. 99.

30. Special Service Volunteers Battalion Commander to Third Army Command, Sivas, n.d., *Belgeler II*, no. 102. The Ottoman Governor of Sivas believed that 15,000 of these had gone over to the Russian Army, while 15,000 were guerrillas within the Ottoman East, awaiting Russian occupation ("Coded Message Received from the Governor of Sivas, Muammer Bey, 22/ 23 April 1915. *Belgeler II*, no. 107).

31. Commander of Fourth Army Cemal to Acting Supreme Commander, Jerusalem, 14 September 1915. *Belgeler I*, no. 36. This was the action dramatized in Franz Werfel *Fory Days of Musa Dagh*.

32. Acting Commander of 11th Army Corps Hakki to Ministry of War,

Mamuretülaziz, 28 February 1915. *Belgeler I*, no. 13.

Message from Bronzar [*sic*] Paşa on behalf of the Acting Supreme Commander, 18 March 1915. *Belgeler I*, no. 17.

Commander of Fourth Army Cemal Paşa to Acting Supreme Commander, Jerusalem, 11 April 1915. *Belgeler I*, no. 19.

M. Baki to Acting Supreme Commander, Hasankale, 2 February 1915. *Belgeler III*, no. 148.

U+013Ozzet Sami and Mahmut Kamil to Acting Supreme Commander, Hasankale, 8 April 1915. *Belgeler III*, no. 151.

33. Gürün, p. 197.

34. Van Governor Cevdet to Third Army Command, 20 April 1915. *Belgeler I*, no. 22.

35. *Dördüncü Ordu Komutani Cemal, şam*, 3 Nisan 1915. *Belgeler IV*, no. 2053.

36. *Erkân-i Harbiye Umumiye Dairesi Dahiliye Nezareti'ne Tezkere*, 29 Nisan 1914. *Belgeler IV*, no. 2048.

Various local notables from the Zeytun District to the Harbiye Nezaret-i Celilesi, 23 Ekim 1914. *Belgeler IV*, no. 2049.

37. Kara Schemsi, *Turcs et ArmUjéniens devant l'Histoire, Nouveaux témoignages russes et turcs sur les atrocités arméniennes de 1914 a 1918, Genève, 1919 (hereafter, Kara Schemsi)*, p. 72.

38. Mahmudin Kazasi Kaymakam Kemal, Report on Investigation of Armenian Murders in Mergehu Village, 15 March 1915. *Belgeler I*, no. 15.

Commander of the Ninth Army Öevki to Chief of Staff of the Office of the Supreme Commander, Kars, 23 October 1918. *Belgeler I*, no. 24.

Acting Commander of Fifth Army Corps Halil Recai to Acting Supreme

Commander, Ankara, 23 July 1915. *Belgeler I*, no. 31.

Commander of the Fourth Army Cemal PaU+0130a to Acting Supreme Commander, 19/ 20 July 1915. *Belgeler I*, no. 32.

Message from Niksar Training Command, 28 June 1915, *Belgeler II*, no. 113.

-235-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 235.

Konya Conscription Dept. Head Ziya to First Army Corps Command on Armenian gang in Avanos, 23/ 24 July 1915. *Belgeler II*, no. 115.

Col. Fuat to First Army Corps Command on Armenian gangs in Nevşehir region, 27 July 1915. *Belgeler II*, no. 116.

39. Mobile Division Commander at Saray KU+013Ozim to Third Army Command, 29 November 1914. *Belgeler I*, no. 9.

40. In an interesting tract, the Armenian guerrilla leader Armen Garo (G. Pasdermadjian) openly admitted that Armenian revolt in the east had begun long before the deportations began. He explained the revolts as a reaction to supposed Ottoman atrocities against Armenians, such as deportation and massacre of the inhabitants of Zeytun in 1914 (!) and their replacement by Turkish refugees from the Balkans (p. 24), and other similar fabrications. Despite the fact that his justifications are spurious, it is obvious from his reporting that Armenian rebels did indeed revolt early in the war and, in some cases, even before the war began. It should be remembered that Garo was one of the main leaders of the rebellion at that time (G. Pasdermadjian [Armen Garo], *Why Armenia Should Be Free*, Boston, 1918, especially pp. 23-26).

41. The Armenians of the villages of Baynk, Alaköblankanis, and Buganis seized the strategic points in their area and besieged the village of Kuşa

(GüFrün p. 198).

42. Van Governor Cevdet to Third Army Command, 20 April 1915. *Belgeler I*, no. 22. See also a copy of a military telegram from Van. *Belgeler IV*, no. 2050.

43. Gürün, p. 109.

44. Testimony of police agent Suleiman Efendi, *Documents sur les Atrocités ArménoRusses, Constantinople, 1917, pp. 10-11. The names have been transliterated from French spellings and may be somewhat misspelled in Modern Turkish. From the names of the villages I have inferred that some may have had mixed populations.*

45. *Documents sur les Atrocités Arméno-Russes, p. 35.*

46. "Déclaration assermentée de Chérif bey, Directeur de l'Instruction publique de Van, qui parvint à échapper par miracle U+00E0 cette tuerie (Van)," *Kara Schemsi, pp. 46-48.*

47. "The Report of Captain Emory H. Niles and Mr. Arthur E. Sutherland, Jr. on Trip of Investigation through Eastern Turkish Vilayets" (U.S. 184.021/175).

48. "Rapport du commandant de gendarmerie de Van", signed 11/24 mars 1916, *Kara Schemsi, p. 60.*

49. By the end of World War I, the Jewish presence in southeastern Anatolia, which had existed since antiquity, was over.

50. See the various depositions in *Documents sur les Atrocités Armino-Russes, pp. 30-41.*

51. *Documents sur les Atrocités Arméno-Russes, pp. 34-37.*

52. See the examples in *Documents sur les Atrocités Arméno-Russes*, especially the deposition of şeyh Enver (p. 35) and the deposition of Létfiye Haném (p. 40).

53. Kazas of Hizan, Pervari, şatak, and Kargekan (*Documents sur les Atrocités Arméno-Russes*, pp. 24-27).

54. *Documents sur les Atrocités Arméno-Russes*, pp. 24-27.

Once the Armenians had retreated from Van and Bitlis in 1915 an Ottoman Commission of Investigation went to the occupied areas and took depositions from

-236-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 236.

government officials, religious leaders, and other responsible persons. These depositions appeared in detail in *Documents sur les Atrocités Arméno-Russes*, *Kara Schemsi*, and *Rustem*. *The depositions often contained eyewitness accounts of hideous crimes, including details of rapes and murders. Those who do not find the statistics and brief descriptions given in this chapter sufficiently convincing should consult the foregoing volumes.*

After the war, the Muslims of Van complained (to the Allies) of Armenian activities during the war. Their report was undoubtedly forwarded as propaganda, but the facts were genuine. They contended that Armenians killed thousands of old people in Van, raped women, pillaged everywhere, and destroyed Muslim houses, religious buildings, and mosques (F.O.371-3658, no. 58433, Webb to Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Constantinople, 9 April 1919, transmitting an appeal from the Muslims of Van Vilâyeti).

55. *"Déposition sous serment de Féhim bey, fils de Kahraman bey, originaire de Mouradié, membre du Conseil administratif de cette ville, se trouvant actuellement émigré au village de Klet (vilayet de Van),"* in Kara Schemsi, pp. 42-43.

56. For example, the village of "Avran," in which the bodies of 19 Ottoman soldiers were found entombed in the house of a member of the Dashnak Committee (Kara Schemsi, p. 37).

57. Muslim refugees from various areas mentioned that Cossacks and Armenian bands often cooperated, including cooperation in the abduction of Muslim women and massacre of other Muslims. See Kara Schemsi, Depositions 1-10, pp. 35-43.

58. Particularly police agents, who understandably would have been the targets of revolutionaries for having arrested their fellows, judges, and other "notables" (testimony of Hassan Efendi, police agent in Bitlis, *Documents sur les Atrocités ArménoRusses*, pp. 9-10).

59. See the first 13 depositions in Kara Schemsi, pp. 35-45.

60. *"Rapport sur les atrocités commises par les Arméniens dans la ville de Bitlis,"* signed by "Hadji Mélik Zadé Chéikh Youssouf, Molla Issa Zadé Abd'ul Halim, Eumer Houloussi (Professeur d'Arabe, l'école Militaire), Cazalar Chéikhi Zadé Youssouf, M. Arif (Directeur intérimaire de la police), and Hakki (Secrétaire Général a.i. de Bitlis)" (Kara Schemsi, pp. 65-68).

61. Rustem, pp. 174-75: "We dispersed in all directions. Of the 18 persons who made up my refugee group, only 5 reached safety in Mardin" (statement of Abdulrazak of Kayali).

62. Rustem, pp. 175-76.

63. Gürün, p. 197.

64. *ibid.*, p. 197.

65. *ibid.*, pp. 194-200. For attacks on Muslim villages see also *Documents sur les Atrocités Arméno-Russes*, pp. 27-29. The depositions on the attacks on Muslim villages are precise, even giving the names of Armenians in the guerrilla bands who were recognized. For example, "Nichan, Muradi, Usep, Dikran, Zah, Biko, Serkis, Tangassal, Kazar, Mosis, Kevachk, who lived in villages near ours" (names not transliterated). For other examples of guerrillas identified, see the numerous examples in the same volume, pp. 33-38.

66. Message from Bronzar Paşa on behalf of the Acting Supreme Commander, 18 March 1915. *Belgeler I*, no. 17.

-237-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 237.

67. Investigation Report to Acting Supreme Command, Ottoman Army, n.d., Van. *Belgeler II*, no. 99.

See also the numerous examples of this in *Documents sur les Atrocités AménoRusses. On the Armenians regulars and irregulars who fought on the side of the Russians, see the sources listed in note 3, especially Caucasian Battlefields*, pp. 299-301.

68. Message from Acting Commander of Tenth Army Corps Pertev, Sivas, 15 June 1915. *Belgeler I*, no. 29. Commander of the Fourth Army Cemal Paşa to Acting Supreme Commander, 19/ 20 July 1915. *Belgeler I*, no. 32.

Order of Ministry of War to Central Headquarters, Istanbul, 24 August 1915. *Belgeler I*, no. 35.

Message from Niksar Training Command, 28 June 1915, *Belgeler II* no.

113.

69. Herbert Gibbons, admittedly a very pro-Armenian source, contended that the Armenian actions in eastern Anatolia had resulted in the diversion of "five Turkish divisions and 30,000 or more Turkish and Kurdish irregulars" from the war to put down the Armenian rebellion. This may be a gross exaggeration. Armen Garo asserted that the Armenian revolts in Anatolia, particularly the revolt and occupation of Van, saved the Russians from defeat by the Ottomans (*Why Armenia Should Be Free*, p. 22).
70. Ministry of Interior, Department for Settlement of Tribes and Immigrants, "Regulation Related to Settlement and Board and Lodging and Other Affairs of Armenians Relocated to Other Places Because of War Conditions and Emergency Political Requirements." 30 May 1915. *Belgeler II*, no. 112.
71. Ministry of Interior, Department for Settlement of Tribes and Immigrants, "Regulation related to Settlement and Board and Lodging and Other Affairs of Armenians Relocated to Other Places Because of War Conditions and Emergency Political Requirements," 30 May 1915. *Belgeler II*, no. 112.
72. Armenian memoirs of the deportations commonly list the guards as "two gendarmes" or similar.
73. The Greeks refused to return the lands when ordered to do so by the Allies after World War I(*F.O.371-4158*, no. 96955, "Report by P. Slade on Situation in Kastamonu", 2 July 1919).
74. Gürün, pp. 212 and 213. Government Commissions, headed by military officers, were set up to investigate those Ottoman officials who acted illegally against Armenians during the deportations. See Gendarmerie General Commander Rasim to the Ministry of Defence regarding the appointments of officers to the commissions, Istanbul, 26 September 1915. *Belgeler III*, no. 165.

75. A postwar British source stated that Armenians "massacred between three and four hundred thousand Kurdish people in the Van and Bitlis Districts," mostly the work of Armenians in the Russian Army ("Interview of Col. Wooley of the British Army, 12 September 1919, in U.S. 184.021/265). See also, F.O.371-3658, no. 64421, Calthorpe to H.M. Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Constantinople, 9 April 1919 and F.O.371-3658, no. 84432, Webb to Curzon, Constantinople, 18 May 1919.

On atrocities against Muslims in the Erzurum Vilâyeti during the Russian occupation, see Vehip to Acting Supreme Commander, 21 March 1916. *Belgeler III*, no. 169.

76. *Caucasian Battlefields*, p. 459.

-238-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 238.

77. For example, see *Belgeler I*, no. 47. The *Belgeler* volumes are full of individual detailed examples.

78. *Caucasian Battlefields*, pp. 459-60.

79. Because of the actions of Armenian guerrillas, commanding general Vehib Mehmet ordered that they not be treated as Russian soldiers. When captured, they were to be courtmartialed, not given the status of prisoners of war. It is in fact more probable that when captured they were shot.

80. Particularly General Odishelidze, in theory the commander of the Transcaucasian forces, was forced to admit that the massacres had taken place. The accounts are also supported by Georgian sources. See Kazemzadeh, pp. 85, 86.

81. Third Army Commander Vehib Mehmed to Caucasian Army Corps, 6 February 1334. *Belgeler I*, no. 52. Note that Vehib Pap's name appears in sources spelled as Vehib and Vehip.

82. For example, see the letter of Vehib Mehmed Paşa, Commander of the Ottoman armies on the Caucasian Front, to General Perjovalsky, "Commander in Chief of the Russian Caucasian Armies", 2 February 1918 (*Belgeler II*, no. 124):

1. Male Moslem population of Erzincan and surrounding villages, are being taken away by Armenians with their hands tied and shot in the barracks.
2. On 28.1.34 [28 January 1918], many of the male Moslems of Erzincan were assembled at the Church square by Armenians and burnt to **death**.
3. Armenians are still continuing setting on fire Muslim's homes in Erzincan. In this context let me mention only the Government Office Building of Erzincan, Yenicami Mosque, and all the mosques of Zekganç and surrounding villages.
4. Corpses of six Moslems murdered by Armenians on 15 January 34 [15 January 1918] at Teke, southwest of Gümüşhane were found by the road." See also two similar letters from Vehib Paşa (*Belgeler I*, nos. 47 and 73), which document further atrocities.

83. Third Army Commander Vehib Mehmed to Acting Supreme Command, 13/14 March 1334. *Belgeler I*, no. 65.

84. "For eight days, Armenians have been forcibly obstructing people from leaving their homes or going from one village to the other. Day and night they are rounding up male inhabitants, taking them to unknown destinations, after which nothing further is heard of them" -- based on the evidence of Muslims who were wounded but escaped one such massacre, near ruins at Taşkilise (Militia Commander İsmail Hakki to 36th Division Command, Mezraa, 1 March 1334. *Belgeler I*, no. 50).

85. "Statements of Deserters and Refugees", 3 February 1918. *Belgeler II*, no. 125: "Some 500 Moslems from villages around Erzincan were

brought to Erzincan and shot dead."

86. "The same Mirat [otherwise seen as 'Murat'], escorted by Armenian patrols, ordered the assembly of all Moslem people in the Church Square in Erzincan, when moughtars (headmen) came to inquire the reason, all were executed."

The nominal leader of the Armenian (Transcaucasian) forces in Erzincan was Colonel Morel, who had formerly been Russian Military Attaché in Tokyo (*Caucasian Battlefields*, p. 460) and had somehow ended up in Erzincan in Armenian service. Much effective control in Erzincan and the surrounding region seems to have been in the hands of the Armenian guerrilla leader Murat. He was identified

-239-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 239.

as being the mastermind behind the massacre of the Muslims (Lt. General Vehib Mehmed to General Perjovalsky, Commander in Chief of Russian Caucasian Armies, 2 February 1918, *Belgeler* II, no. 124; "Statements of Deserters and Refugees", 3 February 1918, *Belgeler* II, no. 125; and Lt. General Vehib to Caucasian Army Corps, 7 February 1918, *Belgeler* II, no. 128). Colonel Morel's position in the Muslim massacres is unclear. One Russian witness claimed that Morel could not stop the Armenians, but tried (Kazmir, Acting Captain of the 13th Turkistan Snipers Regiment, Erzincan, 7 February 1918. *Belgeler* II, no. 127).

87. Congrès National, *Documents relatifs aux Atrocités commises par les Arméniens sur la population musulmane*, Constantinople, 1919, p. 27. I have assumed this to be a quote from Vehib Paşa. The source only identifies "Le Commandant des armes ottomans du front du Caucase."

88. Vehib Mehmet to Odeshelidje, 21 February 1919. *Belgeler* III, no. 175.

89. Commander of Third Army Vehib Paşa to the Supreme Command, 22 January 1334. *Belgeler I*, no. 45.

Acting Commander of the 36th Caucasian Division Recep to Third Army Command, Kemah, 30 January 1334. *Belgeler I*, no. 48.

Lt. General Vehib Mehmed to General Perjovalsky, Commander in Chief of Russian Caucasian Armies, 2 February 1918. *Belgeler II*, no. 124.

"Statements of Deserters and Refugees", 3 February 1918. *Belgeler II*, no. 125.

Commander of Caucasian 1st Army Corps, Avni, to Third Army Command, 6 February 1918. *Belgeler II*, no. 126.

Third Army Commander Vehib Mehmed to Acting Supreme Command, 8 February 1918. *Belgeler II*, no. 129.

90. Head of Second Section, General Headquarters, Ahmet Refik to Seyfi, Chief of Section, General Headquarters, Istanbul, 1 May 1334(1918). *Belgeler I*, no. 71.

General Odishelidze did not believe that events in Erzincan had been as bad as portrayed by General Vehib. Odishelidze's source was Colonel Morel, who had admitted to him that there had been atrocities, but downplayed their numbers (see *Documents relatifs*, pp. 16-22). However, when the Ottoman troops entered the city and found corpses everywhere and little else, the truth was obvious. Pictures of various street scenes were recorded in *Documents relatifs*, and they are horrible, For example, General Odishelidze doubted the stories of adults and children killed and left lying in the Ottoman barracks of the city; in response, the Ottomans published photographs of the decaying bodies, which were still there when they entered the city.

91. *Belgeler III*, no. 175: "The bodies thrown into wells and then covered with earth in order to prevent the spread of disease were not included in this count, for it is impossible to recover the bodies." However, a count of at least 606 was made. See also *Belgeler II*, no. 72.

On the events in Erzincan, see also *Belgeler III*, no. 177.

92. Vehib Mehmet to the Acting Supreme Command to General Odeshelidze,

18 February 1918. *Belgeler* III, no. 175.

93. One week before, Ottoman documents make it plain that news was carried remarkably swiftly by refugees. The villagers of the Bayburt region would have had sufficient reason to question Armenian intentions without any news from

-240-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 240.

Erzincan, but Ottoman sources indicate that they had the news from Erzincan when they decided to flee.

94. Second Caucasian Army Corps Commander şevki to Third Army Command, Alucra, 20 February 1334. *Belgeler* I, no. 58. Third Army Commander Vehib Mehmed to Acting Supreme Command, Suşehri, 20 February 1334. *Belgeler* I, no. 59.

Third Army Commander Vehib Mehmed to Acting Supreme Command, 8 February 1918. *Belgeler* II, no. 129.

13th Caucasian Regiment Commander Lt. Col. Ahmet Riza to Third Army Command, Bayburt, n.d. *Belgeler* II, no. 130.

"Summary of cables from the Third Army Command related to Armenian cruelties and atrocities," Ottoman Army Acting Supreme Command, 17 March 1918. *Belgeler* II, no. 132.

Vehip Mehmet to Beşinci Ordu Kumandanlığı, et al., *Belgeler* IV, no. 2061.

95. Captain Ahmet Refik to Seyfi, Director, Second Section, General Headquarters, Tercan, 5 May 1918. *Belgeler* II, no. 136.

96. The best sources on Erzurum during the breakup of Russian control and beginning of Armenian rule are the two memoirs of Lt.-Colonel Twerdokhlebof: *War Journal of the Second Russian Fortress Artillery of Erzeroum From Its Formation until the Recapture of Erzeroum by the Ottoman Army*, March 12, 1918 ("Translated from the original Russian"), 1919, and *Notes of a Superior Officer on the Atrocities of Erzeroum*, 1919). The first is the primary document and has been reproduced a number of times; it yields a great deal of first hand information not only on Erzurum, but on events in the countryside and in other areas, such as Erzincan.

97. *Documents relatifs*, pp. 50-52.

98. Captain Ahmet Refik to Seyfi, Director, Second Section, General Headquarters, Erzurum, 8 May 1918. *Belgeler II*, no. 137.

99. See F.O. 371-3659, no. 99204, telegram from GHQ Constantinople to the War Office, 24.6.19. See also *Belgeler IV*, number 2068, Lütfü to the Supreme Command, 19 March 1918, which transmits the same information.

100. Head of Second Section, General Headquarters, Ahmet Refik to Seyfi, Chief of Section, General Headquarters, Istanbul, 1 May 1334(1918). *Belgeler I*, no. 71.

101. Niles and Sutherland, op. cit.

102. Commander First Caucasian Army Corps, Kâzim Karabekir to Third Army Command, 27 February 1334. *Belgeler I*, no. 62.

103. Lütfü Başkumandanlık Vekâlet-i Celilesine, 22 Mart 1918. *Belgeler IV*, no. 2069.

104. Kâzim Karabekir to Third Army Command, 23 February 1918. *Belgeler III*, no. 178.

Vehip Mehmet to Acting Supreme Command, et.al., 23 February 1918.
Belgeler III, no. 179.

Vehip Mehmet Baâkumandanlik Vekâlet-i Celilesine, 26 şubat 1918.
Belgeler IV, no. 2063.

İstiklâl Harbimiz, p. 372.

105.Vehip Mehmet to Yildirim Group Command, et.al., 2 March 1918.
Belgeler I, no. 63.

-241-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 241.

106.Ministry of Interior to Ministry of Defence, 28 August 1918. *Belgeler* 1, no. 85.

Lütfü Başkumandanlâk Vekâlet-i Celilesine, 22 Mart 1918. *Belgeler* IV, no. 2069.

107.From an article cabled to Istanbul to be relayed to the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*, *Prester Lloyd*, *Local Anzlinger*, *Algemeen Handelsblad*, and *Vakit* by Dr. Eshnanie, recorded by the Ottoman Censor, Batum, on 23 May 1334, *Belgeler* I, no. 76. I have not ascertained if the article was in fact published, and these quotes have been taken from the English translation of an Ottoman Turkish original.

108.Kâzim Karabekir Ermeni Kolordusu Kumandani, General Nazarbekof Cenaplarma, Gümrü, 27 Haziran 1918. *Belgeler* IV, no. 2070.

109."Summary of cables from the Third Army related to Armenian cruelties and atrocities, 17 March 1918. *Belgeler* II, number 132.

110. "Statements of Deserters and Refugees", 3 February 1918. *Belgeler* II, no. 125.

111. Kâzâm Karabekir to Third Army Command, 23 February 1918. *Belgeler* III, no. 178.

112. Vehip Mehmet Başkumandanlık Vekâlet-i Celilesine, 14 March 1918. *Belgeler* IV, 2067.

113. The text of the Mudros Armistice is contained in J. C. Hurewitz, *Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East*, vol. II, Princeton, 1956, pp. 36 and 37.

114. See F.O. 371-5210, no. E14888, *Rumbold to Curzon*, Constantinople, 19 November 1920, transmitting letter of Eyres in Famagusta, 20 October 1920. Eyres' sources, who accused Col. Bremond of high crimes, may have had an anti-French bias. However, later British reports reiterated Eyres' analysis (*F.O.* 406-44, p. 75, no. 48, *High Commissioner's Representative, Smyrna, to High Commissioner*, Constantinople, 5 June 1920).

115. The official French analysis of the history of the period:

Until the arrival of the first reinforcements, in June of 1919, the Armenian Legion was the only French force in Cilicia. The history of the French Army in the territory during that period was merged with the history of the Legion; it is, unfortunately, especially marked by acts of undiscipline and violence which did a great wrong to our influence.

(Ministère de la Défense, Etat Major de l'Armée du Terre, Service Historique, Général [CR] du Hays, *Les Armées Françaises au Levant, 1919-1939*, Tome 1: L'Occupation Française en Syrie et en Cilicie sous le Commandement Britannique, Novembre 1918-Novembre 1919, pp. 120-21).

116. As of 10 December 1918:

63 officers (54 present)

4,912 men (4,298 present)

750 local Armenian volunteers from Syria.

Those not present were mainly "in depot" on Cyprus (Gustave Gautherot, *La France en W Syrie et en Cilicie*, Paris, 1920, p. 139).

117.Communication from Boghos Nubar, Paris, 26 December 1920:

[Conditions upon which the Armenian Legion was formed:]

1. That the purpose in establishing the Legion of the Orient was to allow the Armenians to contribute to the liberation of their fatherland and to thus establish their right to the realization of their national aspirations.

-242-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 242.

2. That the Armenian Legion would only fight against the Turk only on the soil of their fatherland.
3. That the Armenian Legion would form the nucleus of the future Armenian Army in the future Armenian State."

(F.O. 608-271 registry number unreadable, 10 January 1920, "But de la Création de la Légion d'Orient [Légion Arménienne]" by Boghos Nubar).

118.Gautherot, pp. 135 and 136. Comte R. de Gontaut-Biron, *Comment La France s'est installie en Syrie (1918-1919)*, Paris, 1923, pp. 53 and 54.

119.U.S. 867.4016/407, H [unreadable] to Secretary of State, Constantinople, 13 March 1919, transmitting Aide-Memoire No. 14305 of the Ottoman Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

120.Gontaut-Biron, p. 55.

121.*ibid*, p. 54.

122.Üçüncü Kolordu Kumandani Selahattin Harbiye Nezareti'ne, Sivas, 27/28 Aralık 1919. *Belgeler IV*, no. 2076.

123.See U.S. 867.4016/407, H [unreadable] to Secretary of State, Constantinople, 13 March 1919, transmitting Aide-Memoire No. 14305 of the Ottoman Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

124.On robberies of Turks by Armenians in Cilicia ("le Taurus"), see F.O. 371-3658, no. 58433, *Webb to Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Constantinople*, 27 March 1919, transmitting letter from the Ottoman Department of War [*sic*]. On Armenian brigandage in Urfa region, led by "Servitchli Boutros," see F.O. 371-3658, no. 58433, *Webb to Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Constantinople*, 27 March 1919, transmitting letter from the Mufti of Urfa and other officials. On Armenian bands attacking Muslims at Sis, see U.S. 867.00/1076, *Bristol to Secretary of State, Constantinople*, 11 December 1919, transmitting note from Sublime Porte of 9 November 1919.

125.General Hamelin in a letter to the High Commissioner, 2 February 1919, in *Les Armies Françaises au Levant*, p. 122.

126.Richard Hovannisian has estimated as many as 120,000 (*The Republic of Armenia*, vol. II, Berkeley and London, 1982, p. 416) and 150,000 (p. 325).

127.Stephen Hemsley Longrigg, *Syria and Lebanon under French Mandate*, London, 1958, p. 77.

128.Gontaut-Biron, pp. 54 and 55.

129.Gautheraut, p. 185.

130.The Ottoman Foreign Ministry complained of robberies, murders, etc. by Armenians in "the Taurus," with detailed descriptions of the events, in late March of 1919 (F.O. 371-3658, no. 58433, *Wenn to Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Constantinople, 27 March 1919*).

The French alleged that they had meant to expel the Armenian Legion altogether from Cilicia, but had no troops to replace them (*Les Armées Françaises au Levant*, p. 120).

131.The events in Maraş were reported in vivid, but less than veracious, form by an American, Engert, who was sent to investigate the reported murders of two Americans in Maraş, but never got closer than Adana (U.S. 867.00/1122, *Engert to Secretary of State, Beirut, 20 February 1920*).

Admiral Bristol reported the actual events in Maraş (U.S. 867.00/1130, *Bristol to Secretary of State, Constantinople, 4 March 1920* and U.S. 867.00/1131, *Bristol to Secretary of State*

-243-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 243.

to Secretary of State, Constantinople, 7 March 1920). See also *İstiklâl Harbimiz*, pp. 460-62.

132.F.O. 406-43, no. E1352, *de Robeck to Curzon, Constantinople, 11 February 1920*.

133.See the numerous formal complaints by Reşid Paşa to the British in F.O. 371-5043, no. E1358, *de Robeck to Curzon, Constantinople, 17 February 1920*.

134.For telegrams from Turkish committees for National Defense on atrocities by French and Armenians in Maraş and letters from towns and villages all over the Maraş District, see U.S. 867.00/1137, *Bristol to Secretary of State, Constantinople*, 7 February 1920. See also F.O. 406-43, no. E1352, *de Robeck to Curzon, Constantinople*, 11 February 1920, for similar statements.

135.U.S. 867.00/1128, *Bristol to Secretary of State, Constantinople*, dated in the document as "undated 1920, received March 7."

136."Latest reports from Marash are that our [i.e., American] citizens and all non-Moslem races as well as fifty wounded French soldiers left behind in care of Americans when the French evacuated are safe and under the protection of the Turkish authorities. . . . Armenians are not being massacred by Turks" (U.S. 867.00/1124, *Bristol to Secretary of State, Constantinople*, 26 February 1920).

Bristol stated that French shelling was obviously the main cause of destruction in Maraş and that about 10,000 Armenians remained after the French withdrawal -- with only "isolated instances" of murders. There was general quiet. The new Turkish mutasarif was working hard to protect Christians, but had limited resources and few men (U.S. 867.00/1185, *Bristol to Secretary of State, Constantinople*, 27 March 1920).

Bristol blamed the French for the Armenians' troubles in Maraş, because of their methods of occupation. "Several thousand Turks" and 10,000 Armenians had been killed, including women and children on both sides. He stated that the Turks did massacre some Armenians, but that all was quiet once the French had evacuated. He also averred that Turkish Nationalists did not want to exterminate non-Muslims (U.S. 867.00/1179, *Bristol to Secretary of State, Constantinople*, 23 March 1920).

Bristol stated that there were no real reports of massacres of Armenians in Cilicia. He advised the State Department to distrust the propaganda they were hearing (U.S. 867.00/1156, *Bristol to Secretary of State, Constantinople*, 12 March 1920). See also F.O. 371-5044, *de Robeck to Curzon, Constantinople*, 4 March 1920, which contains American missionary reports on Armenian suffering and on the burning of Turkish villages.

137.F.O.406-44, p. 75, no. 48, *High Commissioner's Representative, Smyrna, to High Commissioner, Constantinople, 5 June 1920.*

138.Probably thousands of Armenians perished on the retreat from Maraş, which was accomplished in the snows of winter, with great suffering. See Stanley E. Kerr , *The Lions of Marash: Personal Experiences with American Near East Relief, 1919-1922*, Albany, 1973, pp. 186-96; F.O. 371-5042, no. E919, *de Robeck to Curzon, Constantinople, 2 March 1920*; and F.O. 371-5044, no. E1941, *General Staff Report, 20 March 1920*. The British set the numbers of the dead at 12,000, Kerr at 11,000.

By June 1925, the total refugees in northern Syria were, according to Longrigg

-244-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 244.

(p. 138): 89,000 Armenians, 4,000 Chaldeans, 1,800 Jacobites, 900 Greek Orthodox, and 250 Syrian Catholics.

139.F.O. 406-44, no. E15253, *Director of Military Intelligence to Foreign Office, 4 December 1920, transmitting, "Note by General Gouraud respecting French Policy in Armenia", Paris, 25 November 1920.*

140.Muzaffer, et al. to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of the Interior, 7 and 8 May 1920. *Belgeler III*, no. 193. Consideration of the Turkish Nationalist-French conflict over Urfa is tangential to the events discussed here, but is interesting, especially for the ambivalent attitude of Urfa's Armenians, the place of American missionaries, and the interaction between the Turks and the French. See Mary Catherine Holmes' personal narrative, *Between the Lines in Asia Minor*, New York, 1923, and Ali Saip detailed *Çukurova'nın Acıklı Olayları ve Urfa'nın*

Kurtuluş Savaşları (put into Modern Turkish by Selim Ak), şanlıurfa, 1984. The latter describes Holmes in detail, as well as giving detailed original correspondence.

Note that the term "Turkish Nationalists," as used here, denotes the Turkish forces in Anatolia and eastern Thrace that were organizing resistance to the occupation of Anatolia. These were the forces that eventually united under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal. See the details in Chapter Seven.

141. On the grave situation of Armenians in the Caucasus, see F.O. 371-6265, no. E23, "Report by Col. Stokes at Tiflis on the Situation in Armenia", 24 December 1920, and F.O. 371-3658, no. 59561, 1918 (the only date) by A. Sahakian, President of the Armenian Parliament. For a general picture, see Richard Hovannisian, *Armenia on the Road to Independence and The Republic of Armenia*.

142. Kara Schemsi, p. 74.

143. Commander of the Ninth Army şevki to Ministry of Defense, 27 December 1918. *Belgeler* III, no. 185.

144. F.O. 371-3660, no. 157887, *Wardrup to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Tiflis, 2 November 1919*, transmitting the "Report of the delegate of the Minister of Relief for inquiring into the economical situation of the Mussulmans in Armenia" by the delegate Makinsky, Erivan, 9 September 1919. Makinsky estimated that, "Only the region situated near the last bank of the lake of Gokchy has been preserved in safety. In the Erivan District in the regions subordinated to the Government there are not more than 25,000 Mussulmans; in Echmiadzin there is the same number also, 25,000, while in Sourmalinsk again in that part which is subordinated to the Government there is a population of 15,000 souls. Except this in Erivan there are 13,000 refugees besides the local population." Makinsky alluded to the fact that Armenians were receiving assistance from America: "It may be said that all the population without any distinction of nationality are in need, but with the difference that the Mussulmans are in much more dire need than the Armenians as no aid has been given them." Muslim refugees who wished to return to their homes in 1918 were stopped by Armenian forces (Ministry of Interior to

Ministry of Defence, 28 August 1918. *Belgeler I*, no. 85).

145.Ninth Division Commander Rütü to the First Caucasian Army Corps Command, Yukarı Talin, 20 June 1918. *Belgeler III*, no. 183,

146.F.O. 371-3660, no. 157887, Wardrup to His Majesty's Principal Secretary

-245-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 245.

of State for Foreign Affairs, Tiflis, 2 November 1919, transmitting the "Report of the delegate of the Minister of Relief for inquiring into the economical situation of the Mussulmans in Armenia" by the delegate Makinsky, Erivan, 9 September 1919.

147.şevki to Ministry of Defense, Kars, 4 January 1919. *Belgeler III*, no. 187.

148.şevki to Ministry of Defense, Kars, 6 January 1919. *Belgeler III*, no. 189.

Kâzım Karabekir to Ministry of Defense, Erzurum, 30 August 1919. *Belgeler III*, no. 191. Karabekir mentioned the general situation of the Muslims of Kars, Erivan, and Azerbaijan in various sections of his *İstiklâl Harbimiz*, although the book generally dealt with political and military matters. See especially pp. 305-18, 555-56, and 916-17.

149.Sixth Army Commander to 13th Army Corps Command, 17 May 1918. *Belgeler II*, no. 138. See also U.S. 867.00/1191, *Bristol to Secretary of State, Constantinople*, 1 April 1920.

150.*Belgeler* III, no. 194. This report is extremely detailed and specific and seems to be completely genuine. Unfortunately, few such complete reports could have been made in the conditions existing at the time. The report, dated 23 October 1920, is made up of "three lists of the names of the villages burnt and destroyed by the Armenians during the last year as well as the number of Moslems murdered by the Armenians." The lists are detailed and include information on pillaging, destruction of crops, etc., as well as murder (Chairman of the Popular Council Ali Riza to the Supreme Command of the 12th Division, Kağzman, 23 October 1920. *Belgeler* III, no. 194).

151.Şevki to Third Army Command, 13 May 1918. *Belgeler* I, no. 75.

152.*ibid.*

153.F.O. 371-3405, no. 196800, and F.O. 371-3301, *F.O. to Lord Derby* in Paris, 27 July 1918: "Please give following message to Boghos Nubar Pasha. 'His Majesty's Government are much perturbed by persistent reports which reach them of massacres carried out by Armenian soldiers both in Armenia proper, before they were driven out by Turkish advance, and in Baku region, where the victims are Tartars. . .'"

154.The population proportions of the Kars Province, as listed in the Russian *Statistical Yearbook* for 1915 [assumed to be for ca. 1914], pp. 64 and 70:

Orthodox	.2123
Muslim	.5016
Catholic	.0150
Protestant	.0042
Jews	.0042
Other Christians	.2510
Other non-Christians	.0117

enians were not listed by religion, but they were listed under "ethnic groups": Armenians, 253; "Turco-Tartars," 359, Kurds, 148. It will be

noted that the percentage of "Orthodox" rose significantly from 1897-1914, which may be questionable.

155.W. E. D. Allen gives a detailed description of the Turkish, Armenian, and British actions in Kars Province. He concludes: "The Turkish community (including members of the families of the provisional government) became the victims of persecution at the hands of ill-disciplined Armenian troops and many excesses

-246-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 246.

were committed in the Turkish villages of the Kars plain" (*Caucasian Battlefields*, pp. 497 and 498).

156.A. Rawlinson, *Adventures in the Near East, 1918-1922*, London, 1924, p. 215.

157.F.O. 371-3660, no. 157887, *Wardrup to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Tiflis, 2 November 1919*, transmitting the Memorandum of the Plenipotentiaries of the Kars Musulmans' National Council (A. Kazieff and Asadulla Iskenderbekoff), 1 October 1919.

158.Kâzım Karabekir İngiliz Kaymakamı Ravlinson Bey Cenaplanna, Erzurum, 10 Temmuz 1919. *Belgeler IV*, no. 2073.

159.See F.O. 371-3660, no. 157887, *Wardrup to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Tiflis, 2 November 1919*, transmitting a "List of unlawful actions performed by representatives of Armenia in the places usurped by them."

160.Osmanlı Ordu-yu Hümayunu Başkumandanlığ Vekâleti Hariciye Nezareti Celilesine, 12 Ocak, 1919. *Belgeler IV*, no. 2072.

161.U.S. 860J.4016/60, translation of a statement by Kâzım Karabekir in *Bristol to Secretary of State*, Constantinople, 19 January 1921.

162.U.S. 860J.4016/60, translation of a statement by Kâzım Karabekir in *Bristol to Secretary of State*, Constantinople, 19 January 1921.

Muslim officials in Kars estimated that 40,000 Muslim bodies were left lying on the ground. Such an estimate is indicative of the enormity of the loss, but is surely not statistically reliable. See the letters of Ali and Asif to the Ottoman government and to the English Command in Kırzioğlu M. Fahrettin, *Milli Mücadelede Kars*, I. Kitap "Belgeler", Istanbul, 1960, pp. 40 and 41.

163.U.S. 860J.4016/58, *Bristol to Secretary of State*, Constantinople, 4 January 1921, transmitting letter from Ahmed Muhtar, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, 1 November 1919.

164.U.S. 184.021/46, enclosure A, *Kiazim (Karabekir) to Lt. R.S. Dunn, Erzurum*, 30 June 1919 and 15 August 1919.

165.Rawlinson, pp. 217 and 218.

166.F.O. 371-3660, no. 157887, *Wardrup to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Tiflis*, 2 November 1919, transmitting the Memorandum of the Plenipotentiaries of the Kars Musulmans' National Council (A. Kazieff and Asadulla Iskenderbekoff), 1 October 1919. See also the notes and statistics on refugees and mortality in Kırzioğlu M. Fahrettin, *Kars İli ve Çevresinde Ermeni Mezalimi (1918-1920)*, Ankara, 1970, especially pp. 65-71 and 97-111.

167.U.S. 184.021/46, enclosure A, *Kiazim [Karabekir] to Lt. R.S. Dunn, Erzurum*, 30 June 1919 and 15 August 1919.

168.F.O. 371-3658, no. 42884, translated in flowery prose by the School of Oriental Studies, London Institution. See also F.O. 371-3669, no. 22072, *Cromer to Verney, Sandringham*, Norfolk, 18 January 1919.

169.Rawlinson, p. 227. Rawlinson's testimony is especially reliable because he had good reason to be anti-Turkish, but nevertheless reported honestly. Before his book was written he had been treated badly when a prisoner of war, held until he was exchanged for Turkish prisoners held by the British in Malta. In conversation with the American intelligence agent Lt. Dunn, Rawlinson described Armenian atrocities against Muslims in the same way as in his writings. See Robert Dunn , *World Alive*, New York, 1956, p. 309.

See also, F.O. 371-3658, no. 50074, 29 March 1919, Director of Military

-247-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 247.

Intelligence to Acting Under Secretary of State, 29 March 1919, on Armenian atrocities on Muslims.

170.*Caucasian Battlefields*, p. 481.

"Every Azerbaijani whom the Dashnak bands could catch was killed" (Kazemzadeh, p. 74). On the Baku massacres, see Kazemzadeh, p. 72-76 and Swietochokowski, pp. 114-18 and 139. Ronald Grigor Suny (*The Baku Commune, 1917-1918*, Princeton, 1972) gives a view of the events that is biased against the Muslims (pp. 214-26). For example, he quotes only Armenian sources on the numbers of Armenians and Muslims killed in Baku (pp. 224 and 339).

171.*Caucasian Battlefields*, p. 495. See also, Abdulhaluk Çay, "The March 31, 1918 Baku Massacre" in *The Eastern Question: Imperialism and the Armenian Community*, Ankara, 1987, pp. 121-32.

A British representative in Transcaucasia at the end of the war,

Urquhart, reported: "Over 8,000 Tartars were killed in Baku, over 18,000 unarmed Tartars ruthlessly murdered in Elizavetpol mainly by Armenian rebels." See F.O. 3713301, no. 121685, "Following from Urquhart to Colonel Steel, War Office," telegram from Mr. Lindley (Archangel [!]), 8 July 1918). Urquhart added that the Armenians had "restarted their blood feud with Tartars instead of continuing to fight the Turks [i.e., the Ottoman Army]."

The Azerbaijani government stated, "The Mussulman population was bombarded, shot down, and burnt alive" (*Claims of the Delegation of the Republic of Caucasian Azerbaijan Presented to the Peace Conference in Paris*, Paris, 1919, p. 18). They claimed that more than 12,000 Baku Muslims had been killed (p. 19).

172. Kazemzadeh, p. 143, quoting an Armenian commission. The numbers may be exaggerated, but there is no lack of higher estimates. See Jacques Kayaloff, *The Fall of Baku*, Bergenfield, New Jersey, 1976, especially p. 7.

173. *Caucasian Battlefields*, p. 495.

174. Richard G. Hovannisian, *Armenia on the Road to Independence*, Los Angeles, 1967, p. 194.

Andranik's forces were also active in the Nahcivan region in 1918, as witnessed in a telegram from the Armenian military commander Nazarbekov [Nazarbekian] to the Chairman of the Independent Armenian Commission in Gümrü: "Please inform the Turkish Commander that Andranik and his entire detachments, which did not obey my orders and which have been dismissed from the Army Corps, are indeed carrying out very cruel actions on the people of the Nahdjuvan [*sic*] region" (*Belgeler I*, number 79, no. 1008, 27 June 1919, sent on to the Chairman of the Turkish Commission by the Chairman of the Commission, Brig. General Trakopov).

On Andranik, see also *Belgeler I*, no. 88, şevki to Chief of Staff of Supreme Command, Kars, 23 October 1918, and F.O. 371-4156, no. 47610, *Webb to Balfour*, Constantinople, 26 February 1919, transmitting Reşid Paşa's complaints of Armenian actions in Nahcivan and elsewhere in the Caucasus.

175.Library of Congress, Bristol Papers, no. 66, notes from "Bryan in Tiflis to Bristol" and *Bristol to American Mission in Paris*, Constantinople, 21 and 23 November 1919.

176.U.S. 867.00/1047, *Bristol to Polk*, Constantinople, 17 November 1919; 867.00/1047, *Bristol to Secretary of State*, Constantinople, 17 November 1919; and 867.00/1063, *Bristol to Secretary of State*, Constantinople, 4 December 1919.

177.Bryan was bothered that the Muslims of the area hated Americans because

-248-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 248.

of Armenian deeds. He said that the hatred arose from U.S. support of the Armenians; his mission had given three million [*sic*] rounds of rifle ammunition to the Armenian Republic, and "the Armenian army has been rationed by Near East Relief to the number of 27,000 rations per day" (U.S. 867.00/1047, *Commander H. V. Bryan, Liaison Officer to Allied High Commission to Armenian*, Tiflis, 3 November 1919). The U.S. Commissioner in Armenia said that American Near East Relief gave flour and soap to the Armenian army, as well as sweaters, woolen socks, etc. He said this was only to be expected (U.S. 867.00/11088, William Haskell, "The High Commissioner in Armenia of the United States of America, The British Empire, France, and Italy" to Secretary of State, Tiflis, 2 January 1920).

178.*F.O.406-43*, p. 288, no. 171, *Earl Curzon to Mr. Wardrop in Tiflis*, 11 April 1920.

179.*Bristol War Diary*, 14 August 1922, U.S. 867.00/ 1540.

180.Osmanlı Ordu-yu Hümayunu Başkumandanlığ Vekâleti Hariciye Nezareti Celilesine, 12 Ocak, 1919. *Belgeler IV*, no. 2072.

181.The Ottoman Foreign Ministry did, however, send less detailed reports on the situation in the Caucasus to the Allies, listing Armenian attacks and murders. See U.S. 867.4016/414, *Ravndall to Secretary of State*, Constantinople, 24 June 1919, transmitting Ottoman memorandum no. 16178.

182.F.O. 3717-3660, no. 157887, *Wardrup to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs*, Tiflis, 2 November 1919, transmitting the Memorandum of the Plenipotentiaries of the Kars Muslims' National Council (A. Kazieff and Asadulla Iskenderbekofl), 1 October 1919.

183.U.S. 860J.4016/58, *Bristol to Secretary of State*, Constantinople, 4 January 1921, transmitting letter from Ahmed Muhtar, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, 1 November 1919.

184.F.O. 371-3660, no. 144753, *Wardrop to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs*, translating the letter as received from "Monsieur Djafaroff in his letter No. 3341 of September 25th." Another, similar report: From *T. Vesiroff, Minister of the Republic of Azerbaijan at Constantinople*, to *Bristol*, 4 March 1920 (867.00/1284).

185.F.O. 371-3660, no. 154951 [number difficult to decipher], *Cox to Curzon*, Teheran, 25 October 1919, transmitting the letter of "Etola ul Mulk" of the Persian Foreign Office to Cox, 21 October 1919. He further mentions that 5,000 Persians had escaped from the Armenian Republic into Iran, mainly men and women forced to leave their children behind. He states that the Persian government holds the Great Powers responsible for what has happened and for correcting the situation -- a forlorn hope.

F.O. 371-4952, no. E4925, Letter from the Persian Consul-General in the Caucasus, Tiflis, 5 April 1920.

186. Quoted in F.O. 371-3660, no. 144753, Wardrop to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, translating the letter as received from "Monsieur Djafaroff in his letter No. 3341 of September 25th." The same report was summarized from the semiofficial Georgian paper Borra [*sic*-Bor'ba?] in the Press Reports in U.S. 184.021/270.

187. F.O. 371-3660, no. 157887, *Wardrop to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs*, Tiflis, 2 November 1919, transmitting a translation by Elsie Mavropulo of the article in *The Revolutionary Banner*. For representations

-249-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 249.

of the Azerbaijan government on Armenian massacres of Turks see U.S. 867.00/ 1215, *Bristol to Secretary of State*, Constantinople, 14 April 1920.

188. Major L'Etat Ottoman, *Atrocités Arméniennes, commises contre les Mussulmans du Caucase durant le mois de Juillet 1919*, Istanbul, n.d., p. 7.

189. Osmanlı Ordu-yu Hümayunu Başkumandanlığı Vekâleti Hariciye Nezareti Celilesine, 12 Ocak, 1919. *Belgeler IV*, no. 2072.

190. U.S. 867.00/1100, *Bristol to Secretary of State*, Constantinople, 2 January 1920, commenting on a U.S. Intelligence Report on Transcaucasia. Sentence begins "It will be noted in this narrative that the Armenian government. . . ."

191. "Little by little, all the Tartar villages in the Vedi Bassar region, except Beiuq Vedi, were cleared of Tartars, and General Dro prepared a

movement against Sharour and Nakhitchevan in force." But the Azerbaijanis beat off attacks (Intelligence Report from the Caucasus, 31 December 1919, in U.S. 867.00/1100, *Bristol to Secretary of State*, Constantinople, 2 January 1920).

192. See Appendix for statistical procedures and evaluation.

193. I.e., without Nahcivan, Kulp, and Iğdır. The assumption has been made that Turks in these three areas were approximately the same number in 1915 as in 1926-27, when in reality a number of Armenians were gone from Nahcivan. Also, the assumption is that in-migration of Turks roughly balanced the Turkish dead in Nahcivan. Being wrong in these assumptions by as much as 25 percent (highly unlikely) would have little effect on the conclusions. "Turco-Tatars" in Nahcivan, 1926: 88,466 Turkish-speakers in Kulp and Iğdır, 1927: 20,581.

194. One of the rare honest European accounts of the refugees, a British military report from Baku [1 July 1919] stated that during the war Armenians fled from Muslim areas and Muslims from Armenian areas. Both groups "fled to avoid massacres and from massacres" (U.S. 867.00/1063).

195. See *Muslims and Minorities*, Chapter 7.

196. U.S. 184.021/46, enclosure A, *Kiazim [Karabekir] to Lt. R. S. Dunn*, Erzurum, 30 June 1919 and 15 August 1919. See also *Atrocités Arméniennes*, p. 6. On refugees and Oltu, see *İstiklâl Harbimiz*, p. 811.

197. The Russian Empire took a census in 1897 but the next census was not taken until the Soviet census of 1926. While the empire registered population by religion, the Soviets did not. The empire only listed the broad ethnic category "Turco-Tatar," whereas the Soviets divided this category into many separate ethnic divisions. Such problems add to the difficulties of comparative analysis.

198. Often called "Kars and Ardahan," the area was ceded to Russia in 1878. Most of the land was then returned to Turkey after the Turkish victories

over the Armenian Republic and a subsequent treaty with the Soviet Union. The area was divided into the Republican provinces of Artvin Vilâyeti (less Yusufeli Kazası), Oltu Kazası of Erzurum Vilâyeti, Iğdır and Kulp kazas of Bayazıt Vilâyeti, and all of Kars Viliâeti.

199.The 1897 Russian census was published in various forms in Russian and French. The version used here is the detailed, bilingual *Premier Recensement Général de la Population de l'Empire de Russie, 1897, Relève Général*, "rédigé par Nicolas Troinitsky," St. Petersburg, 1905.

200.Females were greatly undercounted, so male population has been doubled to approximate total population. The resulting figure is inexact, but superior to

-250-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 250.

the uncorrected population numbers. This figure and those that follow below are estimations, not precise statements of population numbers.

201.The 1915 Russian Statistical Yearbook gave 389,800 as the population of Kars Province, of which .5016 were Muslim. Cf. also fn. 154 supra.

202.In Van Vilâyeti, 62 percent of the Muslim population was lost between 1912 and 1922 (*Muslims and Minorities*, p. 134).

203.At a rate of .014 per year, consistent with other rates of increase in postwar Anatolia.

204.The Van figure is perhaps more likely to be accurate, because the Erzurum figure was affected by in-migration during and after the wars.

Indeed, I assumed the Van figure for my calculations in "Muslim Refugees in Turkey" in the *festschrift* to Andreas Tietze.

205. Only approximately one-half of the Muslim refugees labeled themselves as born in Russia, or 127,988. These must be assumed to be part of the group of refugees from areas that remained in Russia in 1927. The vast majority of the 1927 inhabitants of the Kars region actually must have been born in Russia, since the area was in the Russian Empire from 1878 to 1922. Yet 212,512 of the 341,254 recorded inhabitants of the area listed themselves as having been born in Turkey. As seen before, most of those who registered themselves as being born in Turkey were in fact born in the Russian Empire, outside of even the larger 1927 Turkish borders.

Some Muslim refugees came from more northerly areas of the Caucasus, fleeing Soviet conquest, but their numbers are assumed here to have been statistically insignificant when compared to those from Erivan, etc.

206. The following Republican provinces, in the general area of the Kars Vilâyeti:

Province	Males Born in Russia
Amasya	839
Artvin (Yusufeli Kazası)	1*
Bayazıt (İğdir & Kulpkazas)	790*
Bitlis	938
Erzincan	150
Erzurum(Oltu kazası)	4,257*
Gümüşhane	15
Rize	80
Samsun	2,142
Şebinkarahisar	13

Tokat	2,298
Trabzon	223
Van	2,734
Total	14,480

* Only those areas that were in the Ottoman Empire after 1878.

SOURCE: 1927 Turkish Census.

-251-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 251.

The areas that the Turkish Republic took from Russia listed only 41 Russian citizens in the 1927 census. So those listed as born in Russia must be considered to have been refugees.

207. Given the overall **death** rate of (a) the other Muslims in the eastern Anatolian area and (b) the Armenians in the same area, an estimated mortality of one-third is by no means excessive.

208. Ordu, Giresun, Ünye, Samsun, Bafra, and Kastamonu.

209. "To the Office of the Prime Minister", 4 December 1916, *Belgeler I*, no. 41.

210. It is obvious from the documents that some areas were much better enumerated than others. For example: "The number of people who took refuge in Diyarbakir is 16,901 at the central district and 16,162 at the district of Mardin. So far 40,000 refugees have been sent to Urfa." Obviously, more was known of the refugees in Mardin and Diyarbakir

than of those "sent to Urfa."

211. See *Muslims and Minorities*, Chapter Six, especially pp. 110 and 111.

212. Arnold J. Toynbee, *The Western Question in Greece and Turkey: a Study in the Contact of Civilizations*, London, Boston and New York, 1922, p. 191.

213. The author of the Ottoman document on these refugees spoke of "an exodus of about 800,000 people," but even this may have been too low an estimate of the refugees as of 1916.

214. This assumes that refugees suffered higher mortality than Muslims of the area in general. For the general mortality, see below and *Muslims and Minorities*, pp. 133-37.

215. Niles and Sutherland. On the *bona fides* of Captain Niles, see U.S. 867.00/ 1005, *Philip Brown of Princeton University to William Carr*, Princeton, 11 October 1919.

Other reports, such as those of the Harbord and King-Crane Commissions were surely well-publicized. By rights, the statements of Niles and Sutherland should have been included alongside the Harbord Reports, but were not. One cannot help but believe that their evidence was not what those in power wished to hear. General Harbord mentioned in his report that Captain Niles had visited areas of eastern Anatolia that the Harbord Commission had not seen, but Harbord completely misrepresented what Niles had written. (See Justin McCarthy, "The Report of Niles and Sutherland: an American Investigation of Eastern Anatolia after World I", *XI. Türk Tarih Kongresi*, Ankara, 1994, pp. 1809-53. This article reprints the Niles and Sutherland Report.) Both the Harbord and King-Crane reports commented in detail on the situation in provinces such as Van and Bitlis without having been there. Very little attempt was made to elicit Turkish opinion or testimony. Indeed, the Harbord Commission's only interpreters were Armenians, so the likelihood of accurate reporting about what the Turks thought was extremely remote.

216.Niles and Sutherland, op. cit.

217.ibid.

218."Erzerum, Frontier District, i.e., Diadin, Kara Kilissa, Alashgird, Zeidekan, Velibaba, Khorasan, Keupri Keui, Jaghan, Hassan Kale, Ilidja, Karabijik, Baiburt."

219.Niles and Sutherland, op. cit.

220.ibid.

221.ibid.

-252-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 252.

222.ibid. See also *Istiklâl Harbâmız*, pp. 369-71.

223.Births would normally have been well above deaths, but this would not have been true in conditions such as those that applied in eastern Anatolia.

224.See notes 207 and 208.

225.See F.O. 371-3658, no. E77890, *Boghos Nubar to Balfour*, Paris, 15 May 1919.

226. These provinces are the Ottoman vilâyets as they were in 1895, compared to the same geographic area in the Turkish Census of 1927. For exact comparisons of the districts involved, see *Muslims and Minorities*, pp. 231-34.

227. The 1927 Turkish Census figures have been projected back to 1922. For the procedure, see *Muslims and Minorities*, pp. 145-62.

228. I theorize that many migrated from the Kastamonu Vilâyeti. Others may have come from Ankara and Sivas vilâyets, especially.

229. Even İsmet Paşa (representative of the Turkish Republic at the Lausanne Peace Conference) underestimated the deaths in the east. He stated them as 1,000,000 (F.O. 371-9058, no. E219, Address of İsmet Pasha, Lausanne, 5 January 1923).

230. The 1915 Russian *Statistical Yearbook* and the 1926 U.S.S.R. census. For explanations of the procedures involved, see Appendix. The years in Table 21 and Table 22 are different because Table 21 conforms to the usage in its source, *Muslims and Minorities*.

231. Migration from the northern Caucasus into what was called Transcaucasia would make the mortality appear smaller than it was. Migration from Transcaucasia into Turkey would have the effect of making the Caucasian mortality appear somewhat greater and Anatolian mortality lesser, i.e.,

$$CP1-CP2 = CM$$

$$AP1-AP2 = AM$$

$$\text{but } CP1-CP2-M = CM-M$$

$$AP1-AP2+M = AM + M$$

where CP1 = Transcaucasian population in 1914.

CP2 = Transcaucasian population in 1921.

AP1 = Anatolian population in 1912.

AP2 = Anatolian population in 1922.

CM = Population Loss in Transcaucasia.

AM = Population Loss in Anatolia

M = Migrants.

However, the majority of the emigrants from Transcaucasia probably went to Kars Vilâyeti and other areas of the Turkish Republic that had been in Russia, and this would not affect the calculations of mortality in what had been Ottoman Anatolia after 1878.

232. More than 40 percent if in-migration, mentioned before, is taken into account.

-253-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 253.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE FINAL WAR IN THE WEST

"Oh daughter," she said, impatiently putting her hand on my notes, which lay on my knees, "what is the use of scribbling about burned huts and people whose throats are already cut? They are no more. Will it feed us or cover us or make us live? The village had three thousand cattle and sheep . . . there is not even a hen which can lay eggs. How can I feed my old man and my daughter, who is wounded by the Greeks? There is not even salt to put in the leaves which we boil to silence this angry hunger in our stomachs. . . .

"Something is wrong, something is wrong, daughter. We used to think the gendarmes were the only calamity sent by Allah in the old days. Then we

used to say that the sultan did not know that we were oppressed. Oppressed? It was heaven compared to this. Oh, my Allah, how I begged the Greeks to leave some cover for those who were left alive! They laughed and told me that Avrupa (Europe) had sent them to do it all, and that they would never leave us in peace. That man Avrupa must be told, daughter; he must leave us, the poor peasants, alone. What have we done to him?"

(Fatma Nine of Mulk village to Halide Edib.) ¹

PREPARING FOR WAR

The Anatolian War of 1919-22 (the Turkish War of Independence) between Turks and Greeks was the culmination of the process

-255-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 255.

of de-Turkification begun by the Greeks in their War of Independence. The methods were the same as those used in earlier wars, especially in the Balkan Wars, to kill or drive out Muslims. In the Balkan Wars and in the Turco-Russian War of 1877-78 in Bulgaria, exemplary massacres, pillage, and destruction of Muslim property had caused hundreds of thousands of Muslims, primarily Turks, to flee from territories occupied by enemy Christian armies. The same policy was implemented by the Greeks who invaded Anatolia. From the first day of the Greek occupation, Turks were put on notice that their lives were in danger if they remained under Greek power.

The intention of the Greek army in Anatolia was the same as that of the Balkan allies in 1912 -- to create a Christian land where there previously had been an ethnically and religiously mixed population. To this end, the Muslims had to be driven out. Unlike the Balkan territories, however, in which Muslims were geographically scattered, ethnically divided, and only a very slight majority, the Muslims of western Anatolia were the overwhelming majority and almost all were ethnically Turks. As shown in [Table 23](#), Muslims made up 80 percent of the population of western Anatolia; Greeks only 14 percent. If the region's Armenian Christians, who would be expected to have sided with the Greeks in a civil war, ²were added to the Greek totals, the combined Greeks and Armenians (195,000) were still only

845,000, or 18 percent of the total population. The makeup of the population thus made the creation of a Christian majority a more difficult proposition than it had been in the Balkans. Moreover, the sheer numbers of Turks added to the

TABLE 23. THE POPULATION OF Ottoman WESTERN ANATOLIAN PROVINCES, 1912. ³

	Muslims	Greeks	Total
Aydin	1,734,000(79%)	385,000(18%)	2,119,000
Hüdavendigâr	1,599,000(83%)	208,000(11%)	1,807,000
Biga	166,000(91%)	9,000(05%)	175,000
İzmit	272,000(70%)	48,000(12%)	320,000
Totals	3,771,000(80%)	650,000(14%)	4,421,000

SOURCE: McCarthy, *Muslims and Minorities*.

-256-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 256.



Western Anatolia and Eastern Thrace in 1914.

difficulties of the Greeks. It was a great task to eject the large numbers of Turks who lived in western Anatolia. In the Balkan Wars, Greeks had taken territories that had contained a prewar population of 750,000 Muslims. Western Anatolia had a prewar Muslim population of almost 4 million.

The Ottoman Empire had suffered more than any other combatant nation during World War I. ⁴Systems of agricultural production and distribution, health, and civil order had broken down under the pressure of a multifront war that the Ottoman Empire had not been prepared to fight. In western Anatolia, the presence of almost one million ⁵refugees from the Balkan and eastern Anatolian war zones contributed to widespread starvation in the

region.

-257-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 257.

Hundreds of thousands of men had died during the war, leaving families made up of old men, women, and children. The political system was discredited by the Ottoman defeat. Public security was virtually nonexistent outside of cities, and Greek, Armenian, Circassian, and Turkish bands raided at will. ⁶Cholera, typhoid, and especially typhus ravaged the population. After the world war, Greek refugees who had migrated to the Greek islands or been deported to other areas of western Anatolia returned to their homes. ⁷The occupying Allies evicted Turkish refugees from the Balkans who had been housed there, returning their property to the Greeks and leaving the Turks once again homeless; no one offered to turn out those who had taken possession of the Turks' homes. The Turkish population that awaited the Greeks was weak and seemingly unable to resist. ⁸ Nevertheless, the Greeks failed to conquer western Anatolia, despite the support of the Allies and the prostrate position of the Ottoman government. To a great extent, the victory of the Turks was due to able leaders who arose at the needed time, especially Mustafa Kemal Paşa. But Mustafa Kemal did not fight alone. Behind him was a mobilized nation. The Muslims of western Anatolia, now beginning to think of themselves nationally as Turks, knew that the battle for Anatolia was their last stand. Many of them had come from the Balkans. Others were the children or grandchildren of Muslims driven from the Caucasus or the Crimea, still others refugees from lands in eastern Anatolia taken by the Russians in the recent war. They knew that after Anatolia there was no land left to receive them. The Ottoman government, its capital under Allied occupation, was incapable of defending them. Therefore they united under the Turkish Nationalist banner and defended themselves.

THE COURSE OF THE WAR

OVERVIEW

The Greek invasion of Anatolia began and ended in İzmir. ⁹On 15 May 1919 a Greek army landed at İzmir. It moved quickly into the rest of the province

of Aydin, of which İzmir was the capital

-258-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 258.

city. Initially, Turkish national forces in Aydin Vilâyeti were able to drive the Greeks back, and retook temporarily the cities of Bergama and Aydin; however, the disorganized Turkish forces could not hold on, and a renewed Greek offensive in June and July of 1920 moved north to Bursa. In July, the British took the İzmit Peninsula, immediately to the east of Istanbul, and in effect presented it to the Greeks. In January of 1921, Greek forces met their first major resistance at the First Battle of the İnönü, where Turkish Nationalist forces under İsmet Paşa held them back. The Greeks regrouped and attacked the Nationalists once again, but were defeated by the Turks at the Sakarya River in September 1921. It was not until almost a year later, in August 1922, that the Turks advanced. The Greeks were quickly and finally defeated, and İzmir was retaken on September 8. In the Treaty of Lausanne (24 July 1923), the Greeks and their European allies accepted the creation of a new Turkish state in Anatolia and eastern Thrace.

The decision to allow Greece to occupy the sancak of İzmir was made at the Paris Peace Conference (1919). The terms of the Mudros Armistice between the Allies and the Ottoman government did not allow such an occupation, except in the Six Vilâyets of Armenia. Article VII ("The Allies have the right to occupy any strategic points in the event of any situation arising which threatens the security of the Allies") might have been applied justifiably to a fortress, perhaps a port, but not to an entire sancak. ¹⁰In fact, the occupation of İzmir was a military invasion by a hostile power, supported by the most powerful nations on earth. From the first, the decision was made on the basis of false information and duplicity. Both Lloyd George and Woodrow Wilson were fervently pro-Greek and anti-Turkish. Throughout the Peace Conference, Wilson made plain that his Fourteen Points, in particular the right of self-determination of peoples, did not apply to Turks. Lloyd George had never even avowed such scruples. Moreover, England, France, and the United States were afraid that Italy would claim the İzmir region if Greece did not, for Italy was seen as a threat to the interests of France and England in the eastern Mediterranean. Even though the region had been awarded to Italy in wartime agreements, ¹¹her allies, especially Great Britain, preferred to see İzmir in the hands of a small client state, Greece.

The Italians were not notified of the decision to allow Greece to occupy İzmir until immediately prior to the landing. They reluctantly accepted, but only on condition

-259-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 259.

that the occupation was temporary and did not prejudice final disposition of the region.

From the first, the Greek government saw the Allied "Rules of Occupation" for what they were, pious nonsense. As demonstrated by the actions of his army, neither Prime Minister Venizelos nor, later, the Greek king intended their army to serve as the "peacekeepers and protectors" envisioned in the Allied charge to Greece. They were an army of occupation whose intention was to make western Anatolia the next step in the expansion of Greece. As in the previous expansions, this necessitated the removal of the bulk of the Muslim population.

The wonder is that the Allied Powers, especially Great Britain, truly did not understand Greece's intentions. Nowhere in the voluminous archival documentation is there evidence of British understanding of Greece's intentions before the Greek landing at İzmir. Only slowly, as reports of massacre and forced migration of Muslims provided compelling evidence, did the British government begin to see what was occurring. The British were beset with the mentality that allowed them to create "mandates" all over the world, convincing themselves, as well as others, that their motives were altruistic concern, not imperialism -- a belief in the purity of those, such as the Greeks, who had sided with the Allies and a blindness to the real intentions of their friends and even of themselves.

The French had fewer illusions. Perhaps it was their political realism that allowed them to change sides so easily and end the war in support of the Turks. The British may on the surface appear to have been the more noble, supporting their friends to the end, but theirs was the sort of stubborn nobility that comes as a blessing to the confidence man.

Even though they had been bombarded with false statistics, ¹² the European Allies who had given İzmir to the Greeks realized that western Anatolia was

overwhelmingly Muslim. ¹³They therefore restricted their grant to the sancak of İzmir ("Smyrna and Vicinity") and mandated that a plebiscite be held in five years to decide the future rule of the sancak. Presumably, in five years the population of İzmir Sancağı would be mainly Greek, through a forced population exchange, although such sentiments were not openly stated. The Greeks, however, seem to have intended from the beginning of their occupation to take a much larger territory than that awarded by the Allies. This meant there was a need to create a Greek majority in a large area, perhaps the entire Aegean littoral. ¹⁴

-260-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 260.

The moral justification of the invasion was the supposed danger to the Christians of İzmir if they remained in Ottoman hands. At the Paris Conference, it was repeatedly stated with assurance that the Turks were massacring Greeks and that the Greeks needed protection. "The Turks were firing on the Greeks, Lloyd George stated, and it was only logical to send Greeks to protect Greeks." ¹⁵As the Allies own formal investigation of the ensuing disaster was to state later, such assertions were untrue. In fact, the Turkish civil government and the military were keeping the peace well. The tranquil state of the entire Aydın Vilâyeti, of which İzmir was the capital, had been reported to the British by their own representatives, but Lloyd George chose to accept the massacre reports of Greek Prime Minister Venizelos rather than the reports of his own agents. ¹⁶

The proposed occupation was not without its critics. At the Peace Conference, only the Italians protested, asking that the occupation be made by Allied, rather than purely Greek, units. Allied officers in İzmir and Istanbul also felt that a purely Greek occupation would be an error. The Senior U.S. Naval Officer in İzmir, Captain Dayton, when apprised of the plan, suggested that American, British, French, and Italian units land first. He was refused. ¹⁷

Among the Turks of İzmir, fear of Greek occupation was based on knowledge of past Greek occupations in Macedonia, Thrace, and Crete. Most of the local Turks may not have possessed detailed knowledge of the history of Greco-Turkish relations, but they had heard the stories of the many refugees among them -- 150,000 Muslim refugees from the Balkans had

been settled in Aydın Vilâyeti since 1912. Because of them, the Turks of İzmir knew what to expect from Greek occupation, and the Greek occupiers hastened to prove them correct.

The situation was the same one Turkish Muslims had seen in the Balkans -- a Christian national army and local Christian forces killing them and forcing them out. The intention was the same -- to create a majority Christian state by the murder and forced migration of the Muslim majority. To that end, a policy of state terror was employed, beginning with massacres of Turks upon the Greek landing at İzmir and rising in intensity to a high point in the year from 1920 to 1921. Turks not personally attacked in the Terror nevertheless heard of the massacres and fled before the Greek armies, as was intended. As the Greeks advanced, the policy bore results. Hundreds of thousands of Turks fled.

-261-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 261.

THE İZMİR INVASION

On 13 May 1919, the Senior Allied Officer in the flotilla off İzmir, British Admiral Calthorpe, notified the governor (vali) of Aydın Vilâyeti and the Ottoman military commander that the forts and defensive batteries of the city would be occupied by the Allies on the next day. No notice was given of the impending Greek occupation, but the suspicions of the Turks were aroused. Suspecting the worst, the vali begged that, if the city were to be occupied, it be occupied by Allied, not solely Greek troops. ¹⁸The forts were taken on 14 May. That evening, the vali was notified that Greek troops would be landing the next morning, in accordance with Article VII of the Mudros Armistice. After protesting the action, the vali stated that he was forced to accept the occupation, with the understanding that it would be temporary. He agreed that Ottoman soldiers in İzmir would be withdrawn into their barracks so as to prevent incidents between Greek and Ottoman troops. He also requested that 100 English, French, or Italian soldiers be sent into the city along with the Greeks, to keep order. He was refused.

Greek troops began to land after 8 a.m. on the fifteenth. One group landed at the central quay of İzmir, where they were greeted by Greek Bishop

Chrysostomos, who blessed them with his episcopal cross. They were also greeted by "an excited mob of Greek civilians who hung on in clots and filled the air with enthusiastic cries." ¹⁹Accompanied by the mob, the troops marched directly to the offices of the provincial government, past the barracks into which the Ottoman soldiers had been collected. As they reached the government offices, a shot rang out. ²⁰The civilian mob fled in terror, and the Greek troops began to fire on the government offices and the barracks.

Whoever fired the first shot will never be known. Turks accused an unknown Greek in the crowd of firing at the government buildings. Greeks accused an unknown Turk, firing from the government buildings. Of more importance are the results of the shot. What occurred in İzmir took place in the sight of scores of neutral and pro-Greek European witnesses. Three of the many reports:

[The statement of the officers of the British ship the S/S Brescia] After the firing had somewhat abated, [Greek] soldiers and civilians commenced breaking into premises, apparently Turkish. The civilians took a very active part in operations, in several instances they were seen to

-262-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 262.

take firearms from the soldiers and use them in order to gain admission to these premises.

Several civilians, apparently Turks who were arrested by the mob, were subjected to severe cruelty by both soldiers and civilians until they collapsed; they were then dragged out of sight into a café.

Everything was comparatively quiet until a batch of prisoners under a white flag, holding their hands up and escorted by Greek troops, marched along the [water] front. Firing was then resumed from different houses and after the prisoners had passed, a long line of killed and wounded were seen along the front. ²¹

[The statement of Donald Whitall, British resident of İzmir] From there [the custom-house] up to the Kramer Palace Hotel I was the unwilling witness of the massacre of some thirty unarmed men, who were being marched with

hands up. This butchery was committed by Greek soldiers entirely.

At a point between the Corn Exchange and the Orient Bank I saw six being shot out of one batch within ten yards. At a point higher up I saw five others succumbing under the fire of Greek rifles. Close to the landing place of the Cordelio boats I saw a lot more shot down. Near Kramer I witnessed three more cases of shooting. . . . ²²

[The statement of the Commanding Officer of the U.S.S. Arizona] Old men, unarmed, and other unoffending civilian Turks were knocked down by the Greeks, killed by stabbing with knives or bayonets, and then afterwards, having their valuables and clothing stripped off their bodies, were thrown into the sea. In one instance, the man was again shot after being thrown into the sea, this by Greek soldiers. Many of the prisoners, including high military officers, as they were marched along with hands up were permitted to be beaten by the rabble who followed. Specific instances are cited by these same eyewitnesses where Turkish soldiers and officers ²³ were bayoneted from behind by their Greek guards, while the rabble rifled their pockets and then threw their bodies into the sea. Many of the worst instances of inhuman treatment of the Turks were while they were under arrest and on the open sea front at noonday. ²⁴

From the center of the city, the mob, assisted by Greek soldiery, fanned out to the city's neighborhoods. Property was stolen, whole neighborhoods ransacked. Greek soldiers only occasionally stopped the looting of Muslim property; more often they joined in the looting. Mobs of local Greeks went from house to house, stealing all they found. Stores, businesses, and factories owned by Turks were looted of all their goods. In the process of pillaging, many hundreds of

-263-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 263.

Turks were killed in their houses and shops. Others were simply killed in the streets. The Turks of the city were not armed, the Ottoman gendarmerie had been disarmed and often imprisoned or themselves killed. For the Turks, there was no defense. ²⁵ Perhaps 700 to 800 Turks were killed, ²⁶ while three Greek soldiers died. ²⁷ Worse scenes were enacted in the villages that surrounded the city, many of which were sacked and destroyed. In one

town, the Greeks demanded a payment of 500 gold liras so that the town would not be pillaged. Once the ransom was paid, the town was sacked. Other suburban towns were simply robbed of all they had. ²⁸ Europeans living in the areas surrounding İzmir listed villages such as Cim Ovasi, Cücükler, Keler, Sasal, Değirmen, Lere, Tiratsa, Palamut, Çileme, Gürece, and many others, by name, as having been sacked by Greeks, with heavy loss of life. ²⁹ An indication of the terror of the Turkish villagers is that whole villages fled to İzmir, rather than remain in their homes, despite the obvious danger to Turks in the city. ³⁰ As the British Control Officer who investigated the situation reported: "The Greeks in the country round Smyrna have looted the arms-depots, have sacked Turkish villages, and hunted down Muslims." ³¹

The Greek policy of disarming Turks and arming local Greeks began in İzmir. Unlike some village Turks, the Turks of İzmir were not particularly well-armed. Thus, when the İzmir Turks heard of the impending Greek occupation, they attempted to obtain arms from the armory in the central army barracks. Their demands were refused, but they broke down the doors and had begun to take weapons when Ottoman soldiers fired on them and forced them to flee. The Ottoman soldiers were under orders to keep the peace and acted accordingly. When the Greek occupation was accomplished, and these same soldiers had been marched off, many beaten and killed, the weapons from the barracks armory were distributed to the Greeks of İzmir. ³² The official British Military Representative in İzmir formally (though diffidently) protested the distribution of arms to the Greek population of the region: "Constant shooting, looting, and hunting-down of Turks has taken place. . . . It is therefore a possible inference that this arming of the civil population has been done with the object of aggression against the Turkish population." ³³

The Ottoman soldiery was treated particularly badly by the Greek mob and Greek troops. Greek civilians and soldiers robbed

-264-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 264.

and murdered many Ottoman soldiers, tortured others, and subjected them all to great harassment and indignity. The officers who survived the march from their barracks to the quay were imprisoned in the lowest hold of a

Greek ship, a hold that had been used to transport horses. Meanwhile, the barracks and government offices were looted. The house of each Ottoman officer was identified and systematically looted. Wives of some officers were raped. ³⁴

In addition to provincial military officers, prominent Turkish officials and civilians were also selected for **death** -- newspaper editors and reporters, retired leaders of the gendarmerie, officials of the Public Debt Administration, etc. Many of these were simply murdered and thrown into the sea. ³⁵

Perhaps the most important analysis of the events at İzmir was the report of the Allied Commission of Inquiry. In July of 1919 the Allies sent a commission, led by one French, one Italian, one English, and one American delegate, to investigate the atrocities in İzmir. Britain had agreed to the Commission reluctantly, out of fear that refusing to investigate the atrocities would be politically damaging at home. ³⁶ The report stated that the Ottoman government had kept proper order in İzmir. The pretext of a need for Greek occupation to protect local Greeks was labelled as completely false. Greek soldiers and officials were blamed for events subsequent to the occupation, and Greek massacre and pillage were identified as such. In short, the document was an indictment of the Greek invasion, of subsequent Greek actions, and, by inference, of Allied support for the Greeks.

The immediate political importance of the Allied commission might have been great, had it reached a wide audience. However, it was suppressed. The British, who had a great stake in the success of the Greek occupation, correctly sensed that publication of the report would hurt their plans for postwar Anatolia and would reflect poorly on them, as well as on their Greek allies. One Foreign Ministry official, Phipps, commented, "I do not think it would be advisable to issue any important part of this dispatch [i.e., the Allied Report] as a White Paper at present. The Greeks come out so badly that the less we publish the better." ³⁷ Calls by members of Parliament for dissemination of the report were refused. ³⁸

Many of the scenes reported from the İzmir occupation and massacre were reminiscent of the atrocities of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 and the Balkan Wars. In many ways, the atrocities

of the İzmir invasion were the more revolting for having taken place in a great city that was completely at peace. There had been no Ottoman resistance in İzmir; Ottoman soldiers, on orders from Istanbul and faced with the superiority of the Allied fleet, had obeyed their orders and surrendered peacefully. The populace could not rebel. Yet the Ottoman soldiers and Turkish civilians in İzmir were treated like combatants in a particularly vicious war. Rapes and mutilations were common, murder and pillage ubiquitous. ³⁹

GREEK ADVANCE FROM İzmir

After consolidating their hold on the sancak of İzmir, the Greeks began an advance past the boundaries that had been assigned to them at the Peace Conference. They marched up the Meander Valley, taking the city of Aydin on 27 May 1919. They then took Nazilli, from which they retired late in June. On 30 June, the Greek army was driven from Aydin by Turkish forces. The Greeks retreated to Karabunar, then to Değirmencik, but Greeks attacking from the south retook Aydin on 4 July. North of İzmir, the Greeks moved beyond the İzmir Sancağı and took Manisa on 25 May. On 11 June, they moved from Menemen (within their assigned sphere) to Bergama. At Bergama they were once again forced to retreat by Turkish forces. They retreated to Menemen, which was in turn taken by the Turks. However, the Turkish forces were too weak to sustain continued battle in Aydin Vilâyeti and on June 23 Greek army units landed at Dikili, took Bergama, and occupied the other towns they had lost. In July, Greek troops "mopped-up" remaining Turkish guerrilla forces. Thus, throughout the months of June and July 1919, the province of Aydin was embroiled in war.

As the Greeks advanced through Aydin Vilâyeti, all Turkish villagers who remained in their villages were disarmed, at first peaceably. For example, in Kasaba, a detachment of Greek soldiers took the city unopposed. The Ottoman officials and gendarmes were disarmed, as was the Turkish populace, and their guns given to local Greeks, who, along with Greek soldiers, proceeded to pillage the town. ⁴⁰ The same happened at Nazilli, Manisa, Menemen, and other occupied towns and villages. The Greek commander of Aydin ordered the Turks of the city to deliver up 6,000 guns (26 June 1919), which they could not do, because there were so few guns in the city. A house to house search was therefore instituted, and all

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 266.

who were in a house in which a gun was found were shot. ⁴¹In Tire, the gendarmes and others were disarmed in the usual pattern, and thus they and the Ottoman officials were then not able to intervene as Greek soldiers robbed the town and surrounding villages. ⁴²There is evidence that local Greeks were even given Greek army uniforms, as well as arms, and wore them as they attacked Turkish villages. ⁴³

Patterns set in earlier wars were followed again by the Greeks in Anatolia. In both the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 and the Balkan Wars, local Christians had been used as shock troops to kill local Muslims, with the ultimate aim of forcing Muslim migration. In these earlier wars, the set policy of the conquerors was to disarm Muslims and leave them completely defenseless, faced with the choice of flight or death; so it was, also, in Anatolia. Wherever Greek forces went, Turkish civilians and gendarmes were systematically disarmed. Turkish villagers were often beaten until they revealed the hiding places of weapons -- a process particularly hard on those who had no such secret caches. The guns that had been seized, along with other weapons brought by Greek soldiers, were then distributed to local Greeks and Armenians. This pattern was as invariable as it had been in the Balkans. The invading Greek army assumed, correctly, that many local Christians could be counted on as their partisans. ⁴⁴Fear of Turkish sniping and of guerrilla actions could explain the disarming of Muslims; in the light of the very real possibility of revolt against the occupying Greeks, it made sense to disarm Turks. Arming the local Greeks did not. The Greek army, at least in theory, had been sent to Anatolia to protect the populace and insure civil order. Disarming all civilians would have been consistent with that goal. Disarming only the majority group, the Turks, was only consistent with a goal of creating a Greek majority in the region by killing or forcing the flight of the majority Muslims.

Under the official pretext of providing "scouts" and other irregular troops, local Anatolian Greeks were also supplied with arms from Greek military stores. Rifles were brought in by ship to equip them. Of course, once armed, irregulars were free to do what they wished, including attacking their fellow citizens. Most who were thus armed were never enrolled in Greek fighting units, and even those who actually did participate in organized units were released after the battles and retained their arms. ⁴⁵On many occasions, Greek authorities explained atrocities against Muslims as the work of bands of "irregulars" whom they could not control. ⁴⁶

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 267.

Greek depredations in western Anatolia were reported more fully than attacks on Muslims in other regions and in other times. This was due to the Allied nature of the İzmir occupation. Detailed documentary evidence of Greek activities in Anatolia exists, particularly in British archives: The Greeks were in Anatolia solely because of the support of the powers who had been victorious in World War I, especially the British. The occupation of İzmir was in many ways the creation of Lloyd George.⁴⁷ In fact, British support of the Greeks was so great that British sailors at İzmir were ordered not to intervene even when they personally observed massacres of Turks, leaving the sailors "unwilling, impotent, and infuriated spectators of some of the worst Greek outrages."⁴⁸ Because of this British involvement, British intelligence agents and diplomats, centered in İzmir and Istanbul, followed the occupying Greek armies and reported back to London in detail. These documents are a fine source of historical detail. The reports were not without bias, but they were generally reliable in their facts.

In considering British reports, one must separate the reporting of events from analysis and comments. For western Anatolia and the Balkans, the British consular and (less often, significantly) military intelligence officers were often accurate observers, but their own prejudices and lack of experience in the region just as often caused them to interpret incorrectly what they had seen. For example, the Advance British Headquarters General Staff Intelligence reported accurately Greek atrocities against Turks in the ÖdemişTire region. Murders, rapes, robberies, imprisonment on false charges, destruction of property, and so forth -- by Greek soldiers and local Greeks -- were all catalogued. However, in analyzing the subsequent flight of Turkish peasants from the region, an intelligence officer added, "It may have been a guilty conscience that compelled them [to flee]; but, more probably, Nationalist propaganda had forced them to think that if they stopped behind they would suffer at the hands of the Greeks."⁴⁹ Surely intelligence officers should have seen from their own reports that no "Nationalist propaganda" was needed to convince Turkish peasants that they were in real danger. This sort of analysis points up two basic prejudices of British observers,⁵⁰ for which the researcher must always watch -the search for any reason other than the real one, Greek atrocities, for Turkish suffering (which they were forced to admit was very real) and the denial of

commonsense reactions on the part of Turkish peasants. Thus, Turks who fled in justified fear of massacre were

-268-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 268.

assumed to have fled because of their "guilty consciences" (no evidence was given of any acts they had committed for which they should have felt guilty) or their unthinking acceptance of propaganda. In fact, what the Turkish peasants exhibited was a highly rational response to their environment. When they could fight, they fought; when they could not, they fled. ⁵¹

British agents reported primarily from Anatolian cities and large towns, because it was difficult and dangerous for them to go into the countryside. Nevertheless, they did manage to gain a certain amount of accurate intelligence from the countryside, as well as the city.

PERSECUTION IN AYDIN Vilâyeti: THE CITIES

The Muslim inhabitants of cities in the province of Aydin were subject to persecution from the first days of the Greek occupation. In no sense could these urban Turks have been considered a military danger. Villagers might, and often did, harbor anti-Greek guerrillas, but the cities were disarmed and under complete Greek control. They were not able to assist Nationalist forces because of Greek interdiction of movement in and out of the cities. In short, Turks in Aydin, Menemen, Manisa, Nazilli, or any of the occupied cities could not have acted in any effective way against the Greeks. It is instructive that the cities briefly retaken by Turkish forces in 1919, such as Bergama and Aydin, were assaulted from outside by Turkish armed forces, not taken by revolt by the defenseless Turks inside them. There was no military excuse for attacks on urban Muslims, but their passivity did not save them.

The pattern of Greek actions against the Turkish population was fairly consistent. First, all Ottoman police and soldiers and Muslim civilians were disarmed. Then, guns were distributed to the local Greeks. Next, officials of

the Ottoman government and Muslim religious leaders were imprisoned or deported. Following this, plunder, murder, and rape began, sometimes immediately, sometimes after a short time had elapsed. Turkish houses and government buildings were destroyed. Muslim religious buildings and institutions, the most potent symbols of Muslim identity, came in for violent abuse. On entering Manisa, for example, the Greek army violated all the mosques in the cities as well as dervish convents, the theology school, and the Muslim cemetery. ⁵²

-269-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 269.

The Turks of all the cities of Aydin Vilâyeti suffered to some degree. The cities discussed here are only those for which the most detailed and accurate information is available.

Menemen. At Menemen, Turks had been disarmed after the peaceful ⁵³ surrender of the city to the Greeks, who immediately arrested many Ottoman officials. The Greeks were then armed, and a massacre ensued. That the massacre was preplanned is indicated by the fact that before the attacks, all Greek houses in the city had been marked with white crosses. ⁵⁴ Fortunately for the historical record, British Control Officers ⁵⁵ arrived in Menemen unannounced just as the murders commenced. They saw the bodies of the kaymakam and of the Turkish gendarmes in the konak (government administration house) and observed the murders of Turks on the streets. From what they saw, the observers readily identified the Menemen events as a massacre, not a battle -- "only the Greeks were firing." Turkish houses in Menemen were emptied and pillaged. What was not taken was destroyed: ⁵⁶ from 300 to 400 Turks may have been killed in the city; 1,300 in the nearby countryside. ⁵⁷

Although less visible to British agents, the same sort of pillage and massacre was occurring in the countryside surrounding Menemen. Admiral Calthorpe, commenting to London on the fact that some Turks of Menemen had managed to survive, stated, "In my opinion the Greeks are responsible for the whole affair. . . . Only their complete lack of organization prevented them from obtaining a greater measure of success. It is also possible that the unexpected presence of British witnesses cooled them a little." ⁵⁸

Aydin. The major provincial city of Aydin was taken with no resistance on 27 May 1919. For a while there was quiet. This may have been the result of the anomalous position of the Greeks. In taking Aydin, they had gone beyond the limits of their grant by the Allies and had advanced into an area that was incontestably Turkish in population. ⁵⁹The Allies were thus watching events in Aydin carefully. Nevertheless, on the tenth day of occupation the murders began when six Turks were killed in the street by Greeks led by a Greek army officer. On the same day, four Turkish houses were attacked and the women within raped. From then on, attacks against Turks and Turkish property were constant. ⁶⁰Indignities upon Muslim Turks ranged from the petty, such as forcibly removing all fezzes (even from Christians and Jews), to rape and murder.

-270-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 270.

Under pretext of interrogation, Turks were removed from Aydin and surrounding villages and then butchered. ⁶¹Villages in the Aydin region were burned and their inhabitants massacred.

The Greek representatives in Aydin made it plain that, despite the Turkish majority in the region and the fact that the Greeks had not been awarded Aydin by the Allies, they planned to remain. The Greek commandant in Aydin notified the local Turkish leaders that the Greek occupation was not temporary, but was an annexation by Greece. To reinforce this, Ottoman officials and Turkish notables, including the sancak governor, judges, and the head of the Tobacco Regie, were arrested. Most of these were killed, including the governor.

The Turks of Aydin were rescued by Turkish military forces, who took the city from the Greeks after two days of battle. Those two days allowed the Greeks to burn down the Muslim quarter and engage in further massacres before their retreat. The Turks estimated that 2,000 Muslims had been killed in the city and from 300 to 400 Christians, both figures perhaps exaggerations. The report of a British witness to the events in Aydin recorded that the deaths in the city were organized by the Greek army. On 28 June, machine guns were mounted on roofs and the Turkish quarter was bombarded and set ablaze. "All the Turks who tried to escape from the flames were shot with machine guns and rifles by the Greek soldiers and

civilians to whom rifles had been distributed." The firing and burning continued into the next day; "the firing, the screams, and the noise were dreadful to hear." ⁶²

The Turkish soldiers who entered Aydin saw Turkish corpses on the ground and the devastated Turkish Quarter. In revenge, many Christians were attacked in the street before Colonel Şevket could restore order. ⁶³ When the Greeks retook Aydin, the surviving Turks were gone, preferring to be refugees. British accounts of the events in Aydin corroborate the summary made by the Ottoman delegation to the Versailles Peace Conference: "Of the 30,000 Turks living in the city of Aydin, only a few families remain. 5,800 homes have been destroyed and 81 Turkish villages in the city's environs have been burnt." ⁶⁴

Nazilli. The town of Nazilli was occupied by Greeks on 2 June and held for 17 days. During the occupation, the usual pillaging, rape, and murder of Turks took place. Local Greeks were aided in this by Greek soldiers and by convicts ⁶⁵ who were released from

-271-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 271.

jail by the soldiers. When the Greeks were forced by Turkish troops to retreat from Nazilli on 19 June, they took with them a large group ⁶⁶ of Turks with their hands tied. These were killed en route and the villages on the Greek line of march were pillaged and what inhabitants remained in the villages were killed. ⁶⁷

Kasaba. In Kasaba, the first action of the Greek soldiery was to disarm the Turks. After guns had been distributed to local Christians, pillaging of Muslim homes began, part of a pattern well-known to the Muslims. The Turks feared what was coming next, especially because the Greek colonel in charge of the city had called in Ottoman government officials and the mufti of the city and notified them that he considered all Muslims to be belligerents in a war zone. The Muslims waited "as if under a sentence of death." ⁶⁸

The Turkish defeat of the Greeks at Bergama and the subsequent Greek retreat was the last Turkish victory for some time. The relatively small

number of Turkish soldiers proved unable to hold against a Greek army supported by the Allies. "On the 23rd June the Greeks landed near Dikili and reoccupied Bergama, burning on the way ten Turkish villages, containing 1,095 houses. The number of homeless Turks who assembled in consequence at Soma was 70,000." ⁶⁹

PERSECUTION IN AYDIN Vilâyeti: THE COUNTRYSIDE

The killing of Turkish villagers and pillage of Turkish villages began immediately after the Greek landing at İzmir. Greeks from İzmir and surrounding Greek villages, many armed by the Greek military, attacked Turks. Sometimes accompanied by Greek soldiers, they went into the surrounding villages and pillaged and murdered. As mentioned before, many of the massacres were done in the sight of Westerners, who reported the Greek deeds village by village. Apparently the conquerors had no thought of their consequent image in the West, or they were confident that it would hold up no matter what their actions. Greeks from villages outside the city joined in the massacres, attacking Turkish villages. "Greek armed bands from Sevidi Keuy and the neighboring Greek villages have spread about in all directions looting and shooting down the Turks." ⁷⁰ The pillage and murder spread south to the Urla Peninsula, where Turkish villages were burned. ⁷¹ Approximately 3,000

-272-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 272.

Turks were killed. ⁷² The British Commanding Officer in İzmir summarized the obvious condition of the countryside in a cable:

The Greeks in the country round Smyrna have looted the armsdepots, have sacked Turkish villages, and hunted down Moslems. General anarchy appears to prevail in many places where the Greeks are in a majority. ⁷³

The Turkish villages of the Urla Peninsula were pillaged by Greek soldiers, with attendant killings. ⁷⁴

When the region around the city of Aydın was taken (June 1919), the Turkish residents of a number of surrounding villages, including Michançe [sic], Kara Pınar, Erikli, Kadiköy, and Yeniköy, were massacred and the villages burned. ⁷⁵Other villages soon joined the list, especially when the Greeks first retreated from the city in June of 1919. As mentioned before, Greece had been awarded only the sancak of İzmir by the Allies. However, by the end of May 1919, Greek troops had already gone beyond the sancak's borders, taking Manisa on 25 May and Bergama on 11 June. Bergama was recaptured by Turkish forces, then taken again by Greeks who landed near Dikili and marched inland. Both on their retreat and subsequent advance, Greek troops massacred Turkish villagers. Greek forces retreating from Nazilli (19 June 1919) destroyed the villages along their route and killed whichever inhabitants they could find. ⁷⁶The Greek contingent of troops that marched toward Bergama from Dikili burned at least ten villages, destroying 1,100 Turkish homes. ⁷⁷Even the Greek navy entered into the massacre of civilians. Greek boats shelled Turkish villages near Ayvalı, for no military purpose whatsoever. ⁷⁸

As they advanced into the interior, the Greek regular army joined with local Greeks to pillage and murder, and British soldiers whose duty it was to observe the Greek advance and Greek atrocities particularly mentioned the rape of Turkish women by Greek soldiers. ⁷⁹In most cases, however, attacks on Turks were made by local Anatolian Greeks armed by Greek soldiers. Many of these locals were more or less under Greek military authority, even wearing Greek military uniforms. ⁸⁰When the Greek columns advanced into the interior they were preceded by guerrilla bands, called *chettés*, made up of local Greeks and Armenians. These bands functioned as scouts and shock troops, but they were mainly occupied with attacks on Turkish villages. At first they attacked the villages on

-273-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 273.

the army's line of march, often assisted by regular soldiers, then, when the area was secure, fanned out to attack outlying villages. ⁸¹

Rape was common in occupied villages, as was abduction of women by Greek soldiers and civilians. Diplomatic descriptions of the types and frequency of rape range from the detailed and gruesome to British

understatement: "Violence to Moslem women on the part of Greek soldiers appears to have occurred." ⁸²

Because most depredations on the Turkish population took place in villages, few of which contained European observers or even Ottoman officials who could report back to Istanbul, most atrocities could only be known by the reaction of the victims (usually flight), the demographic evidence (whole regions denuded of Turkish population ⁸³), or reports after the fact (European observers who saw burned villages with bodies in their streets). In only a few villages were outside observers present to witness the massacres. Even towns, such as Ahmedli, were only occasionally the subject of observation by Allied Control Officers. In Ahmedli, a French sergeant happened to be present to corroborate the citizens' story of imprisonment and gruesome murder. ⁸⁴

Of course, once they realized that the Greek army was advancing, sensible Turks fled. They knew of the events of İzmir and of the fate of the Balkan Muslims in 1912. As the Greeks advanced toward Ayvali, "Practically all Turkish villages were found deserted but the inhabitants having fled in a hurry did not manage to take away any of their belongings with them." ⁸⁵

Once the Ottoman gendarmerie had been disarmed, Greek soldiers attacked Turkish villagers with impunity. In the small area of Tire Kazasi, the British recorded 32 villages as having been attacked and robbed by Greek soldiers, many of them more than once, in a two-month period. ⁸⁶ It should be remembered that these were only those villages that had come to the attention of the British representatives in Tire. In the same period in the Tire area, 22 Turks were known to have been killed by Greeks, 32 Turks imprisoned without trial. Goods plundered from the Turkish villages were openly sold by Greeks in the bazaar at Ödemiş. ⁸⁷

In the district round Soghandere, between 25 and 30 villages have been destroyed with massacre of the entire population.

Between Akhissar and Manissa, 82 villages have been attacked in this way with varying degrees of massacre. Some, but not all, have been burned. . . .

On June 24th at Bashlamish near Akhissar, Greek soldiers and Armenian "chettis" surrounded the village, collected the inhabitants between the ages of 12 and 60 years and massacred almost all. 4 of these were beaten before being killed. . . .

Turkish civilians, especially "notables" are being collected in various towns and villages, throughout the occupied country behind Smyrna, and marched off as "prisoners of war."

Bands of these prisoners pass through Smyrna almost daily, and disappear. They are supposed to be deported to Greece, but nobody hears from them, and the corpses of some of them have been found.

These deportations have taken place at: Kasaba, Manissa, Nif, Alashehir, Salihli, Ushag, Kula, Mamara [sic], Akhissar, Tira, Odermish [sic], Barindir [sic], Turbali, Aidin. ⁸⁸

ATROCITIES IN YALOVA, İİZMİT, GEMLİK, AND SURROUNDING VILLAGES

European commentators on the events in Anatolia found it hard to credit the evidence of Greek atrocities. This was especially true of the British. The British had been the instigators of the Greek invasion, smoothing the way for the Greek troops, providing political and logistic support, and arguing the Greek case in international forums such as the Paris Peace Conference. In terms of investment and prestige, the British had much to lose if the Greek invasion was proved to be a long series of massacres. Moreover, the spirit of philhellenism was strong in England. Therefore, despite the overwhelming evidence brought forth by British observers, the atrocities of the Greeks in their initial occupation in Aydin Vilâyeti were dismissed in British governmental circles and British public opinion. It was not until the events of the Greek occupation of the Marmara Sea region that the British were forced to open their eyes.

The region of Anatolia closest to Istanbul, the İzmit Peninsula, was first taken from Ottoman control by the British. Before and during the short British occupation, all was relatively peaceful. The Christians in the area, particularly, were recognized by the Allies as being in no danger. All that changed when the region was turned over to the Greeks. The pattern seen before in Aydin Vilâyeti and elsewhere was then repeated in towns such as

Yalova, Gemlik, İzmit, and in surrounding villages. First came the search for Turkish arms and the disarming of Ottoman gendarmes, then the pillage and murder. Crops were destroyed; fruits were stripped from the

-275-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 275.

trees. Eventually the villages were destroyed and the Turks forced to become refugees or die. All this took place but a short journey from British headquarters in Istanbul. British officials, reporters, and even university professors could and did visit the sites, and the ensuing full and detailed reports could not be ignored.

In the region seized by the Greeks, Turkish villagers were indiscriminately slaughtered. At first, Allied observers felt that the murderous actions were those of local Greeks in quest of revenge for real or fancied wrongs. However, even the British observers, who so wanted to find in the Greeks a positive force for "Christian Civilization in the East," were forced to admit the character of the Greek atrocities:

A distinct and regular method seems to have been followed in the destruction of [Turkish] villages, group by group, for the last two months, which destruction has even reached the neighborhood of the Greek headquarters.

The members of the [Inter-Allied] Commission consider that, in the part of the kazas of Yalova and Guemlek occupied by the Greek army, there is a systematic plan of destruction of Turkish villages and extinction of the Moslem population. The plan is being carried out by Greek and Armenian bands, which appear to operate under Greek instructions and sometimes even with the assistance of detachments of regular troops. ⁸⁹

There can be no doubt that the burning of villages, massacres, and forced migrations were sanctioned by the Greek military and government. The American High Commissioner, Admiral Bristol, commented on "the Greek atrocities, which appear to have been carried out in cold blood, according to a prearranged plan." ⁹⁰ The British General Franks, on the scene in the Gemlik region, reported that burnt-out villages such as Karacali and Nash were close to Greek headquarters, but they were nevertheless burned,

without interference by the Greek army and with "obvious signs of atrocities." ⁹¹ Though intervention would have been easy, the Greek army had not attempted to stop the destruction. Other British officers investigated Greek atrocities in other areas. For example, in the vicinity of Kandira, "The soldiers took everything possible such as money, cattle, and effects; having recourse to torture in all instances where pressure seemed necessary to them. Cases of rape and murder were prevalent. Some villages were either totally, or in part de-

-276-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 276.

stroyed. Totally destroyed -- Mehter Keui, Lazlar Keui, Ahmak Keui, Omer Agha Keui, and Sira Keui." ⁹² The Greeks occupied Şile twice. "During the second occupation, from November 1920 to March 1921, a band of 200 men on their way to Ismidt, composed of soldiers and some civilians, officered by a Captain and three Lieutenants, terrorized the district. Twenty of these men under [guerrilla leader] Katsaros remained in the district destroying nearly all the villages and robbing the peasantry of their valuables and cattle. Many of the inhabitants were beaten, some were hanged by their feet over straw fires, others were killed outright and some women were raped." ⁹³ In the region of Beykos, an Allied Commission of Inquiry found "widespread murder committed by Greek troops." ⁹⁴

Those villagers who survived the Greeks were usually those who fled before the Greeks arrived, but some were forcibly evicted: "In the first week of November [1920] the town of Karamürsel was entirely looted and 14 neighboring villages burned by the Greek troops after desultory fighting with Nationalist irregulars. The Turkish officials were carried off to Yalova and the remaining population shipped across to the other side of the Gulf of Ismidt, whence the bulk of them came on as refugees to Constantinople." ⁹⁵

[May 1921] General Franks, in making an appeal yesterday for full liberty of action for Red Crescent to succour and remove Moslem population of Gemlek area, telegraphed that this commission is convinced that Power in occupation [Greece] is proceeding upon system of destruction of Moslem element, Greek troops and brigands appearing to act on programme in complete accord. . . . ⁹⁶

[June 1921] Notwithstanding visit of commission of enquiry and decision of High Commissioners to authorize removal of refugees by Red Crescent, Greek military authorities continued up to the latter part of last week to display bad spirit and to place obstacles in the way of removal. Greek officer commanding at Yalova was particularly obstructive. Greek military authorities appear to be hand in glove with Greek brigands and much under their influence. ⁹⁷

Professor Arnold Toynbee, who came to Anatolia as a reporter/ analyst for the *Manchester Guardian*, expected a far different situation than the one he found. As the holder of the Korais Chair in Byzantine and Modern Greek Language, Literature, and History at the Uni-

-277-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 277.

versity of London, and during the war no friend of the Turks, ⁹⁸Toynbee expected to see noble actions from Greeks, base actions from Turks. He realized the reality of Greek actions and intentions after viewing the massacres at Yalova and Gemlik and subsequently investigating the continuing destruction around İzmir. He, like the Inter-Allied investigation Committee quoted before, concluded that massacres and expulsions of Turks were planned by the Greek government. ⁹⁹

Information on Greek atrocities in the small villages of the Marmara region is scant, but there are a number of detailed accounts, verified by Allied observers, of such atrocities. The accounts often indicate the precarious state of those Turks who managed to survive the initial onslaught of the Greek invasion and now lived under Greek domination. For example, in the village of Arablar (which was in the Marmara Region and under British observation), Greek "brigands" and Greek inhabitants of the village of Afisia and other nearby villages attacked the village, murdered some, and took away seven men and two women. The men were killed, the women raped. Eventually, the women were allowed to go to Karabiga. One hundred ninety other refugees from Arablar had already arrived there. Half the village had been burned and, out of fear and lack of places to live, the villagers had fled aboard the H.M.S. "Stuart," protected by the British. ¹⁰⁰

The place of the Greeks from the village of Afisia in the murders at Arablar

was one of "support troops" for the "brigands." The so-called brigands were in reality villagers themselves, at least one of whom was from Afisia. ¹⁰¹ An Allied commission investigating the incident at Arablar noted that no regular Greek soldiers were involved, with the exception of a deserter from the Greek army. "At the same time the commission have remarked that in all cases the Turkish villagers have been disarmed while the Greek villagers are armed, thus leaving them entirely at the mercy of their Greek neighbours, whereas no steps appear to have been taken to safeguard their lives or property by the military government." ¹⁰²

The British High Commissioner, Rumbold, accurately summarized the condition of western Anatolia when he stated, "It is clear that the greater part of what the Greeks describe as their zone of operations is gradually being reduced to the condition of a wilderness." ¹⁰³

-278-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 278.

THE ROLE OF THE CIRCASSIANS

One of the most bizarre facets of the Greek campaign was the action of a group of Circassians as marauders in concert with the Greek army. Some Circassian leaders (Çerkes Ethem is the best example ¹⁰⁴) pursued independent policies that brought them into alliance with the Greeks. Other Circassians, who had no love for the Greeks, stood for the Istanbul government against the Nationalists, out of understandable loyalty to the Ottoman sultanate for the survival of their people. However, most Circassians naturally stood with their fellow Muslims against the Greek invaders. Despite the self-serving actions of a few, most Circassians were in the Nationalist camp. More than 50 years had passed since their expulsion from their homelands and, although Circassians may have kept many of their ethnic identifications, they were, by 1919, Turks in their loyalties and support for the Nationalists. ¹⁰⁵

THE GREEK RETREAT

There was much fear among the Allies that the Greeks and other Christians would suffer greatly when the city and region of İzmit were retaken by the Nationalists. Greek actions there had given good cause for reprisals. British observers were on the scene when the Greeks abandoned the city and reported massacres of Turks. ¹⁰⁶ Reprisals against Greeks were expected when the Turks occupied the city, but the British reported that none occurred, due to the "good bearing and discipline" of Nationalist troops. ¹⁰⁷

The Greeks began to lose the war in August of 1921, when they were held at the Sakarya Line by the Turkish Nationalists. At first slowly, then precipitously, they retreated from the areas they had conquered. With their retreat came a change in the character of Greek actions against the Turks. Hopes and plans for a Greek western Anatolia had ended, and there was no longer any rational cause for the persecution of Muslim Turks. Yet, the massacres had a life of their own that went beyond rational, if vicious, policies of state. As the Greeks retreated, they destroyed more thoroughly than before all that was in their path. When they had been in the ascendancy, destroying all they found would have been folly, only Turkish property need be burned so that the owners might not return.

-279-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 279.

Therefore, Turkish houses were destroyed, not Greek houses; Turkish villages were burned, not Greek villages. In retreat, there was no longer reason to save anything, so all was destroyed -- Christian property as well as Muslim. Whole cities were set on fire, Christian quarters burning alongside Muslim quarters. Crops were destroyed, ancient olive trees and grape vines cut down. The Greek army knew Greece would not now claim the new land and the Greeks and Armenians of western Anatolia knew they would no longer be able to live there, so hatred was given free reign.

The pattern of Greek retreat was set after their first real setback, the first battle of the Sakarya, after which they retreated to Eskişehir to regroup. At first, when it appeared the Greeks would rebound from their initial check and still hold much of Anatolia, their policies toward the land and the people appeared to have some military justification -- a "scorched earth" policy. As

one rather cold-blooded contemporary military analyst described the Greek retreat to Eskişehir in October 1921:

The retreat was carried out with skill and in an orderly manner. The Greeks carried out a thorough devastation of the whole area which they evacuated, burning all the villages and thoroughly destroying the railway. ¹⁰⁸

That their policy of scorched earth arose from more than military expediency became evident as the Greek retreat went on. They continued to destroy all that was in their path long after their defeat was certain. By 1922, Greek army units that would have better served as rear guards for the retreat were being delegated to destroy Anatolian villages with kerosene and gunpowder. The days of retreats "carried out with skill and in an orderly manner" were over. As the Greeks fled as quickly as they could to the sea, it appears that only the units carrying out the destruction of what remained behind were calm and orderly.

During the Greek retreat, one city after another was set aflame. Bilecik, Yenişehir, İnegöl Afyon, Söğüt, and Adapazari were all burned, as were the other cities and villages along the Greek line of retreat. ¹⁰⁹ The American consul at İzmir, Park, who toured much of the devastated region immediately after the Greek loss, described the situation in the cities he had seen:

-280-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 280.

[Manisa] Almost completely wiped out by fire . . . 10,300 houses, 15 mosques, 2 baths, 2278 shops, 19 hotels, 26 villas. . . .

[Kasaba] The reliability of these statistics cannot be proven or disproven, and must be taken for what they are worth, but my own observation would indicate that they are approximately correct.

We were told that Cassaba was a city of 40,000 souls, 3,000 of whom were non-Moslems. Of these 37,000 Turks only 6,000 could be accounted for among the living, while 1,000 Turks were known to have been shot or burned to death. Of the 2,000 buildings that constituted the city, only 200 remained standing. . . . Ample testimony was available to the effect that the city was systematically destroyed by Greek soldiers, assisted by a number of

Greek and Armenian civilians. Kerosene and gasoline were freely used to make the destruction more certain, rapid, and complete.

[Alaşehir] Hand pumps were used to soak the walls of the buildings with Kerosene. . . . As we examined the ruins of the city, we discovered a number of skulls and bones, charred and black, with remnants of hair and flesh clinging to them. Upon our insistence a number of graves having a fresh-made appearance were actually opened for us as we were fully satisfied that these bodies were not more than four weeks old [i.e., the time of the Greek retreat through Alaşehir.] ¹¹⁰

Consul Park did not like Turks. He was distressed to see that the Greeks, whom he had supported, had committed such outrages. Yet, he was forced to agree that the evidence he had seen was conclusive. He saw evidence of the use of gasoline and "incendiary bombs" in many areas, as well as evidence that those Turks who had tried to put out the flames in their cities were shot down by Greek troops. He saw what he called "conclusive evidence of extensive personal violence inflicted upon the Turkish civilian inhabitants." He concluded:

1. The destruction of the interior cities visited by our party was carried out by Greeks.
2. The percentages of buildings destroyed in each of the last four cities referred to were

Magnesia 90 percent Cassaba 90 percent Alashehr 70 percent Salihli
65 percent

3. The burning of these cities was not desultory, nor intermittent, nor accidental, but well planned and thoroughly organized.

-281-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 281.

4. There were many instances of physical violence, most of which was deliberate and wanton. Without complete figures, which were impossible to obtain, it may safely be surmised that "atrocities" committed by retiring Greeks numbered well into thousands in the four cities under consideration. These consisted of all three of the usual type of such

atrocities, namely murder, torture, and rape. ¹¹¹

The Greeks' policy during their precipitous retreat through western Anatolia was simple -- if at all possible, to destroy every Turkish village in their path. Greek soldiers took captives of every useful Turkish civilian found on their retreat, especially women and those men who could serve as guides. Those who were not useful were often killed. However, many Turkish villagers saw their impending fate before the Greek soldiers arrived in their villages and hid in the mountains. Indeed, many had fled when the Greeks had first taken their districts. ¹¹²

All the inhabitants of the regions evacuated, no matter their sex, are taken away by the retreating Greek troops. Only those who had fled to the forests or the mountains escape the misfortune. All the villages on the route of the retreating Greek troops are burned. ¹¹³

By the time of the Greek retreat, many sources were witness to their atrocities. The Ottoman and Ankara governments had long given detailed lists of burned villages, murders, rape, and pillage. British observers had listed many. These were now joined by increasingly detailed reports from other Western sources, including newspaper reporters. The British government was having increasing difficulty in keeping down the indignation that arose from the Greek massacres. Member of Parliament Aubrey Herbert asked in Parliament if it was not true that 5,000 out of 7,000 of the Turks in Yalova had been massacred. The government spokesman (Chamberlain) responded that he had no detailed statistics, but admitted "grave excesses." ¹¹⁴ Viscount St. David, in a parliamentary speech, stated, "I am told that the number of Turkish villages burned by the Greeks is something like three or four hundred [actually an understatement]." The government agreed that villages had been burned, but was not willing to say how many. ¹¹⁵ Despite the mounting evidence, the British government still refused to provide even the Smyrna Report to the Commons. ¹¹⁶ Meanwhile, the British government was receiving reports from its investigation commission

-282-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 282.

of "atrocities of appalling nature, including murder, torture, and mutilation" and statements that the "behavior of the Greek army in retreat is deplorable

and unworthy of a civilized nation." ¹¹⁷

In one typical example of Greek actions during their retreat, on 14 February 1922, the Turkish village of Karatepe in Aydin Vilâyeti was surrounded by Greeks, both regular army and local Greek bands. All the inhabitants were put into the mosque, then the mosque was burned. The few who escaped the fire were shot. All moveable valuables and animals were stolen. ¹¹⁸

Bursa was saved from the fate of so many other Anatolian cities by the presence of Allied officers and men in the city and the fact that the Greek army in Bursa was penned-in, in effect surrounded by Turkish troops. The Greeks knew there was a good possibility that they would become prisoners of war. It is one thing to burn down houses when you can expect to escape, quite another when you can expect soon to be a captive of the owners. Despite this, some Greeks did make an attempt at creating a fire in the city; the Allied representatives discovered the attempt and put the fire out. The bridges in the city were destroyed by Greek soldiers, and they did ultimately burn forty houses and Greek churches, ¹¹⁹ but the damage was minimal when compared to that suffered elsewhere.

When the Greek army retreated from Bursa the city's Christians and Christian refugees from elsewhere gathered in buildings belonging to French and Italians. There they were guarded by the thirty Turkish gendarmes who had remained in Bursa. The Greek commander had refused to arm the gendarmes. They nevertheless managed to protect the Greeks and Armenians. Arriving Nationalist troops took up the duty of protection and, according to the Allied commission, sent to observe the events in Bursa, the Turkish regulars permitted no atrocities.

The Muslim villagers in the neighborhood did not all share in the safety offered Bursa's Christians:

The Italian consul, M. Miazzi, reported that he had just visited a Turkish village, where the Greeks had slaughtered some sixty women and children. Most of them had been violated before being killed. Women had their breasts cut off. This was afterwards corroborated by Captain Kocher, the French consul, who also visited the scene of the atrocity. ¹²⁰

Along the path of Greek retreat from Mudanya to Bursa and beyond, the Turkish villages were burned to the ground. ¹²¹

PERSECUTION OF WESTERN ANATOLIAN JEWS

Given the proportionately smaller size of their community, the Jews of western Anatolia probably suffered from the Greek invasion as much as the Muslims. Unfortunately, the records on Jews are sparse, because they were neither belligerent nor a group that was of special interest to Allied observers. Only Turkish sources mention the Jews of the period in any detail. They catalogue the murder of Jews by Greeks and the plunder of Jewish shops and homes in Anatolian cities. In Nazilli, for example, the Turks were able to name 11 of the city's Jews who were murdered (and 5 who were wounded) by the Greeks, out of a larger total number of massacred Jews.¹²² However, even Turkish sources seldom mention Jews. The best evidence of Jewish suffering is statistical. [Table 24](#) lists the numbers of Jews in the war zone before and after the war. More than half the Jews in the zone of war in western Anatolia either left Anatolia or died. Due to imprecise or nonexistent statistics of Jewish emigration (which was significant), the exact mortality of western Anatolian Jews cannot be calculated, but the Jewish **death** toll must, nevertheless, have been staggering.

TABLE 24. JEWS IN WESTERN ANATOLIA, 1912 AND 1927.

Province	1912	1927
Hüdavendigâr	5,290	2,011
Aydin	44,206	18,728
İzmit	512	5
Biga	409	1,092

SOURCES: McCarthy, "Jewish Population"¹²³ and 1927 Turkish Census.

PERSECUTION OF CHRISTIANS

Attacks by Muslims Against Greeks. As was stated in earlier chapters, it is not the purpose here to describe or comment on atrocities committed by

Turks and other Muslims. These have been considered at great length and in stupefying detail by others. In the process, they have been multiplied at least tenfold and excluded

-284-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 284.

from any historical context. To avoid committing the same error here, some mention must be made of Turkish murders of Greeks, as well as Greek murders of Turks.

The actions of Turkish Muslims against Greeks, both Hellenic and Anatolian, took two forms -- official actions by the Nationalist government and personal acts of reprisal.

As had been the case in previous wars in the Balkans and the Caucasus, the invaders of western Anatolia could count on active support of Christians in the local community. The polarization of Christians and Muslims into antagonists was based on age-old identifications as much as on modern nationalism. Although the Greek community had for centuries been a functioning, economically assimilated part of the Ottoman Empire, Greeks in the empire had obviously identified themselves primarily as Greek Orthodox, as Muslims had primarily identified themselves as the People of Islam. It is doubtful if Anatolian Greeks or Muslims ever thought of siding with any but their religious brothers. Those who did not feel willing to fight and die for their group would have been forced to do so, since they would have found no comfort in the other camp. Despite all this, Greek vehemence against Turks is difficult to understand. They had, after all, lived with a great deal of economic benefit in an empire that tolerated their religious, linguistic, and ethnic differences. One must believe that Greeks in Anatolia, like Greeks in Europe, hated Turks largely because of the fact that Turks ruled, and that this was an image that they meant to erase, never mind the fact that the Turkish villagers whom they killed shared no more in the Ottoman government than they did.

A number of reasons can be given for the political difficulties. The millet system was one. One of the best features of the Ottoman tradition of rule was toleration of ethnic and religious diversity, but a Turkified population would have been a safe population, and would have given European nations

fewer pretexts to intervene. Another cause of later unrest was the Ottoman tactic of "divide and rule," in which few internal governing systems were developed. Instead, the Ottoman government acted to balance different forces. When Ottoman power was withdrawn, especially in time of war, public security in the provinces often disintegrated. With no one to serve as policeman, the millets battled against each other. This was especially true in eastern Anatolia, where Ottoman power was weakest, but it surfaced in the far more civilized milieu of western Anatolia as well.

-285-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 285.

Prior to the Greek invasion, the safety and security of the different regions of Anatolia was proportional to the power of the central government in the region. Where the armed might of the Ottoman government was felt, observers invariably noted tranquil conditions and political stability.¹²⁴ Indeed, after World War I, the Ottoman government, which had capitulated to the Allies, was actually assisting the return of Greeks and Armenians to western Anatolia.¹²⁵ At the time, a strong gendarmerie was needed because of the presence of bandit gangs in parts of Anatolia. In northern and western Anatolia, these gangs were usually made up of either Muslim deserters from the Ottoman army or Christians who had gone to either the mountains or to Greece to avoid conscription or deportation.¹²⁶ Both Muslim and Christian bandit gangs had become stronger and more numerous at the end of the war, as deserters, deportees, and emigrants returned and took up a convenient occupation. After the Greek invasion, Greek and Armenian bands were responsible for much of the Turkish mortality in the Greek-occupied territories, as has been seen. Correspondingly, Muslim bands were the main agents of **death** for western Anatolian Greeks and Armenians.

The worst massacres of Christians were the work of Muslim bands. Some of these avowed the Nationalist cause, others did not; some changed sides as fortune changed (e.g., the bands around Çerkes Ethem). Many of them, like many Christian bands, were simply bandits taking advantage of the political situation. The worst of the atrocities perpetrated by Muslim bands was in the İznikİzmit-Bursa region in the second half of 1920. Hundreds of Christians¹²⁷ were killed in İznik, Ortaköy, and Akhisar and in small towns and villages.

Once the Greek army was routed, the Turkish reconquest of western Anatolia was so rapid that documentary evidence of the final Turkish revenge on the Greeks is very limited. It is obvious that in many places the revenge was terrible. Greeks do not seem to have suffered greatly at the hands of Nationalist troops, who generally kept good discipline, but the vengeance of Turkish villagers was a different matter. ¹²⁸It is hard to imagine, given the events of the Greek occupation, that returning Turkish refugees would tolerate a Greek presence in their regions. For that reason, Anatolian Greeks fled to the coasts, ultimately to the Greek islands and mainland Greece. Many more came during the Greek-Turkish Population Exchange following the Anatolian War. In its first census after

-286-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 286.

the Anatolian War, the Greek government counted 1,104,216 refugees from Turkey residing in Greece (Table 25), 802,123 of them from Anatolia.

TABLE 25.

GREEK REFUGEES FROM TURKEY.

Origin	Migrants
Asia Minor*	626,954
Eastern Thrace	256,635
Pontus	182,169
Constantinople	38,458

Total 1,104,216	

* Titles as in source.

SOURCE: 1926 Greek Census.

Migration and Deportation of Greeks and Armenians. An unknown

number of Greeks died as the result of Greek emigration from Anatolia immediately after the Balkan Wars. Although the Ottoman government did not actually attack Anatolian Greeks at the time, it did foster a climate of fear among them. ¹²⁹The Committee of Union and Progress, in charge of the Ottoman government, organized a boycott of Greek business in the southwestern coastal region. ¹³⁰Greeks in the coastal area feared reprisals for the actions of Greeks in Europe during the Balkan Wars. This was especially true after Turkish refugees were settled in the area. There was also a desire by young male Greeks not to be conscripted into the Ottoman army. As a result, perhaps more than 100,000 Greeks fled western Anatolia for Greece. A further number was deported to the interior of Anatolia as potential enemy partisans during World War I. ¹³¹Most of these seem to have survived World War I and returned to their homes between 1918 and 1919.

The main official Nationalist policy directed against Greeks during the Anatolian War was the deportation of Greeks from the Black Sea region to east central Anatolia. This was avowedly done to keep local Greeks from aiding a Hellenic invasion in the Black Sea region the way local Greeks had aided the invasion of western Anatolia. Unfortunately, deportation of Christians was and is such an emotional issue that it is difficult to find the truth about the Greeks who were forcibly moved. The Greeks contended that the

-287-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 287.

Turks were forcing the entire Greek population of the Pontus region (Black Sea), ¹³²men, women, and children, into the interior of Anatolia in order to kill them. The Turks contended that they were deporting only those young men who would ally themselves with an invading Greek army and were potential or actual guerrillas and bandits. (Demographic evidence supports the Turkish claim, as the Greek young, old, and women were still present in the Black Sea region at the later date of the population exchange.) The Turks responded to British and American queries about the Black Sea deportations by asking why the Allies were not equally concerned about the fate of the Turks under Greek rule. ¹³³

The Turkish Nationalists did not ever deny that the deportations were taking

place. They justified them on military grounds. As such, there was indeed justification. Local conditions and past experience had put the Turks on notice that Anatolian Greeks were to be considered as potential enemies. Also, Greek guerrilla bands had been operating in the Black Sea area, attacking Turkish villages and defying the government.¹³⁴ Officials of the Greek Orthodox Church in Trabzon made it plain that they wished the creation of a Greek Pontic Republic,¹³⁵ and all sides agreed that there was in existence an active rebel movement called "Pontos." Most of all, the Turks had the experience of the Greek invasion of western Anatolia before their eyes, and they feared the experience would be repeated on the Black Sea coast. They knew that the Turks of the Black Sea could expect the same treatment at the hands of invading Greeks as their brothers had experienced in İzmir, Aydın, or Menemen.

Deportation was a classic Middle Eastern and Balkan method to neutralize one's enemies. It had been practiced by Ottomans and by Byzantines before them. Most recently, the Ottoman government had deported hundreds of thousands of Greek and Armenian Christians from war zones and potential war zones between 1914 and 1915. It was an effective military tactic, especially against guerrillas, because it robbed chetté bands and invaders of indigenous support. The tactic has in fact become a stable element of anti-guerrilla campaigns in the later twentieth century, although now it is usually described as "relocation" rather than deportation. However, for the Turkish Nationalists in 1920, deporting the Black Sea Greeks was an error.

With all the benefit of hindsight, we now know that the Greeks were incapable of landing in force on the Black Sea coast. There

-288-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 288.

was no real danger of local Greeks participating in a Greek invasion. The "Pontus Republic" revolutionaries were never a potent political or military force and would have been better dealt with by police than by deportation. The one real threat to the Turks of the Black Sea was local Greek support for Greek guerrilla/bandit bands, and this was indeed a threat.¹³⁶ Nevertheless, it is doubtful whether the expenditure of time, money, and men (who would have been better used as fighters or rural gendarmes) in the deportations balanced the small gain against Greek bandits. Politically,

the deportations were a clear loss. They played into the hands of the Turks' enemies, allowing them to drag up once again the mixture of half-truths and lies that had been spread concerning the Armenians in 1915. Western newspapers did not print the Nationalist justifications for the deportation, only lurid stories of long lines of Greeks, half-starved and dying on the roads.

Deportation is an act of desperation. In war, it can only be justified in the most perilous circumstances, because it punishes so many of the innocent to get so few of the enemy. Whether for moral, military, or propagandistic reasons, the Nationalists should not have begun mass deportations of the Pontic Greeks.

The events concerning the Black Sea deportations were intensely debated at the time. Then and now, the main difficulty in discovering the truth is that so little objective evidence exists. In fact, all of the negative reports were based on accounts sent by American missionaries. Like most of their earlier reports on Muslims, missionary accounts from 1919 to 1922 were more informed by prejudice than observation. The missionaries did not even agree among themselves as to what they had seen. ¹³⁷

The mortality of the deportees from Samsun was caused by lack of attention to their needs. They often went without food and water and were sometimes unprotected against robbers, who occasionally included those who were supposed to protect them. As a result, an unknown but relatively large number died. The final destination of the Greeks was Harput, in the eastern Anatolian vilâyet of Mamuretülaziz. According to the highest figures offered by American Near East Relief workers, notoriously anti-Turkish in their evaluations, 30,000 were deported, of whom 8,000 died on the road to Harput, and more later. However, American missionaries could have had no way to count the dead, and their estimates of both deportees and dead were probably exaggerated. ¹³⁸

In evaluating the Black Sea deportations, as well as earlier

forced migrations, one fact is often overlooked -- if the Turkish Nationalists

had intended to kill the Greeks or force them to flee, there was no need to formally deport them. The flight and deaths of western Anatolian Muslims, never deported but forced to either flee or die, proved just that. The claims that Turks intended to "exterminate by deportation" are thus obviously false. Between the Greek method of forced migration and the Turkish, the Turkish would probably have been preferable. Nevertheless, the deportations of Greeks resulted in much inhumanity and mortality.

These deportations seem to have been the only examples of such organized activities on Greek civilians during the war. Most Turkish actions against Greeks were acts of individuals and chetté bands. Many of these actions were the result of long-standing hatreds and greed for plunder; collectively they can be styled reprisals, because they arose after prior Greek actions and probably would not have taken place had the Greeks not invaded. It is probably more accurate, however, to consider them as reactions to the long series of forced migrations and deportations that began with the **exile** and deaths of the Muslims of Old Greece in the Greek War of Independence. In that context, the question of who killed first in 1919 has little meaning.

It must be noted that the districts that were to become the scene of the Anatolian War were uniformly calm and in good order until the Greeks attacked. This is attested to by neutral observers, including the Allied Smyrna Investigation Commission. In fact, even after the İzmir invasion, Greek villagers in Turkish-held areas were safe until the Greeks actually occupied the area. ¹³⁹The Christians' time of peril came during the Greek occupation, especially during and after the Greek retreat, when the Muslims took their revenge. In areas such as the Yalova-Gemlik Peninsula, Nationalist chettés did not even appear during the Greek Occupation; the only bands were Greek and Armenian. ¹⁴⁰In the Aydin area in 1919, even after Greek atrocities on Turks were well known, Turkish soldiers were extremely restrained. Commenting on one area in which massacres of Christians had been alleged, British representative Morgan stated: "Despite persistent rumours to the contrary, no Armenian was killed at Bergama and indeed no case of killing [by Turkish soldiers] of any of the inhabitants, Armenian, Jew, or Greek, took place." ¹⁴¹Even as late as May of 1921, Turkish officials were still keeping the peace wherever possible and Christians were

protected. The Allied "Commission to Investigate the Ismidt Peninsula" reported: "There is evidence that adjacent villages of different creeds exist side by side in the same districts without trouble when the Greeks are in a minority and the administration Turkish." (The "same districts" were those in which the Greeks had, according to the commission, destroyed civil order and persecuted the Turks.) ¹⁴²

Undoubtedly a number of Greek and Armenian refugees in Anatolia died from lack of proper care. When Christian refugees were under Turkish control in cities such as Eskişehir, what extra bread and housing was available first went to Muslim refugees, and there was little if anything left for Christian refugees. For example, Christian refugees were sent (or allowed to return) to their old homes in Eskişehir by the Allies. The local Turkish government refused to expel the Muslim refugees from Thrace who had been put into the former homes of Christians. ¹⁴³ Only in areas in which the Allies had firm control, such as the Marmara Islands (before Greek occupation), were Christian refugees easily settled. In such cases, Muslim refugees were evicted so that Christian refugees might have homes. ¹⁴⁴

The greatest breakdown of discipline of the Nationalist troops came in the city where the Greek invasion had begun, İzmir. When the Turkish troops arrived they found a city abandoned by the Greek army. The army and many civilians had passed from the piers of İzmir to Greek and Allied ships. In the months that followed, they were followed by hundreds of thousands ¹⁴⁵ of Anatolian Greek and Armenian emigrants. The Anatolian Christians were never to return. ¹⁴⁶ At first, the Nationalist army kept good order in the city. ¹⁴⁷ Troops were delegated to guard foreign consulates and other buildings that might have been in danger. The Turkish citizens of İzmir, smarting from years of Greek rule, were held in check by Turkish troops. Then this changed. A few days after the Nationalist army had taken the city, the lives and property of Christians were at risk. The looting of Christian property in the city began, and many Greeks and Armenians remaining in İzmir were killed by local Muslims, with some aid from Turkish soldiers. Given the fact that military discipline was in force for days before the looting began, it is probable that military authorities had knowledge of what was transpiring.

The final act of İzmir's drama was a great fire that obliterated Ottoman İzmir. The fire was started in the Armenian district, either

Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 291.

by local Armenians, local Turks, or Nationalist troops -- the historical record is extremely confused. One can easily theorize that there was in fact not one fire, but many -- fires set in revenge by Christians who did not wish Turks to have the city and by undisciplined soldiers and civilians who simply wished to see buildings burn (in war such things are far from unknown). ¹⁴⁸The often-stated idea of the Turkish Nationalist government deliberately burning down their second greatest city immediately after it had once again become theirs is a prima facie absurdity.

Between the years 1912 and 1922, approximately 300,000 Anatolian Greeks were lost -- primarily Greeks from the Black Sea coast and western Anatolia. ¹⁴⁹They died, as did the Turks, from starvation, disease, and murder. Because of the lack of specific mortality statistics, it is impossible to tell how many died in a specific year. Most died in the Anatolian War, but many must have died as a result of the poor conditions during World War I. The Greek invasion of Anatolia was ultimately as great a disaster for Anatolian Greeks as for Anatolian Turks.

RESULTS AND DEVASTATION OF THE WAR

THEFT AND DESTRUCTION OF MUSLIM PROPERTY

The loss of Muslim property was a matter of theft by individual Anatolian Greeks and by Greek officers, enlisted men, and officials. Some theft was to be expected, as it has always been a part of war. To this normal taking of booty, however, was added the deliberate destruction of Turkish property as a political act. In this, as in many things, the Greek invasion of Anatolia reflected the wars of 1877-78 and 1912-13.

Much of the theft took place in abandoned Turkish villages. The inhabitants had fled at the rumor of the arrival of Greek troops, leaving too quickly to take anything but a bit of food and a few clothes, glad to be alive. For example, when Greek soldiers advanced a short distance from Ödemiş, ostensibly in order to shorten their battle lines, 4,000 Turks became

immediately homeless. Everything

-292-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 292.

was left behind, and it was all taken by Greek soldiers. The soldiers drove animals and loaded sacks of grain and tobacco onto carts for transport. Houses were even torn down for building materials. Everything moveable was shipped to Greek regional headquarters at Ödemiş. ¹⁵⁰Speaking of this robbery, British High Commissioner de Robeck commented

The small rectification in the Greek line which was necessary to improve their tactical position has resulted in rendering a further 4,000 people homeless and destitute at the beginning of winter.

One cannot help but reflect, as report after report of this nature is received, how entirely opposed these proceedings in Western Asia Minor are to the principles and ideals for which the Allies fought during the war. ¹⁵¹

As de Robeck indicated, many Turkish villages in the ÖdemişTire region had been destroyed. Of the 100 houses in Sevikli, for example, only one was left habitable after the Greeks had passed through. ¹⁵²James Morgan, representative in İzmir of the British High Commissioner, collected examples of the type of pillage that was occurring in the region and forwarded the findings to M. Sterghiades, the Greek High Commissioner in İzmir. He detailed pillage, murder, the abduction of women, and destruction of Turkish villages, requesting an explanation. ¹⁵³Mr. Sterghiades did not reply.

The Ottoman government listed by name seventy-six villages in the Meander Valley that had been destroyed by Greeks in their initial invasion of the region (i.e., by 1919). ¹⁵⁴There is no reason to believe that their list was not accurate, because the village names were substantiated in Allied sources and in other Turkish reports. Indeed, because those seventy-six were the villages whose names were known to the government, there must have been many smaller and lesser known settlements also destroyed. As Greek soldiers advanced on Ayvalı, all the Turkish villages in their path were plundered. In Ayazmend alone the plundering took three days. Most of the spoils were "ferried to Mitylene by boats." ¹⁵⁵Cities such as Aydin and Ödemiş became collection points for plundered goods to be sold in bazaars

or sent off to Greece. ¹⁵⁶

The houses and effects of Ottoman officials, especially members of the military and the gendarmerie, were singled out for plundering by the Greeks. The thoroughness with which Ottoman officers were

-293-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 293.

robbed leaves little doubt that they were deliberately selected and that the thefts were allowed by the Greek authorities, perhaps encouraged by them. For most areas, the extent of the despoliation of the Ottoman military cannot be quantified. However, the record of the plunder of the Ottoman military in İzmir was clear and the Ottoman government was able to give very precise numbers of officers from the garrison of Aydin who had been robbed, along with their losses. They listed by name 310 officers who had been robbed of their arms, personal effects, horses, baggage, and even furniture, in the Aydin garrison alone. ¹⁵⁷

Terrible as it was, the destruction of houses and buildings did not have the long-lasting effect of the plunder and destruction of livestock. Over time, housing could be replaced. (The worst loss was the loss of timber used in building; in deforested Anatolia, burnt wood was often irreplaceable.) However, many generations of importing and breeding stock would be needed before the numbers of horses, donkeys, or sheep would once again be sufficient. While not as precise as the seeming accuracy of the figures would indicate, statistics on the loss of livestock in the war region (Table 26), presented at the Lausanne Conference by the Turkish representative, İsmet Paşa, do indicate the magnitude of the problem. Turkish postwar statements such as "there are no more beasts of burden in the devastated region" ¹⁵⁸ ring true. Any beast capable of carrying food or military hardware had been requisitioned by the armies or wantonly slaughtered in the Greek retreat. ¹⁵⁹

In the end, statistics and contemporary descriptions indicate a terrible fate for the Muslim peasants of western Anatolia. After years of privations in World War I, the Muslim peasants were made refugees when their land was invaded by the Greeks. Those who survived returned to find houses destroyed and little timber left for rebuilding, crops a burnt stubble and little

seed for new planting. If the peasants did find seed, they had few plows. What few digging and cultivating tools remained were pulled by human beings; the plow animals were gone. For the peasants of western Anatolia the effects of the war went on long after the final victory of the Turkish armies.

The theft of Ottoman government property and money by Greek troops and officials had the dual purpose of enriching the Greek government and destroying Ottoman government functions in the occupied territories. Despite the fact that such exactions were

-294-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 294.

TABLE 26.

THE NUMBER OF ANIMALS LOST IN THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES.

	Donkeys						
	Horses & Mules	Cows	Buffalo	Camels	Goats	Sheep	
İzmir Sancağı	40,774	13,962	24,105	32,971	5,464	192,739	156,031
Saruhan	24,502	13,170	12,997	20,254	1,988	44,034	86,137
Aydin	7,126	4,830	7,543	11,115	30	25,471	29,581
Denizli	1,832	3,314	3,061	1,759	38	34,321	28,249
Bursa	3,730	630	38,820	29,058	--	1,251	39,916
Ertukrul	504	258	36,364	27,181	--	403	29,640
İzmit	5,702	2,790	28,437	34,113	--	12,100	161,109
Eskişehir	28,202	15,796	82,347	34,374	748	297,614	1,120,009
Karasi	4,862	1,122	4,281	6,973	164	6,066	40,203

Afyon	528	954	1,860	2,859	--	4,164	28,260
Kiitahya	13,222	2,850	17,500	18,618	--	99,922	33,752
Haymana Kazasi	3,086	3,710	7,665	8,955	72	103,254	17,370
<hr/>							
<hr/>							
Total	134,040	63,926	264,980	228,230	8,504	821,339	1,770,316

SOURCE: *İsmet Paşa* at the Lausanne Conference ¹⁶⁰; addition errors are in the original.

-295-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 295.

in direct contradiction to the terms of the Armistice and the Allied charge to the Greeks, little Ottoman governmental property escaped the Greeks. In İzmir, Bursa, Bandırma, Edremit, Karasi, and elsewhere, government funds, even including all supplies of postage stamps, were seized. In İzmir, the Ottoman government lost, according to its own reckoning, 17,332,961.95 piastres in gold, silver, and notes, more in "effects." ¹⁶¹ Equipment, tools, machines, animals, and raw materials were also taken from Ottoman government sawmills, agricultural schools, and military factories. The property of the Ottoman Agricultural Bank was seized and removed. In fact, the only difference between these acts of theft and those visited on the Turkish citizenry was their official character, with Greek soldiers often presenting official orders before seizing the property. ¹⁶²

TABLE 27.

BUILDINGS DESTROYED IN WESTERN ANATOLIAN CITIES.

Cities	Buildings Destroyed	Buildings Present Before the War
Manisa	13,633	14,773

Alaşehir	4,350	4,500
Salihli	2,000	2,200
Kasaba	6,126	6,326
Gemdens	431	Completely Destroyed
Aydin	6,243	Completely Destroyed
Nazili	2,121	Completely Destroyed
Senhe	1,731	Mostly Destroyed
Mihaliççik	1,965	Completely Destroyed
Pazow Keuy	408	Completely Destroyed
Bilecik	2,245	Completely Destroyed
Soğut	948	Completely Destroyed
Yenişehir	1,187	Half Destroyed
Bozüyük	748	Completely Destroyed
Pazarcik	644	Completely Destroyed
İznic	615	648
Karamürsel	830	847
Yalova	232	286
Eskişehir	1,867	Partially Destroyed
Mihalişik	905	Completely Destroyed
Suşak	1,971	Mostly Destroyed

TABLE 27. (continued)

Kedos	694	Completely Destroyed
Çevril	405	Completely Destroyed
Eşme	307	Completely Destroyed
Pandirma	1,305	Mostly Destroyed
Afyon Kara Hisar	394	Partially Destroyed

Total 54,205*

SOURCE: Turkish Delegation at Lausanne. ¹⁶³

* Total as in original; actual total is 54,305.

TABLE 28.*BUILDINGS DESTROYED IN THE COUNTRYSIDE.*

Sancak or Kaza	Buildings Destroyed
İzmir Sancağı	13,599
Saruhan Sancağı	9,084
Aydin Sancağı	8,326
Denizli Sancağı	634
Bursa Sancağı	13,668
Ertuğrul Sancağı	3,235
İzmit Sancağı	17,728
Eskişehir Sancağı	21,711
Karasi Sancağı	6,385
Afyon Kara Hisar Sancağı	278
Kütahya Sancağı	894

Haymana Kazasi	1,127
----------------	-------

Total	87,669*
-------	---------

Total, Cities Included	141,874
------------------------	---------

* Destruction in cities not included.

SOURCE: Turkish Delegation at Lausanne. ¹⁶⁴

The worst destruction of houses, villages, and government, religious, and communal property obviously came during the final Greek retreat. Much of what lay on the Greek line of march was totally destroyed, and there can be no doubt of the fact. Effective use was made of photography by both the Nationalists and Western photographers in documenting the destruction. Cities such as Afyon, Uşak, Eşme, Alaşehir, Söke, and many others were shown in photographs to have been almost completely destroyed. ¹⁶⁵

-297-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 297.

THE DESTRUCTION OF CIVIL ORDER

One of the foremost Greek activities in the occupied territories was the destruction of the Ottoman system of civil government. This had a dual purpose: First, the Greeks could not allow the presence of a standing and functioning non-Greek government in a region they planned to make part of Greece. The only governors, bureaucrats, judges, and policemen were to be Greek. By destroying Ottoman civil government in favor of their own, the Greeks actually could claim to rule in Anatolia, not simply to be an army in temporary occupation. If the Greeks were the only government, to whom but the Greeks could the Allies turn when they looked for a stabilized postwar state in western Anatolia? Second, by removing the Ottoman

government, especially the gendarmerie, the Greeks left the Muslim population defenseless, completely at the mercy of the local Greeks, Greek bands, and Greek regular soldiers. The Turkish villagers were themselves disarmed by the Greek soldiers. To whom could they turn when attacked? Their only recourse was flight, exactly as the Greeks intended. ¹⁶⁶

The rules of the Occupation, as set forth by the Allies, and the terms of the Mudros Armistice both mandated the continued ordinary function of Ottoman civil administration in the occupied territories. The Greeks did all in their power to ensure that this was not the case. While they were forced to accept at least a semblance of Ottoman civil administration in areas close to Allied observation, such as the Marmara region, the Greeks in general did not allow Ottoman officials to serve even in name only. Governors appointed by the Istanbul government were not allowed to take up their duties. Those officials who were already in place were driven from their posts. In fact, those who were driven back to Istanbul were the lucky ones. Many other Ottoman officials were forcibly deported to Greece, often never to be seen again, or simply killed. Some were arrested and summarily shot. ¹⁶⁷

The general anarchy in the region occupied by the Greeks was partially due to the absence of any policing power in the region. Both the Ottoman government and the Allies complained that, in addition to the obvious crimes of the invading army and its partisans, ordinary crime was also unstoppable. ¹⁶⁸ This too worked in favor of the Greek invaders, who contended that the lack of order showed the need for a strong Greek force.

-298-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 298.

Except in the far northeast of Anatolia and Cilicia, there was no effective Ottoman army when the Greeks invaded. What gendarmerie remained after World War I was restricted to a few areas and often was poorly armed. The limited power of the state was sufficient to protect only essential, usually urban, services. Rural areas were often unpoliced. In a letter intercepted by British Military Intelligence, the mutasarrif (chief official of a sancak) of the Black Sea sancak of Canik, Ethem Bey, complained to the Porte in April of 1919 that he barely had enough gendarmes to protect the prisons and the post, much less pursue bandits and insurgents. As a result, he stated, in the kazas of Canik Sancağı there were "439 chettes, of which 58 are Moslems

and the rest Greeks." ¹⁶⁹The British High Commissioner, Horace Rumbold, reported that the disarming of the gendarmerie had left the Turks helpless and thus "terrorized by Greek and Armenian bands." ¹⁷⁰

All regular organs of the Ottoman government in the occupied territories ceased to function. Sometimes they were replaced by Greek government officials, but usually were not. Ottoman administrators and civil servants were at best ignored, at worst killed. The mayor of Şile was murdered and his body quickly buried without religious rites. At Alaşehir, the kaymakam (district officer) made repeated complaints to Greek authorities. Their response was to deport the kaymakam, along with 27 other religious and civil notables of the town. They were not seen again. ¹⁷¹The 28 leading notables of Sivrihisar, including all the municipal council, were deported to İzmir. ¹⁷²

Such deportations as were seen in Alaşehir were a normal, and probably effective, Greek tactic for destroying Turkish authority. Those who were deported were governors, religious leaders, landlords, village headmen -- in general, those who were respected and whose authority could potentially challenge that of the Greeks. As mentioned previously, the deportees seldom survived. ¹⁷³Those taken from Alaşehir, Aydin, Nazilli, and other cities were not heard from again. (The tactic may not have had the effect desired by the Greek command. They removed the older, more conservative Turks who were likely to be shown respect in a traditional Muslim society as well as Ottoman officials who were likely to be primarily loyal to the Istanbul government. This left the Nationalists as the only symbol of Turkish authority.)

-299-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 299.

MUSLIM REFUGEES

A certain number of refugees are a part of any war; no intelligent person remains on a battlefield, except perhaps those who are fighting. When their villages and homes become a battlefield, the people of an area become refugees. However, the Anatolian War created excessive numbers of Turkish refugees. This was due to the deliberate expulsion of the Turks of western

Anatolia in order to create a majority Greek state, the same refugee tactic successfully used by Greeks, Bulgarians, Serbs, and Russians in earlier wars. The Greek occupation of Anatolia also had forms of administrative coercion that were specific to it: High taxes were levied and crops confiscated; Ottoman currency was not allowed to circulate and could only be exchanged for Greek currency at an artificially low official rate, destroying both the economy of Turkish villagers and of the Ottoman state; leading men of villages and cities were deported, leaving the Turks without traditional leaders, and regular citizens were deported from their villages for forced labor projects; travel by Turks was greatly curtailed, unless they planned to leave Greek territory completely, when it was facilitated. In short, the Greek government did all it could to insure that the Muslims would become as much a minority in the occupied territory of Anatolia as they had become in the Balkans. ¹⁷⁴

Turkish refugees often fled a number of times. Their sufferings from multiple migrations were reminiscent of the sufferings of the refugees in the Balkan Wars. Indeed, a number of the Turkish refugees of Aydin Vilâyeti had come there as refugees of the Balkan Wars. When word of the Smyrna landing reached the rest of Aydin Vilâyeti, local Turks began to fear and local Greeks to threaten. Both sides knew what would be the result of a Greek occupation of the Turkish villages. Many of the Turks fled from the dangerous countryside to cities such as Manisa. ¹⁷⁵ This provided no safety, as later events in Manisa were to prove, and the survivors became refugees once more.

[General Harrington at Istanbul] I have paid a visit to many of the Turkish refugee camps. Of the 65,000 refugees about 23,000 are in real distress. On my last visit I saw 7,000 composed of old men, almost beyond work, women and children. Their condition is deplorable. One bowl of soup every second day and a bit of bread on alternate days is all that I saw are getting. Excellent work is being done by British Relief

-300-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 300.

Committee, under Sir Adam Block, and they are deserving of every support. They are working up to one bowl every day. Their clothing is mere rags.

Their state is worse than that of the Russians. ¹⁷⁶

The city of Aydin changed hands three times in 1919 -- first held by Turks, then taken by Greeks, retaken by Turks, then taken again by Greeks. Perhaps 2,000 Turks and 400 Greeks died in the fighting and attendant massacres, but the number of refugees makes the disparity in suffering between the Greeks and Turks even more obvious than the mortality. After the second loss of the now almost destroyed city to the Greeks, 3,000 Greeks were homeless, as were 25,000 Turks. Unlike the Turks, the Greeks had somewhere to go. The Greek army was in charge and Turkish houses and villages were available. The number of Turkish refugees from the city of Aydin was thus swelled further by Turks from villages around Aydin whose villages were occupied or burned down by Greeks. ¹⁷⁷

Refugees did not flee solely from the troops of the other side. Many, perhaps the majority of the refugees, Muslim and Christian, fled because of the danger of being in a war zone. In fact, danger was most likely to come to Muslim refugees from Christian soldiers and chetté bands, but that would have made little difference to refugees. It was enough to know that danger existed. Thus, in areas such as the Adapazari-Geyve region of northwestern Anatolia, Greeks, Armenians, and Turks all fled from battles and chetté bands. It was estimated that, in November of 1920, the city of İzmit and its surroundings held 12,000 Greek, 6,000 Armenian, and 10,000 Turkish refugees. ¹⁷⁸

Corresponding to the Turkish refugees from the territories held by the Greeks during the war were the Greek and Armenian refugees in western Anatolia, refugees from areas held by the Turkish Nationalists. In most regions, their numbers were relatively small. The Athens government, known to exaggerate numbers, estimated only 1,800 Christian refugees (supported by the Greek administration, which would not have included some) in the Manisa-AydinNazilli region. ¹⁷⁹ The only large groups of Christian refugees were gathered at İzmit, at Bursa (Greek estimate 16,000), and on Kios (Greek estimate approximately 7,500). ¹⁸⁰ The latter seem to have been made up primarily of refugees of the World War I period, not the more recent Turco-Greek conflict.

The comparative suffering of the Greek and Turkish refugee populations is difficult to measure, and assessing the differences

would normally be a profitless exercise. It should be enough to consider starving and ill-housed refugees as human beings who suffered. However, from the time of the population exchange until today, only the sufferings of the Greeks have been noted in the West. Ignoring and obfuscating the suffering of Muslim Turks sent from Greece to Turkey began almost as soon as the Lausanne Agreement was signed. After admitting that he had not gone to Asia Minor to see for himself the conditions of Turkish refugees, Dr. Fridtjof Nansen, the League of Nations High Commissioner of Refugees, wrote:

Nevertheless, it is clear from the evidence which I have received that the situation of the population in this area of Asia Minor, although undoubtedly serious, is one with which the Turkish authorities are in a position to deal without great assistance from outside, and I do not think that the problem there is comparable in gravity to that of the refugees in Greece. ¹⁸¹

One seemingly rational explanation for the supposedly greater suffering of Greek refugees was simply the fact that more Greeks left Anatolia during and after the war than Turks left Greece. (The Turks who left Europe during the Balkan Wars were left out of the equation.) This was a true, but in terms of suffering, a meaningless statistic. The proper question was not which country had a larger population or which had taken in more refugees, but whether the country could care for the refugees that arrived. If that question is asked, it is obvious that Turkey was much less prepared than Greece to support the immigrants. The Turkish refugees came to a country that had been ravaged by war. In the regions of the Greek retreat, especially, there were few houses for the surviving Anatolian Turks, much less the immigrants. Much of the manufacturing power of the state had been lost in the wars, so there were no industrial jobs. Terrible though the sufferings of the Greek refugees were, Greece was at least a settled state that had not suffered such destruction. Her houses were intact, her industries still there; yet it was the Greeks who received the international aid. American aid organizations such as the American Red Cross and Near East Relief contributed millions to house and feed Greek refugees. The Bank of England advanced £2,000,000 to Greece for refugee aid and two major loans added up to almost £20,000,000 for Greece from 1924 to 1938. ¹⁸² While the Greeks would have preferred, and needed, grants rather than loans, the Turks, who needed the loans more, received nothing.

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 302.

Numbers of Refugees. The numbers of refugees from the Greek invasion can never be known exactly. With the virtual collapse of the Ottoman government, the only agency that had effectively aided, and counted, Muslim refugees, the Ottoman Refugee Commission, ceased most of its field operations. European observers were astounded by the magnitude of the Muslim migration, but they could only estimate the refugee numbers. British reports often spoke of large numbers of Turkish refugees from areas such as İzmir, Aydın, or Yalova, using phrases such as "there must be 100,000 refugees" ¹⁸³ in that area alone. The Ottoman Refugee Commission estimated that there were between 200,000 and 350,000 Turkish refugees in the spring of 1921. ¹⁸⁴

What estimates were made in the midst of the first Greek actions in Aydın Vilâyeti indicate a great number of Muslim refugees. The Senior Italian Naval Officer, G. Giovannini, reported that by the middle of July 1919, 20,000 Muslim refugees were already camped on the south side of the Meander River, the victims of Greek soldiers and civilians who had taken their beasts of burden and their wheat and burned their villages. ¹⁸⁵ By August 1919, there were already from 40,000 to 50,000 Muslim refugees from the Bergama district camped at Soma. ¹⁸⁶ By September 1919, at least 60,000 Muslim Turks from Aydın were refugees. ¹⁸⁷ The Ottoman Interior Ministry estimated that in 1920 there were almost 800,000 refugees "in the interior" (i.e., central Anatolia) -- 200,000 refugees from "Roumelie" who wished to return; 407,000 Muslim refugees from the eastern vilâyets; and 150,000 from the "recent events in Smyrna." ¹⁸⁸ As in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 and the Balkan Wars, many Muslim refugees were forced to move a number of times. For example, when the Greek army occupied Foça and the kazas of Koçhisar, Soma, and Kirkağaç (of Aydın) in June of 1919, the Turks of these areas fled to Karasi. ¹⁸⁹ When Karasi fell to the Greeks, they were forced to flee again. It is particularly distressing to realize that many of these migrants had originally been forced from their homes in Europe during the Balkan Wars.

Of all the estimates of the number of Muslim refugees, the figures offered by İsmet Paşa (İnönü) at the Lausanne Peace Conference seem most accurate. He estimated that 1.5 million Anatolian Turks had been exiled or had died in the area of Greek occupation. ¹⁹⁰ This estimate may appear high, but it fits well with estimates made by contemporary European observers. Moreover,

İsmet Paşa's figures on refugees were presented to the Conference accompanied by

-303-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 303.

detailed statistics of destruction in the occupied region, and these statistics make the estimate seem probable. İsmet Paşa, quoting from a census made after the war, demonstrated that 160,739 buildings had been destroyed in the occupied region. The destroyed homes alone would account for many hundreds of thousands of refugees, ¹⁹¹and not all the homes of refugees were destroyed.

European accounts of refugee numbers were necessarily fragmented, but when compiled they support İsmet Paşa's estimate. The British agent at Aydin, Blair Fish, reported 177,000 Turkish refugees in Aydin Vilâyeti by 30 September 1919, ¹⁹²only four months after the Greek landing. The Italian High Commissioner at Istanbul accepted an Ottoman estimate that there were 457,000 refugees by September of 1920, ¹⁹³and this figure did not include the new refugees in the fall and winter of 1920 to 1921. Dr. Nansen stated that 75,000 Turks had come to the Istanbul area alone ¹⁹⁴since November of 1920. Such figures make İsmet Paşa's estimate all the more credible. Since approximately 640,000 Muslims died in the region of occupation during the war, one can estimate that approximately 860,000 were refugees who survived the war. Of course many, if not most, of those who died were refugees, as well. If one estimates that half the Muslims who died were refugees, it would be roughly accurate to say that 1.2 million Anatolian Muslim refugees fled from the Greeks, and about one-third died. ¹⁹⁵

A number of Muslims left eastern Thrace during the Greek occupation of 1918 to 1923. It is known that more than 9,000 of these escaped into Bulgaria. ¹⁹⁶The Greek government took a census of eastern Thrace in 1920, ¹⁹⁷but only counted total population, not religion or ethnic group. In 1920, the Ottomans estimated that 200,000 refugees from "Rumelia" ¹⁹⁸were in the Istanbul area. Of these, at least 30,000 came from eastern Thrace. ¹⁹⁹Muslim refugees who went from eastern Thrace to Anatolia remain uncounted.

MUSLIM DEATHS

Postwar migration into the western Anatolian provinces makes it difficult to estimate the exact number of Muslims who died during World War I and the Anatolian War. The only way to count deaths is to take the population before the war and subtract the population after the war; Muslims who moved from one province to another confuse the statistics. The land in western Anatolia was the best

-304-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 304.

in Turkey, and many probably came there before the first Turkish Census (upon which the 1922 figures in Table 29 are based) was taken in 1927. Obviously, many moved from Konya to nearby Aydin, artificially increasing the loss numbers for Konya and decreasing those in Aydin.

TABLE 29.

Loss OF MUSLIMS IN WESTERN ANATOLIA, 1912-1922.

Ottoman Provinces	Prewar*	1922	Loss
Aydin	1,887,673	1,400,949	486,724
Hüdavendigâr	1,643,491	1,437,971	205,520
İzmit	271,751	259,712	12,039
Ankara	1,273,207	1,158,376	114,831
Konya	1,550,843	1,123,889	426,954
Total Loss			1,246,068

* Population in 1912 plus refugees from the Balkan Wars. ²⁰⁰

SOURCE: McCarthy, *Muslims and Minorities*.

CONCLUSION

At the end of the Greco-Turkish War, much of western Anatolia was in ruins. Whether it was the Greeks or the Turks who suffered the greatest hardships is an immaterial question. Losses were so great on both sides that to consider the disaster of one group or the other as more important is to ignore the true dimensions of a human disaster. The sufferings of the Turks have been singled out here not because they were somehow worse, but because they have been so little known.

In terms of the long history of Muslim mortality and forced migration from the western Ottoman Empire, the war in western Anatolia was a climax. All the tactics of ethnic and religious eradication previously used in the Morea, in the Bulgarian War, and in the Balkan Wars appeared once again in Anatolia. The distinction is that in Anatolia the Turks had their backs to the wall -- they

-305-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 305.

could be pushed no farther. Previously they had depended on the Ottoman Empire to defend them and their homes, and had lost. Now they defended themselves, without the sultan who had guided them for six centuries, and survived.

NOTES

1. Halide Edib, *The Turkish Ordeal*, New York, 1928, p. 314.
2. Out of mutual necessity and mutual antipathy to the Turks.
3. Page 112. The provinces here are according to borders as they were in 1895 (i.e., for ease of use, sancaks such as Karasi and Kütahya, which later became independent sancaks, have been included in their "mother" vilâyets). These statistics were drawn from Ottoman population

registration data, adjusted for undercounts by age and sex. For an alternative set of figures, based on Greek Patriarchate estimates, see Paschalis M. Kitromilides and Alexis Alexandris, "Ethnic Survival, Nationalism, and Forced Migration", *Bulletin of the Centre for Asia Minor Studies*, vol. V (1984-85), pp. 9-44. I believe the estimates in the article, which were not based on any actual enumeration, are unreliable and, like all Greek estimates of the time, considerably overestimate the Greek population for political purposes.

4. See McCarthy, *Muslims and Minorities*, pp. 117-44.
5. See the discussion in Chapter 5.
6. *F.O. 371-4164, no. 154462, Hadkinson to Robeck in Robeck to Curzon*, Constantinople, 9 November 1919, and *F.O. 371-4158, no. 96965, Perring to Calthorpe*, Adapazar, 16 June 1919. See also the extremely prejudiced view of Stephen P. Ladas, *The Exchange of Minorities: Bulgaria, Greece, and Turkey*, New York, 1932, pp. 15-16.
7. *F.O. 371-4158, no. 118411, Perring to Calthorpe, Samsoun*, 25 July 1919, and *F.O. 371-4164, no. 154462, Hadkinson to Robeck included in Robeck to Curzon*, Constantinople, 9 November 1919. The Foreign Office documents are full of references to brigandage.
8. A description here of the state of the Ottoman economy need not go beyond the statement that it was virtually destroyed by World War I. See Ahmet Emin, *Turkey in the World War*, New Haven, Connecticut, 1930, and Yusuf Hikmet Bayur, *Türk İnkilâbi Tarihi, III(4)*, Ankara, 1967 (reprinted 1983), pp. 497-546 (a very short description).

There were analysts who realized that the Turks, although prostrated by the war, would resist the Greek invasion. Rear Admiral Webb, the Acting British High Commissioner in Istanbul in 1919, was no friend of the Turks, but he made a perspicacious evaluation of the political situation. He felt that peace would never be possible as long as the Turks were "subjected to the rule of an alien and hostile race like the Greeks" (F.O. 371-4158, no. 130723, Webb to Curzon, Constantinople, 7 September 1919).

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 306.

9. There are a number of works on the political and military history of the Anatolian War, some of them with little or no consideration to the condition of Turkish civilians, but valuable for details of the war. See, for example:

Prince Andrew, *Towards Disaster*, London, 1930.

Fahri Belen, *Türk Kurtuluş Savast, Ankara, 1973.*

Col. Bujac, Les Campagnes de l'Armée hellénique, 1918-1922, Paris, 1930.

Mustafa Kemal [AtaTürk], Nutuk, many reprints, first printed in Ankara in 1927 in two volumes.

A. A. Pallis, Greece's Anatolian Venture -- and After, London, 1937. Selâhattin Tansel , Mondros'tan Mudanya'ya Kadar 4 vols., Ankara, 1973 and 1974.

Stanford J. Shaw and Ezel Kural Shaw, History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey, vol. II, Cambridge, 1977, pp. 340-372.

Michael Llewellyn Smith, Ionian Vision, Greece in Asia Minor 1919-1922, New York, 1973. (The best Western-language description of the Greek disaster, whose author strives for objectivity, despite an overwhelming dependence on Greek sources. Although better than most books on the subject, much on the Turks is omitted. For example, events of the İzmir landing and İzmit massacres are mentioned, but not the actions of the Greeks in retreat.)

Turkey, Genelkurmay Başkanhđı, Harp Tarihi Dairesi, Türk İstiklâl Harbi, 6 vols., Ankara, 1962-1968.

10. For the full text of the Armistice Agreement, with commentary, see W.O. 106-64, "Execution of the Armistice with Turkey".

11. Paul C. Helmreich, *From Paris to Sévres*, Columbus, Ohio, 1974, pp. 94-96. Two treaties covered the prospective Italian possessions in Anatolia: the Treaty of London (26 April 1915) and the Treaty of St. Jean de Maurienne (19 April 1917).
12. The Greek government, and Prime Minister Venizelos in particular, were great believers in the propagandistic use of false statistics. They relied on the well-founded notion that no one in the Allied governments had any idea of what went on in the Ottoman Empire. Moreover, they could count on a high level of statistical ignorance among the Western European leaders. (See Dimitri Kitsikis, *Propagande et Pressions en Politique Internationale: La Grèce et ses revendications à la Conférence de la Paix, Paris, 1963*, and Justin McCarthy, "Greek Statistics on Ottoman Greek Population", *International Journal of Turkish Studies* 1[2], 1980, pp. 66-76.)

On the lack of information among the Allies and subsequent- initial confusion among them, see Laurence Evans, United States Policy and the Partition of Turkey: 1914-1924, Baltimore, 1965, pp. 160-182.

It is often difficult to separate fiction from reality in the Greek accounts of Greek suffering. As Kitsikis has indicated, the Greeks made use of many distortions to feed the Western appetite for anti-Turkish tales. Even though Allied control officers managed to have been on the scene when Greeks massacred Turks, they seem to have very seldom seen Turks massacring Greeks (with the notable exception of the retaking of İzmir). This may indicate that Turks always killed Greeks in out-of-the-way places or that Greeks were not as oppressed as they had indicated. Given the fact that the Allied prejudices were pro-Greek and anti-Turkish at the beginning of the war, it would be odd that Allied representatives reported evidence that was so against those they supported, unless it was true. The British in Anatolia, unlike the British at the Peace Conference, often seem to have given little credence to Greek charges. For example, upon receiving a Greek report of Turkish atrocities

in "Tatabazar," the Acting High Commissioner, Rattigan, remarked, "Slaughter of 7700 out of 8000 Greek inhabitants of Tatabazar is untrue, and there is even doubt as to the existence of such a place. Possibly it is intended for Ada Bazaar, but no reports of wholesale massacre of Greeks has been received from that quarter" (*F.O. 371-6515, no. E6441, Rattigan to Curzon, Constantinople, 29 May 1921*).

During the war, the Greeks were reported by the British as "trumping up" false atrocities stories against the Turks. See *F.O. 106-1501, General Harrington to War Office, Constantinople, 16 August 1922*.

In 1923, after Greece had lost the war, Greek Prime Minister Venizelos stated that almost half of the population (1,175,000 of 3,640,000) of the area occupied by the Greeks in Anatolia had been Greek or Armenian. He also stated that never during the occupation had the Greek government adopted anti-Muslim measures (*F.O. 371-9061, no. E1085, Venizelos to Bompard, Lausanne, 25 January 1923*). Both statements were of equal worth.

13. The British government privately knew and accepted Ottoman population statistics for western Anatolia as the best available. Lip service was given to the statistics provided by Greeks and others, especially by Lloyd George. However, when it came to practical matters, the British accepted Ottoman data. For example, the British Foreign Office advised High Commissioner Rumbold in Istanbul to make use of the published Ottoman population statistics in the official *Tableau indiquant le nombre des divers éléments de la population dans le Empire Ottoman au 1er Mars 1330* (*F.O. 371-7879, E5735, Oliphant, for Balfour, to Rumbold, London, 10 June 1923*). British Naval Intelligence used the same statistics (see the classified handbook, Naval Staff, Intelligence Department, *A Handbook of Asia Minor*, vol. III, pt. 2, London, July 1919), as did Army Intelligence (F.O. 371-4221. no. 137567, Appendix 1, "Operations and Intelligence Survey Summary No. 2, Period 21st-27th August 1919. Statistics on the Population of the Vilayet of Aidin by Cazas," Smyrna).

14. On Greeks in Ottoman Anatolia, their nationalism and desire to be part of a Greater Greece, see Smith, *Ionian Vision*, Chapter 2.

15. See *F.O. 371-4157, Calthorpe to Balfour, Constantinople, 8 February 1919*, transmitting the Report from Senior Naval Officer, Smyrna

[Dixon] on events there preceding the Greek invasion. Crimes were mainly the robberies, etc. that might be expected, but Greek bands were already attacking Muslims, especially at Vurla. If the Ottoman government in İzmir had a failing in its public security, it was its failure to protect Muslims adequately. See also, F.O. 371-4218, no. 94229, the protest of the Ottoman Delegation to the Peace Conference, objecting to the Allied violation of the terms of the Mudros Armistice in allowing the Greeks to invade.

It was alleged that the Ottomans had released Turkish criminals from the prisons to harass the Greeks, but this turned out to be a typical misstatement of the truth. According to British sources, it was Christians, not Muslims, who were let out of prison by the Ottomans immediately before the Greek invasion, to placate the Allies (*F.O. 371-4157, no. 72532, Smith to Calthorpe, Constantinople, 7 April 1919*).

16. This was not the only time that the Conference chose Venizelos' word over that of their own agents. Compare the evidence from British sources in

-308-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 308.

Anatolia and Istanbul presented here with the statements of Venizelos and Lloyd George at the Peace Conference.

17. *F.O. 371-4218, no. 91491, Mallet (for Balfour) to Curzon, Report of R. L. Berry, Commanding Officer of the U.S.S. Manley.*

18. *F.O. 371-4219, no. 98615, "Occupation of Smyrna by the Greek Army, 15th May 1919," Smyrna, 24 May 1919.*

19. *F.O. 371-4218, no. 91630, Calthorpe to Curzon, Constantinople, 12 June 1919, transmitting the detailed report of Mr. James Morgan, the*

Representative of the British High Commissioner in Smyrna, on the Greek occupation of the city. This quote is from Morgan's own analysis.

20. There is some question as to whether one shot was fired or a few shots. Those who were eyewitnesses generally state that there was one shot, but those who heard the gunfire from a distance seem to have heard more than one. Perhaps fire from the Greek soldiers was confused for the initial shot(s). The official Greek version of the events was in no way connected to reality. According to the Greek Minister of Foreign Affairs, 70 Greeks had been killed when they were fired upon by Turkish troops. This was supposedly the cause of the Greek attack. The minister blamed the Italians for instigating the troubles. How he expected the British to believe this, when they had been present in İzmir themselves, is not known (*F.O. 371-79256, telegram from Lord Granville, Athens, 24 May 1919*). For the most coherent Western-language presentation of the Greek position on the events in İzmir and throughout the Anatolian campaign, drawn almost completely from Greek sources, see Michael Llewellyn Smith's *Ionian Vision*. (Smith's sources lead him to some remarkable conclusions, at odds with the Allied evidence, e.g., p. 208 on events in İzmir before the Greek landings.)

21. *F.O. 371-4218, no. 91630, Calthorpe to Curzon, Constantinople, 12 June 1919, enclosure C, "Events Which Happened in Smyrna on the 15th May, during the Greek Occupation, as Witnessed by the Undersigned on the S/S 'Brescia.'" (Signed by nine officers of the ship, W. B. Mater Cresser, et al.).*

22. *F.O. 371-4218, no. 91491, Mallet (for Balfour) to Curzon, Paris, 1919, transmitting "reports received either direct or through the American Delegation of the atrocities perpetrated by the Greek troops in Smyrna. The reports are detailed, circumstantial, and trustworthy, and there can unfortunately be no doubt of the disgraceful conduct of the Greek troops or of the lack of control of the Greek authorities." This quote is from enclosure no. 3, the statement of Donald Whittall, Smyrna, 18 May 1919.*

23. Original reads "Turkish soldiers and soldiers."

24. *F.O. 371-4218, no. 91491, Mallet (for Balfour) to Curzon, Paris, 1919,*

enclosure no. 9, "Commanding Officer U.S.S. 'Arizona' to Senior Naval Officer, Constantinople", Smyrna, 18 May 1919.

25. *ibid.*

26. The estimate of Mr. van der Zee (note 29). Some estimated 500, and some Turkish sources estimated 2,000, but this figure may have included mortality in some of the "suburban" villages. There were obviously no accurate counts made.

27. *F.O. 371-4219, GHQ General Staff Intelligence, Constantinople, Report of Ian M. Smith, A.C.O. Smyrna, Smyrna, 24 May 1919.*

De Robeck remarked that in the "battle" between Greek troops and the

-309-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 309.

Ottoman barracks there were a "considerable number of Turkish casualties. The Greek casualties were reported to be one killed and four wounded." Given the fact that it was the Turks who occupied the fortified buildings while the Greeks were in the street in the open, the casualties indicate a strange battle indeed (F.O. 371-4218, no. 8061, "Report on the Greek Occupation of Smyrna" by de Robeck, 20 May 1919).

For another description of Greek actions at İzmir, see the letter of a French marine quoted in *"Ligue pour la Défense des Droits des Ottomans," Atrocités Grecques dans le Vilayet de Smyrne (Mai, 1919), Documents Inédits et Témoignages des Officiers Anglais et Français, Genève, 1919, pp. 26-29*. The French marine's letter seems accurate, as judged by other accounts, but is different from the British accounts in that it is frankly judgmental, blaming the Greeks completely, whereas the British were still at that time going out of their way to excuse the Greek behavior ("Inexperienced officers," "mistakes in the line of

march," etc.). See also the following accounts: F.O. 371-4219, Appendix. I. I, Report by J. de Swart, "Disregard of the White Flag"; Appendix 1.4, Report of L.H.G., "An Eye Witness"; and Appendix L. I, "Translation of a Letter to the representative of the Allies in Magnesia, Mr. Higham, Signed by 25 Leading Businessmen, Government Officials, and Other Civilians."

Detailed reports from Ottoman officials were included in British and American diplomatic reports and in Ottoman publications. For a representative selection of these, see: F.O. 371-4218, no. 85641, Calthorpe to Curzon, Constantinople, 27 May 1919; F.O. 371-4218, no. 91083, Report by Ali Nadir Pasha, Commander of the 17th Army Corps; and F.O. 371-4218, no. 91491, Mallet (for Balfour) to Curzon, Paris, 1919, enclosure no. 9, "Commanding Officer U.S.S. 'Arizona' to Senior Naval Officer, Constantinople", Smyrna, 18 May 1919, numerous enclosures. The official Ottoman government report is the *Rapports officiels refus des autorités militaires Ottomanes sur l'occupation de Smyrne par les troupes Helléniques*, Constantinople, 1919. See also the following detailed and interesting "atrocities books": Nihad Rechad, *Les Grecs a Smyrne*, Paris, 1920, which contains very complete lists of atrocities; le Bureau Permanent du Congrès Turc de Lausanne, *Le Rigime d'Occupation Hellénique en Turquie*, Lausanne, 1921; and The Permanent Bureau of the Turkish Congress at Lausanne, *Greek Atrocities in the Vilayet of Smyrna*, Lausanne, 1919. (The French version of *Greek Atrocities in the Vilayet of Smyrna*, *Atrocités Grècques dans le Vilayet de Smyrne*, Geneva, 1919, is for some reason considerably less detailed than the English version. All the sections of the French volume were translated exactly in the English version, and extensive descriptions of the massacres in the Meander Valley were added.) The Turkish atrocity books are so detailed and circumstantial that it is difficult to deny their evidence. They contain hundreds of pages of massacres, rapes, and destruction often in sickening and graphic detail and accompanied by photographs of the victims. Compiling such volumes, with their pictures of maimed children and the swollen bodies, must have been an abhorrent duty.

The atrocity books identify destroyed villages by name, district, and province, and go into further details (officials' names, geography, etc.) It is obvious that their information was based on surveys of the destruction. I believe them to be reliable as to the numbers and names of villages destroyed and relatively reliable on the numbers of houses and other buildings destroyed (although they tend to

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 310.

forget that Turks may have been responsible for at least some of the destruction). Their data on the numbers of people massacred is doubtful, except insofar, as sometimes happens, as they give the names of the victims. There is no way they could have counted the dead accurately or statistically differentiated between those who died and those who escaped as refugees. At best, such numbers should be taken as informed guesses.

Turkish reports on atrocities committed by their adversaries were significantly more reliable than Greek reports. Whether this was the result of Turkish governmental honesty or a lack of ability in carrying out propaganda is not worth considering here. It only takes a glance at "atrocities books" printed by the Turks and the Greeks to see a significant difference. The Greek books are slicker, easier to read, but they dwell almost completely in generalities. Their assertions are seldom backed up by evidence, except statistical evidence. These statistics simply assert that so many died or that Greeks were a majority in a region by so many thousands. It has been proven, both from statistical analyses and archival records, that Greek statistics such as these were forgeries. Nationalist Turkish publications, however, make dull reading because they go into great detail. They list houses destroyed, the names of the dead, etc.

The British representative in İzmir in 1919, Morgan, repeatedly verified Ottoman accounts of the happenings in Aydın Vilâyeti. For example, in one letter he stated, "The Turkish account of the incidents accompanying the Greek occupation of Nazli is correct" (F.O. 371-4221, no. 12447, enclosure, *Morgan to Calthorpe*, Smyrna, 12 August 1919). In the same document he said that the Sublime Porte's account of the Greek naval bombardment of Turkish villages was accurate, as was the Ottoman description of the general state of civil order, robberies, and atrocities by Greek soldiers, etc.

28. *F.O. 371-4218, no. 91491, Mallet (for Balfour) to Curzon, Paris, 1919, enclosure no. 9, "Commanding Officer U.S.S. 'Arizona' to Senior Naval*

Officer, Constantinople", Smyrna, 18 May 1919.

29. For example, see the van der Zee Report, F.O. 371-4218, no. 91491 and F.O. 371-4219, no. 101446.

30. One British official remarked on reading of Turkish refugees fleeing from the environs of Menemen to İzmir, "Emigration to Smyrna might be out of the frying-pan into the fire. In their place I should not care to attempt the journey" (F.O. 371-4219, no. 102549, comment on cover page by "N.D.C." [Dickinson]).

31. *F.O. 371-4218, no. 86551, "Cable from A.C.O. Smyrna, 18th May 1919," in Calthorpe to Curzon, Constantinople, 24 May 1919.*

32. *F.O. 371-4218, no. 91491, enclosure 9, Commanding Officer, U.S.S. Arizona to Senior Naval Officer, Constantinople, Smyrna, 18 May 1919, also: "A few were killed by Turkish authorities when the Turkish populace rushed the barracks to get arms. The next day the Greek populace were given the same arms by the Greek soldiers" (F. O. 371-4218, no. 91491, Mallet [for Balfour] to Curzon, Paris, 1919, enclosure no. 8, "Notes of a Conversation with Dr. Alexander MacLachlan of the International College at Smyrna"). This should also help establish how little the Turkish soldiery had prepared a national resistance at the time of the occupation of İzmir. Had they realized what would later occur, the Ottoman soldiers would undoubtedly have distributed the arms.*

33. F.O. 371-4219, no. 98815, Appendix E, British Military Representative

to Admiral Koukoulides, Smyrna, 17 May 1919. See also *F.O. 371-4218, no. 85641, Cable from A.C.O. Smyrna, Smyrna, 15 May 1919.*

34. F.O. 371-4218, no. 91983, Director of Military Intelligence to the Acting Under Secretary of State, London, 17 June 1919: "Copy of Cipher Telegram from G.O.C. 17th Army Corps to Ministry of War. Furnished to the British Liaison Officer in the Ottoman War Office." This is a report by Major General Ali Nadir on the events in İzmir. British Foreign Office comments written on the document testify as to its accuracy, e.g., "This tallies in its main outline with other accounts we have had," and "A note by General Headquarters, Constantinople, states that all the incidents given by the Ottoman general are not more exaggerated than is almost inevitable in the case of a man so treated."

In transmitting a list of the Ottoman soldiers killed to his superiors, Lt. Colonel Ian M. Smith commented, "Attention is drawn to the high proportion of senior officers wounded" (enclosure in F.O. 371-4218, no. 91983).

35. F.O. 371-4219, no. 101446, Complaints from the Delegation Ottomane à la Conférence de la Paix, 2 July 1919. In this document, the Ottoman "Inspector of finances, Muvaffac Bey" stated: "The exact number of dead and wounded cannot be determined. There are bodies in the street. It can be said without exaggeration that a thousand were killed or wounded in Smyrna. In the surrounding regions [*'les environs'*] the number of dead and wounded passes 5,000." There is no way to confirm or reject his estimates. The Europeans gave lesser numbers of dead.

36. Helmreich, pp. 165 and 166.

37. F.O. 371-4222, no. 146629, cover sheet, p. 2.

38. See note 116.

39. For evidence of this, see the numerous European and American eyewitness reports published as enclosures in *F.O. 371-4218, no. 91491, Mallet to Curzon, Paris, 18 June 1919.* The British delegation at the Paris Conference knew well the İzmir events, but that British policy

there was little affected.

40. *F.O. 371-4221, no. 12447, Webb to Curzon, Constantinople, 24 August 1919, transmitting letter of 13 July from the Sublime Porte.*

41. *F.O. 371-4220, no. 115562, Calthorpe to Curzon, Constantinople, 1 August 1919, transmitting note from Sublime Porte.*

42. *F.O. 371-4222, no. 141443, Digest of a report from the British "Intelligence Officer Aydin" on a visit to Tireh -- 16 September 1919.*

43. *F.O. 371-4224, no. 168764, de Robeck to Curzon, Constantinople, 20 December 1919, letter from Morgan in Smyrna on "Brigandage in Narli Dere."*

44. This should not be taken to imply that all local Greeks gladly entered into the Greco-Turkish War; and surely not that all Greeks joined in the persecution of Muslims. It was rather the case, as in the other regions and other wars already seen, that conflict completely polarized millets that were by nature already highly polarized. Given the choice, most Greeks, like most Muslims, would surely rather have not fought at all, but when forced to take sides, Greeks sided with Greeks.

"Greek irregular bands have been formed all over the country and have been armed by the Greek authorities. These bands have been especially active since the Greek army had to retreat from Kovalitza in the Spring. They attack villages, pillage, burn and massacre. The bands are sometimes accompanied by Greek regular troops, sometimes they are alone, but in all cases there seems to be little

doubt of the complicity of the regular troops, and authorities. Some of these regular bands are composed of Armenians, but these co-operate with the Greeks. There are varying degrees of atrocity and thoroughness in their attacks, and this seems to depend on the caprice or the humanity of the particular 'chetti' [*sic*] leader in charge of that band. In some cases they are satisfied with pillage and burning, in others the massacres seem fairly thorough. (All this is exactly the state of affairs we found prevailing between Ismid and Gemlek.)" (F.O. 371-6557, no. E10550, "Note by Mrs. Arnold Toynbee," 20 September 1921, no place listed).

45. "The irregulars were not disarmed and these are now plying their natural vocations" (Lt. Comdr. Hadkinson to B.N.R. Smyrna, Aivali, 4.7.19, "Aivali Report," enclosure B in *F.O. 371-4221, no. 1244477, Webb to Curzon*, 24 August 1919). Hadkinson gave Greek soldiers the benefit of the doubt whenever possible, but sometimes one must assume his comments were tongue-in-cheek: "Simultaneously another proclamation invited volunteers possessing arms and arming those that lacked same to form them into bands who were required to act as scouting parties. These numbered about a thousand and were given to understand that for the risk they were incurring they had freedom of action. These set to work and the villages of Araplar and Muradeli were pillaged and burnt, the inhabitants having fled in the meantime. The Greek military authorities then remonstrated with the irregulars who felt penitent over their misdeeds."

46. See, for example, *F.O. 286-759, no. E7932, Report of Major-General Franks*, Constantinople, 25 June 1921.

47. On David Lloyd George's views on the Turks and the Greeks, see Winston Churchill, *The World Crisis -- the Aftermath*, London, 1929, especially pp. 391-414 (e.g., "The Greeks are the people of the future in the Eastern Mediterranean. They are prolific and full of energy. They represent Christian civilization against Turkish barbarism," p. 391). Also, Gaston Gaillard, *The Turks and Europe*, London, 1921, and David Lloyd George, *Memoirs of the Peace Conference*, New Haven, 1939, in which Lloyd George shows a complete lack of understanding of even the demographic situation, which was fairly accurately represented in the intelligence reports made available to him (p. 650). He thought so highly of Venizelos that he took his information from the Greek Prime Minister rather than from his own officials in Anatolia.

48. *F.O. 371-4219, no. 97051, Harmsworth to Curzon, 27 June 1919.*

49. *F.O. 371-4224, "Report on the Situation at Odemish and Tireh," by I. O. Odemish Dated 5-12-1919 and "Report on the Situation in the Kiamakchi Area" by I. O. Odemish Dated 3rd Dec. 1919.*

50. Researchers must be particularly careful in evaluating the analyses and statements of members of the Foreign Office staff in London, who were physically far removed from the events and mentally even farther away. The "experts" in the Foreign Office sometimes wrote summaries of what they believed to be the case in the field. These were sometimes serious, accurate attempts at summarizing events, but more often laughable examples of the triumph of bigotry over analysis. For the latter, see "Atrocities in Asia minor, etc." by G. W. Rendel (*F.O. 371-7875, no. E149, London, 4 January 1922*). Without any attempt at proof, and seemingly having forgotten the many reports of the Foreign Office representatives in Anatolia, Rendel greatly exaggerated Turkish attacks on Greeks and minimized Greek massacres of Turks -- never mentioning most of the atrocities reported by British diplo-

mats and soldiers. It is useful to compare his claims, and those of others like him, to the claims of the Greek and Armenian patriarchates. The patriarchates can surely not be accused of minimizing Greek and Armenian losses ("Allowance has to be made for the possibility of exaggeration [in patriarchate accounts] and even, in one or two instances, of repetition, under different dates, of the same incidents." High Commissioner de Robeck). Nevertheless, the patriarchate estimates of Christians killed, villages burned, etc. are considerably lower than those of Englishmen, like Rendel, who observed all from London far. Somewhere between Anatolia and London many more Christians were lost (*F.O. 371-5057, no. 14500, de Robeck to Curzon, Constantinople,*

10 November 1920).

51. The reporting of the incidents at Nazilli and other cities in the province of Aydin reflected at first the prejudices of the British. In the first days of the Aydin occupation, when their only information came from Greek sources, the British blamed all troubles on the Turks and issued warnings to the Ottoman government that implied Turkish untrustworthiness, if not guilt. For example, Commodore Fitzmaurice, commander of the British Aegean Squadron, sent an officer to investigate reports of troubles in the Nazilli region: "The officer has instructions to warn the Turkish authorities that in the event of Nazilli being evacuated [by the Greeks] they will be held responsible for the preservation of order; and that any disorders may result in a further advance of the Greek troops" (*F.O. 371-4219, no. 40, Fitzmaurice to the Senior Officer of His Italian Majesty's Men of War at Smyrna, Smyrna, 20 June 1919*). This became the British justification for accepting the advance of Greek troops beyond the area awarded them by the Allies.

In the previous, and in other, correspondence, Fitzmaurice indicated his belief that Greek advances beyond the area awarded them were the result of Turkish inability to "preserve order." On the next day he cabled the British High Commissioner at Istanbul, "Request Turkish government be directed to use utmost endeavours to check all acts of aggression on the part of Turks and to maintain order in the Vilayet of Aydin outside the zone of Greek occupation" (*F.O. 3714219, in a letter to M. Stergiadis, Greek High Commissioner in Smyrna, notifying Stergiadis of Fitzmaurice's cable, 21 June 1919*). More letters and cables with the same general purport were sent. Then, beginning on 23 June, the reports of the British investigators began to come in. These reported the machine-gunning of Turks and other atrocities seen before. However, the main thrust of the reports was that it was the Greek advance into the Nazilli region, followed by a precipitous withdrawal from Nazilli, and Greek actions while in occupation, that resulted in the murders of both Greeks and Turks. Greeks had indeed been killed by Turkish bands, but only in areas occupied by the Greek army and after prior Greek atrocities. In the region that the Greek army had not set foot, "From Nazilli to Denizli [i.e., the area still under Turkish control] perfect order prevails. I did not get a single authentic complaint against the Turk from any Christian and an enquiry ascertained that there is no trouble of any kind on the upper regions of the line [of the Aydin Railway]" (*F. O. 371-4219, Lt. Hodder's Report of 23 June 1919*).

Although Fitzmaurice was still not willing to accept that Greek murders

of Turks, as reported by his own men, had been the cause for reprisals against Greeks, he was at least willing to blame the Greeks for taking territories outside

-314-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 314.

their allotment and noted that "perfect order was being kept elsewhere by the Turks." He added, "In these circumstances I can only hold one opinion, which is that for the unfortunate events at Nazilli on the 20th June, the Greek authorities are solely to blame" (F.O. 371-4219, Fitzmaurice to Stergiadis, 25 June 1919). It would still be a while until the actual events were described and accepted by the British.

52. The Permanent Bureau of the Turkish Congress at Lausanne, *Greek Atrocities in the Vilayet of Smyrna*, Lausanne, 1919, p. 27.

53. "Menemen was one of the first places to be occupied by the Greek forces and mainly owing to the splendid behavior of the kaymakam Kemal Bey, no incidents of any kind occurred there" (F.O. 371-4219, no. 104611, Calthorpe to Curzon, Constantinople, 5 July 1919, Report of Calthorpe's representative, Morgan, on the Menemen massacres). Kemal Bey was later killed in the government building by Greek soldiers.

54. Some Turks were also warned by Greek friends that the massacre would begin the next day.

55. Control Officers were in theory observers who made sure that the provisions of the Mudros Armistice were observed. In fact, they were well placed to serve as spies and did so.

56. "A French officer estimates the number of Turkish killed at least 80 and other foreign witnesses put the number down at 200" (F.O. 371-4219,

no. 104611, Calthorpe to Curzon, Constantinople, 5 July 1919, Report of Calthorpe's representative, Morgan, on the Menemen massacres).

57. F.O. 371-4221, 121944, Webb to Curzon, Constantinople, 16 August 1919, translation of the report of the Ottoman Commission of Investigation on Menemen. The Ottoman commission came to Menemen under Allied protection. When they arrived, there were still bodies of Muslims in the streets. Their report is thorough and is completely substantiated by Allied witnesses.

58. F.O. 371-4220, no. 112194, Calthorpe to Curzon, Constantinople, 22 July 1919. Other reports substantiated the evidence of the British Control Officers. "All important accounts concur that the Greeks were responsible for the disorders at Menemen" (F.O. 371-4220, no. 120192, Telegram from Admiral Webb, Constantinople, 24 August 1919). Webb added that any violence on the part of Turks was brought about by the need to defend themselves. On Menemen, see also F.O. 371-4219, no. 102547, Letter from the Ottoman Foreign Ministry (Sefa) to Calthorpe, 19 June 1919. Speaking for the Greek government, Prime Minister Venizelos disclaimed Greek responsibility for the events at Menemen, as was usually the case whenever he addressed such issues. However, Allied evidence to the contrary was too strong for him to convince even his friends. All the British Foreign Office commentators mentioned in the archival sources agreed that Venizelos had lied in his comments to the Peace Conference delegates on Greek atrocities in Aydin Vilâyeti. Acting High Commissioner Webb stated, "All reports from foreigners, including British officers, who witnessed or investigated the occurrences at Menemen on 16th June are unanimous in placing sole responsibility on the Greeks." With diplomatic reserve, C. E. S. Palmer of the Foreign Office commented, "In general, M. Venizelos' remarks are discredited" (F.O. 371-4221, no. 124451, Webb to Curzon, Constantinople, 24 August 1919).

Reports from the Sublime Porte on Greek activities against Muslims were generally taken as accurate by the British in Anatolia and in Istanbul, although they sometimes felt that the numbers of dead given in the reports were inflated. The British acceptance was based on comparison between Ottoman accounts and those of British officers who saw or investigated the same incidents. For example: "The Turkish account [of the events at Menemen] agrees in the main with that of Lieut. Higham in [dispatch number] 112194. The number of dead is high, being given as 300-400 at Menemen and 1300 in the various villages. The accusation of premeditation also agrees with Lieut. Higham's report; and the latter on page 7 states that a White Cross was painted on the doors of most Greek homes. The whole affair seems to be as shocking as the Aydin massacres" (C. E. S. Palmer, 29/8/19, commenting on a report made by a commission sent to Menemen by the Ottoman Ministry of Foreign Affairs, F.O. 371-4221, no. 121944).

59. See F.O. 371-4219, no. 103230, Admiralty Letter (Hunt for the Secretary) to Under Secretary of State, 15 July 1919 for reports on the Greek movement beyond their allotted area.

60. Note from the Ottoman government, containing translations of reports from the "Gouverneur de Denizli" and "Sous-gouverneur de Nazelli," transmitted in F.O. 371-4220, no. 115562, Calthorpe to Curzon, Constantinople, 1 August 1919.

61. "Égorgés."

62. F.O. 371-4221, no. 130729, Webb to Curzon, 8 September 1919, "a report by Captain Hadkinson, Relief Officer attached to this High Commission, relative to the events which occurred at Aidin during the last few days of June." Hadkinson's reports are all the more interesting because he was no friend of the Turks. See F.O. 371-4221, Hadkinson to Temple, Soma, 29 June 1919. See also U.S. 867.00/ 316, telegram, Bristol to Naval Advisor, Paris, Constantinople, 17 July 1919, which identifies the Greeks as deliberately burning the Turkish quarter and killing the Muslims.

63. The sources in note 62 contain descriptions of the Greek losses. For a gross exaggeration, see U.S. 767.68116/2, Dobbs to State, Athens, 24

March 1920, transmitting a description of events in Aydin by Greek General Nider. Nider stated, more than somewhat hypocritically, "The cruelty of the Turks is something beyond description. Ferocious beasts are mild compared to them." Prime Minister Venizelos, in a letter to the Powers at the Peace Conference, contended that the fire that burned the Turkish quarter of Aydin was accidentally started by Turkish cannon shells. He did not mention any anti-Turkish actions by Greek troops (U.S. 867.00/304, E. K. Venizelos [sic] to Mr. Clemenceau, etc. [translation], Paris, 10 July 1919). The disclaimers of Greeks and others had their effect on public opinion and on opinion in Allied foreign offices, where it was stated that Greeks had been massacred by Muslims, not vice versa. The foreign ministries discovered their errors when their own officials visited Aydin. These found that Muslims had been the victims (although the public was never notified of the fact). For example, Colonel Poillon, the U.S. Military Attaché at Athens went to Aydin, despite attempts by the Greek command to stop him. He said that there had been no massacre of Greeks in the city and described the actions of the Greeks against the

-316-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 316.

Muslims (U.S. 867.00/318, telegram, Drappers to American Mission, Paris, Athens, 19 July 1919).

The reporting of the events at Aydin point up the danger of trusting the reports of prejudiced sources, especially Americans, without careful consideration. The American consul at İzmir in 1919, Horton, was intensely pro-Greek, so much so that members of the American, as well as the Turkish, communities at İzmir complained of his prejudices to the State Department (U.S. 867.00-302, John Manola [of New York] to Lansing, received 11 July 1919). Horton's reports on Aydin were a distillation of reports from the Greeks (U.S. 867.00-288, Horton to American Mission, Paris, Smyrna, 2 July 1919). However, in the face of overwhelming evidence from American and British observers, he was forced to retract his charges of atrocities by the Turks and stated, "During the Occupation of the Turks after the Greeks had retreated, the

Christian population was protected by one British and two French officers and by Turkish regular troops of the old 57th division, who are well disciplined *and bow to foreign flags* [my emphasis] (U.S. 867.00/295, Horton to American Embassy, Paris, Smyrna, 6 July 1919). He would still not admit, despite unanimous evidence of the Allied representatives on the scene, that Greeks had attacked Turks. He blamed all troubles in Aydin Vilâyeti on the Turks and, as instigators, the Italians. His trust was in the Greeks and their High Commissioner -- "I must say that from the very first Mr. Sterghiades assured me that he did not come here to wage war on Turkey" -- who he was sure would do no wrong. Horton was of the opinion that the Turks should never be allowed to return to the areas taken by the Greeks (U.S. 867.00/325, Horton to American Mission, Paris, Smyrna, 19 July 1919).

Horton book, *The Blight of Asia* (Indianapolis, 1926), is a study of the victory of prejudice over reason. In it, he describes the Turks as "the lowest of the Mohammedans intellectually, with none, or at least few, of the graces and accomplishments of civilization, with no cultural history" (p. 209) and "the only branch of the Mohammedan faith which has never made any contribution to the progress of civilization" (p. 255).

64. F.O. 608-276, no. 396, 25 June 1920, Ottoman Delegation Observations on the Proposed Treaty [Sevres].

65. Described as "brigands," so perhaps at least some of the prisoners were members of Greek bands captured by the Ottoman authorities, then set free by the Greeks.

66. "Foule."

67. Note from the Ottoman government, containing translations of reports from the "Gouverneur de Denizli" and "Sous-gouverneur de Nazelli," transmitted in F.O. 371-4220, no. 115562, Calthorpe to Curzon, Constantinople, 1 August 1919.

68. F.O. 371-4221, no. 124447, Webb to Curzon, Constantinople, 24 August 1919, transmitting a letter from the Sublime Porte.

69. F.O. 371-4221, no. 121623, Summary of British Reports and of Conflicting Accounts of Greeks and Turks prepared for Lord Curzon, 26 August 1919.

70. F.O. 371-4219, no. 98815, Report on "The Occupation of Smyrna by the Greek Army, 15th May 1919" Smyrna, 24 May 1919, compiled from dispatches of Consul Morgan and other British representatives."
Appendix H: A letter to

-317-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 317.

Morgan from Oscar van Lennup, who had a çiftlik in the "Nahie of Sevidi Keuy," 17th May 1919.

71. F.O. 371-4219, no. 101446, Complaints from the Ottoman Delegation to the Peace Conference, 2 July 1919.

72. *Rapports officiels reçus des autorités militaires Ottomanes sur l'occupation de Smyrne par les troupes Helléniques*, Constantinople, 1919, the Report of the Commandant of the Gendarmerie, pp. 31-36. The report tallies point by point with the reports of Morgan and other Allied observers. The mortality figures seem reasonable.

73. F.O. 371-4218, no. 85641, Calthorpe to Curzon, Constantinople, 27 May 1919, a Cable from "A.C.O. Smyrna," 15 May 1919.

74. F.O. 371-4227, no. 88773, Calthorpe to Curzon, Constantinople, 31 May 1919, transmitting letter from Ali Nadir, 17th Army Corps Commander, to Ministry of War, 22 May 1919.

75. F.O. 371-4220, no. 115562, Calthorpe to Curzon, Constantinople, 1 August 1919, evidence from the Turkish Foreign Ministry.
76. F.O. 371-4220, no. 115562, Calthorpe to Curzon, Constantinople, 1 August 1919, evidence from the Turkish Foreign Ministry.
77. F.O. 371-4221, no. 124451, enclosure, Lt. Commander Hadkinson from Soma, 29 June 1919. See also F.O. 371-4221, no. 121623, "Memorandum respecting the Greek Occupation of Smyrna," prepared for Lord Curzon, 26 August 1919.
78. The first reports of the naval bombardment came from the Ottoman government (F.O. 371-4221, no. 12447, enclosure in Morgan to Calthorpe, Smyrna, 12 August 1919, a letter from the Sublime Porte to Calthorpe 13 July 1919). They were substantiated by British reports (Report from Morgan in İzmir, same source). See also F.O. 371-6518, no. E6975, telegram from Rattigan, Constantinople, 16 June 1921 on the bombardment of İnebolu.
79. F.O. 371-4222, no. 141443, de Robeck to Curzon, Constantinople, 4 October 1919, Report of Intelligence Officer Aydin from Visit to Tireh, 16 September 1919
80. F.O. 371-4224, no. 168764, de Robeck to Curzon, Constantinople, 20 December 1919. In one incident, Greeks robbed the village of Narlidere. Consul Morgan reported on the incident. He noted that the bands of brigands at Narlidere spoke Turkish, so they were probably not Hellenic Greeks. This confirmed the identification as locals by both local Turks and Greek officials. However, they were "dressed in Hellenic military uniforms." Morgan also mentioned other, similar incidents (same source).
81. F.O. 371-4218, no. 88752, Calthorpe to Curzon, a report of a meeting with a "Deputation from the Ottoman Council of Ministers," 28 May 1919.
82. F.O. 371-4224, no. 170731, Advanced British Headquarters, General

Staff, "Intelligence," Smyrna, No. 1023/S.I., "Digest of Report from I. O. Aidin on Visit to Tireh." On the rape of Muslim women, see Halide Edib, *The Turkish Ordeal*, pp. 308 and 360.

83. See *Muslims and Minorities*, Chapter 7.

84. F.O. 371-4221, no. 12447, Webb to Curzon, Constantinople, 24 August 1919, transmitting the letter of the Sublime Porte to Calthorpe of 13 July 1919.

85. F.O. 371-4221, no. 12447, "Aivali Report," Lt. Commander Hadkinson, Aivali, 4 July 1919.

-318-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 318.

86. F.O. 371-4224, no. 170731, Advanced British Headquarters, General Staff, "Intelligence," Smyrna, No. 1021/S.I., "Report on the Situation at Odemish and Tireh by I. O. Odemish Dated 5-12-1919," and F.O. 371-4224, no. 170731, Advanced British Headquarters, General Staff, "Intelligence," Smyrna, No. 1023/ S.I., "Digest of Report from I. O. Aidin on Visit to Tireh."

87. F.O. 371-4224, no. 170731, Advanced British Headquarters, General Staff, "Intelligence," Smyrna, No. 1023/S.I., "Digest of Report from I. O. Aidin on Visit to Tireh."

88. F.O. 371-6557, no. E10550, "Note by Mrs. Arnold Toynbee," 20 September 1921, no place listed. The Toynbees' sources on their return trip to Aydin Vilâyeti were Turks to whom they had not listened on their first visit. In any case, the Turks of Aydin Vilâyeti did not trust Toynbee when he first visited the province. He was too closely identified with the

Greeks for them to speak freely before him and he was, in fact, the guest of the Greek High Commissioner: "He [Dr. Husni Bey, one of Toynbee's informants] spoke with much more openness now than he had dared to on Arnold's previous visit, for at that time it was known that Arnold was very much in with the Greeks; they had been showing him round, and it was obvious that he was to a great extent in sympathy with them. The Turks had been quite friendly but had naturally spoken with reserve" (F.O. 371-6557, no. E10550, "Note by Mrs. Arnold Toynbee," 20 September 1921, no place listed).

Mrs. Toynbee remarked that, although they had not been able to observe past events in the province of Aydin as they had those in the Yalova-İzmit region, they believed what they heard was true, primarily because "in the smallest details very often" they were the same type of atrocities that they had personally seen Greeks committing elsewhere.

89. Arnold J. Toynbee, *The Western Question in Greece and Turkey: a Study in the Contact of Civilizations*, London, Boston and New York, 1922, p. 284, quoting the Inter-Allied Commission on the Yalova-Gemlik Peninsula.

For a short but excellent first-hand account of the situation in the Yalova-Gemlik region, see the *Report* of Maurice Gehri, the Delegate of the International Committee of the Red Cross (separately printed from the *Revue Internationale de la Croix-Rouge*, vol. III, no. 31, 15 July 1921, Geneva).

See also, F.O. 371-6516, no. E6477, French government note to the Foreign Office, London, 6 June 1921. Attesting to Greek atrocities at İznik. The accounts related by Halide Edib on the sufferings of the Muslim peasants are important and interesting, because they relate the stories of individuals. She describes the horrible face of conflict in a way no statistics can (Halide Edib, The Turkish Ordeal, pp. 308-96). Her interviews with and understanding of village women are among the best descriptions of the consequences of war ever printed.

90. U.S. 767.68116/20, Bristol to State, Constantinople, Jan. 7, 1921.

91. F.O. 371-6513, no. E5889, cipher telegram from General Headquarters, Constantinople, to War Office, 17 May 1921.

92. F.O. 286-759, no. E6204, Rumbold to Curzon, Constantinople, 20th May 1921, transmitting the Interim Report of the Commission of Enquiry on the Ismidt Peninsula (Colonel Farmer). The interim report is in most ways superior to the final report, which was heavily affected by politics (see note 105). The report

-319-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 319.

should be compared with the published Ottoman report from the area, which is far more detailed, but which agrees with the Commission of Enquiry Report in every detail that appears in both. The Ottoman Report is a telling, but gruesome, document, which lists destroyed villages and the dead by name and includes many truly horrible pictures (Ministère de l'Interieur, Direction Generale des Immigrès, Publication No. 5, *Atrocités Grecques en Turquie. Second Livre [sic]*, Constantinople, 1921).

93. ibid.

94. Report of the Commission of Inquiry for the Ismidt Peninsula to His Excellency the British High Commissioner, Constantinople, transmitted in F.O. 286-759, no. 6204, Rumbold to Curzon, Constantinople, 20 May 1921. The members of the Commission were Lieut-Colonel H.M. Farmer, Le.-Colonel S. Vitelli, Lt-Colonel de Witkowski, and Major C.H. Van-Millingen.

95. F.O. 286-759, Rumbold to Curzon, Constantinople, 3 January 1920.

96. F.O. 371-6513, no. E5870, telegram from Rumbold, Constantinople, 21 May 1921.

97. F.O. 371-6515, no. E6310, telegram from Rattigan, Constantinople, 1 June 1921.

98. One might reasonably ask why I accept Toynbee's evidence concerning the Greeks, but dismiss much of what he earlier wrote on the Armenians. The answer is simple. Toynbee actually saw the actions of the Greeks; he only read reports (none from the Ottoman side) on the tragedy of the Armenians. Had Toynbee not travelled to Asia Minor in 1921, he might again have produced a biased, anti-Turkish volume. It is to his great credit that his prejudices melted in the face of hard evidence. Many others (see, for example, Marjorie Housepian *The Smyrna Affair*) have not taken his lead.

99. Toynbee, p. 367.

100.F.O. 286-759, no. E 7932, enclosure no. 1 in Rattigan to Curzon, Constantinople, 30 June 1921, "report of the commission appointed to enquire into the atrocities committed in the islands of Marmara." The report goes beyond what is mentioned here to describe the generally bad state of the Marmara region that was under Greek control, including beatings and murder, and tells of the need to disarm the Greek villagers.

101."The names of the Brigand band were ascertained and are as follows:

Yokos Takor Oghlou Nickit Oglou Istrati of Afisia Sevdali Oglou Istramos of Artaki Mali, or Heraki, a deserted soldier Yorgi, of Pasha Liman [Two brigands were not named]."

(F.O. 286-759, no. E 7932, enclosure no. 1 in Rattigan to Curzon, Constantinople, 30 June 1921, "report of the commission appointed to enquire into the atrocities committed in the islands of Marmara.")

102.*ibid.* On Greek actions in the Marmara region, see also U.S. 767.68116/8, Bristol to Secretary of State, Constantinople, 20 December 1920, and U.S. 767.68116/13, Bristol to Secretary of State, Constantinople, 13 April 1921.

103.F.O. 286-759, Rumbold to Curzon, Constantinople, 3 January 1920.

104.The best known example of the leader of a Circassian band was Çerkes Ethem, who originally led a guerrilla movement against the Greeks, but eventually

-320-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 320.

specialized in pillage of civilians, Christian and Muslim alike, and even joined the side of the Greeks. He was defeated by Mustafa Kemal's Nationalist forces.

105.CMD. 1478, p. 11. Turkey No. 1 (1921), *Reports on Atrocities in the Districts of Yalova and Guemlek and in the Ismid Peninsula. This is a propagandistic version of the reports of Farmer, et al., cited before, much rewritten to please the Greeks and the British government. It nevertheless cannot ignore the massacres of Turks. (It is an instructive lesson in propaganda to compare this version to the original reports.)*

106.F.O. 371-6520, no. E7377, telegram from Rattigan, Constantinople, 28 June 1921. See also F.O. 371-6520, no. E7398, telegram from Commander in Chief, Mediterranean, to Admiralty, 29 June 1921.

107.F.O. 371-6520, no. E7420, telegram from Rattigan reporting on the visit of General Franks to İzmit.

108.W.O. 106-1493, "A History of the Turco-Greek War, 1919 to 1922."

109.F.O. 371-6511, no. E5232, Note from the British High Commissioner transmitting a letter from the Ankara government, Constantinople, 4

April 1921. See also U.S. 867.00/ 1548, Bristol to Secretary of State, 21 September 1922.

110.U.S. 767.68116/34, J. Loder Park to State, Smyrna, 11 April 1923. A report on the tour of the area of the Greek retreat by American Consul Park (consul at Smyrna) and others.

111.ibid.

112.F.O. 371-6533, no. E11890, Rumbold to Curzon, Constantinople, 18 October 1921, transmitting telegrams from the "Angora Foreign Minister" and the Ottoman Foreign Ministry. F.O. 371-6532, no. E11414, letter of Yusuf Kemal to Rumbold, 10 October 1921. F.O. 371-6520, no. E7299, Sublime Porte note of 7 June 1921. F.O. 371-6520, no. E7306, Ankara government to the British High Commissioner, 7 June 1921.

113.F.O. 371-6533, no. E11890, Rumbold to Curzon, Constantinople, 18 October 1921. In this document, the Turks reported that captured Greek officers stated that Greek Prince André had ordered Greeks to burn all villages in their path. To my knowledge, there is no other evidence for such a high-level command except the testimony of the two officers -- listed as Colrakis and Emmanuel. There is no way to tell if their statements were accurate. While it is obvious that the orders to destroy all in the path of the Greek army came from the command of the Greek army, it is also obvious that testimony of prisoners of war is always suspect. See also General Second Section of the Staff of the Western Front, *Greek Atrocities in Asia Minor, First Part*, Constantinople, 1922 (also published in an identical French version), in which the two officers are (probably more correctly) listed as A. Acryoti and Colizakis Emmanuel and the officer as "PrinceAndrea" (listed in the text in Greek as Andreas).

114.F.O. 371-6518, no. E6959, Parliamentary statements on the Greek atrocities at Yalova.

115.Speech in Parliament of Viscount St. Davids (President of the SmyrnaAydin Railway) on reports coming to him.

116.F.O. 371-7878, no. E5395, Parliamentary Question by Mr. Rees, 23 May 1922, asking for the Smyrna Commission paper to be published. F.O. 371-7879, no. E5975, Parliamentary Question of 12 June 1922, asking for publication of the report of the "Inter-Allied Commission on Greek Atrocities."

Interestingly, the secret Smyrna Report, which was denied to the British

-321-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 321.

people by their leaders, had been published in France in 1920. The Turkish delegation to the Paris Peace Conference had been given a copy of the final report of the commission (by the French?) and had published it in 1920. No one in England seems to have paid any attention to materials published by the Turks, and I have seen no indication that anyone in England knew that published copies of the Commission Report existed. (It was published in *Les Grecs à Smyrne, Nouveau témoignages sur leurs atrocités. Un document officiel probant, Paris, 1920. I have assumed the compiler to be the Turkish delegation. No author is listed, but much of the material in the book is the same as that which appears in other Delegation publications.*)

For the English version of the Smyrna Commission Report, see United States of America, Department of State, Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States: the Paris Peace Conference, 1919, volume xii, Washington, 1947.

117.F.O. 371-6521, no. E767, telegram from Rattigan, Constantinople, 1 July 1921.

118.Letter from Arnold Toynbee to *The Times*, 6 April 1922, transmitting a letter from Turkey of 9 March 1922.

119. "British officer sent with allied mission to Brusa [*sic*] to observe evacuation, has handed in report which shows grave demoralization of and atrocities committed by Greek troops who were also responsible for firing Greek villages.

"Their own principal churches were destroyed by Greeks together with 40 houses.

"Turkish Commander Shukri kept his troops in hand and maintained order." (W.O. 106-1501, G.O.C. Allied Forces, Constantinople, to War Office, 15 September 1922.)

120. F.O. 371-7898, no. E10383, "Report on the Nationalist Offensive in Anatolia by Major H.G. Howell, D.S.O., O.B.E., R.A., British Member of the Inter-Allied Commission proceeding to Broussa," Constantinople, 15 September 1922.

121. F.O. 371-7898, no. E10383, Report by Major Howell, Constantinople, 15 September 1922.

122. The Permanent Bureau of the Turkish Congress at Lausanne, *Greek Atrocities in the Vilayet of Smyrna, Lausanne, 1919, p. 96.*

123. Justin McCarthy, "Jewish Population in the Late Ottoman Period," A. Levy, ed., *The Jews of the Ottoman Empire*, Princeton, 1994, pp. 375-97.

124. See the report of Lieut. J.S. Perring in F.O. 371-4157, no. 83004, Webb to Curzon, Constantinople, 20 May 1919, on Bolu, Adapazari, etc. -- areas which would later be the sites of atrocities. Also, F.O. 371-4157, no. E62437, Webb to Curzon, Constantinople, 5 April 1919.

125. "I have visited Hendek on the 25 ultimo, my inspection there was solely connected with a complaint sent in by the Armenian Patriarchate accusing the Turks of taking possession of live-stock, furniture, etc. After a careful investigation, I found their complaint unfounded and their claims grossly exaggerated. It is the same old story retold; live-stock and furniture sold for half its value and even under. I asked the signatories to the report sent to the Patriarchate if they could

substantiate the accusations mentioned therein and not in one single instance could they do so. They simply stated that the Patriarchate asked them to send in

-322-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 322.

a report some four months ago, and the accused Turks mentioned therein are those who bought the goods at very low prices. They expressed themselves, however, satisfied with conditions in general and said that whenever an animal is traced belonging to them they quickly get it back; but unfortunately for them there are hardly any left"(F.O. 371-3660, no. 140460, Charles Hadkinson to de Robeck, Constantinople, 7 September 1919).

126.According to one British observer, two elements were responsible for raids in Aydin ViUyeti before the Greek invasion -- refugees from Europe -- "Cretans, Albanians, Circassians, and Bosniaks" -- and "Greek refugees who have returned from the islands and the Greek Ottomans who escaped from Ottoman military service to the islands" (F.O. 371-4157, no. 72532, Smith to Calthorpe, Constantinople, 7 April 1919).

127.The following are the figures of the Armenian and/or Greek patriarchates. The British warned that they contained "exaggerations." It can be assumed that the actual numbers were lower, but that the massacres actually did take place.

9 June, Ortaköy, 270

10 July, Geyve, 500

15 July, Akhisar, 350

27 August, İznik, 400-500

I have not included some fanciful statements, e.g., "Fouladjik," where

400 were supposedly hanged, or the "village" of Foundouklia," where 1,700 men were supposedly shut up in one village church and many killed, etc. (F.O. 371-5057, no. E14500).

The Greek Orthodox Church actively campaigned for its people and often told the Allies of atrocities committed upon Greeks by Turks. Many of their allegations were made out of whole cloth, but some were accurate, particularly those made against the Nationalist bands, anti-Nationalist bands (Çerkes Ethem, et al.), and bandits. For example, see F.O. 371-6516, no. 6596, letter from Greek Archbishop of Neopolis, Casarea [*sic*], transmitted by the Greek legation to Curzon, London, 6 June 1921. See also F.O. 371-6518, no. E7104, Bulletin of the Greek Patriarchate, Constantinople, 16 March 1921.

Of course, the Greek press printed many claims of Turkish atrocities. See F.O. 371-6516, no. 6608, Granville to Curzon, Athens, 27 May 1921.

On the Iznik massacres, see F.O. 371-5214, no. 13849, de Robeck to Curzon, Constantinople, 21 October 1920. In this document, the General Headquarters of the Army of the Black Sea ("G.H.Q.A.B.S.") blamed "Djemal Bey," who was reportedly also responsible for attacking and burning Turkish villages. The G.H.Q.A.B.S. was, however, not reliable in its assessments.

For a particularly absurd summary of Turkish atrocities, see the "Further Notes on Recent Turkish Atrocities," by G. W. Rendel of the Foreign Office (F.O. 371-7957, no. E 11885). Rendel did not hesitate to lie about his evidence (the reports of the missionary Jacquith), nor suppress evidence that told the truth about Turkish atrocities. See F.O. 371-7956, no. E1 1639 for an intelligence summary of which Rendel tried to halt distribution because it dared to report that "the Archbishop of Smyrna stated a few days before the fire that Smyrna would not be handed to the Turks intact."

Whereas statements of massacres of Muslims, which arrived from numerous sources, were questioned by the British and openly doubted unless they had been personally seen or thoroughly investigated by British officers, baseless rumors of atrocities perpetrated on Greeks and Armenians were often routinely accepted, especially in the first days of the conflict. This often caused British officials to retract previous statements and analyses when the truth emerged. For example, Greek-instigated reports of Turkish atrocities in Aydin Vilâyeti and elsewhere were rife in 1919, including an alleged awful massacre of Greeks at Uşak. These were duly reported to London, usually described as balancing off the Greek atrocities in Aydm Vilâyeti. When the "Turkish atrocities" were investigated, however, they disappeared:

It is noteworthy that, except at two or three places within or in close proximity to the zone of operations in the Aydin vilâyet, where Christians were massacred by irregular and uncontrolled bands in retaliation for Greek atrocities, there have been nowhere any instances of massacre of the Christian inhabitants by the Moslems.

Thus, the rumor of a massacre at Ushak (the subject of my telegram No. 1604 of the 4th August and your Lordship's telegram No. 1327 of the 9th August) proves to have been without foundation, and though the town was occupied by irregulars belonging to the National Army, measures were taken that the Christian population should not be molested. (F.O. 371-4158, no. 130723, Webb to Curzon, Constantinople, 7 September 1919.)

The Foreign Office Indexes of Correspondence are instructive examples of British anti-Turkish prejudices. Listed under the heading "Atrocities" one finds the word "alleged" applied to Greek atrocities, as in "alleged massacre of Turks by Greeks in -----." The word is not used for reports of Turkish actions, despite the fact that they are less reliable, i.e., "Massacre of Greeks by Turks at -----."

128. Halide Edib captured the vengeful feelings of the Turks by quoting Turkish village women appealing to Mustafa Kemal Paşa ("thou" here is the Turkish "sen"):

Thou must avenge our wrongs, if thou ever catchest their women, thou must see that they are treated as we were treated. . . . Oh, the dogs, the pigs . . . they have treated us as if we were mire, abomination under their heels.

(*The Turkish Ordeal*, p. 360)

Halide Edib gives many other examples of the deep hatred felt by the surviving villagers.

129.U.S. 867,00/632, Kehl to Secretary of State, Salonica, 25 June 1914.

130.U.S. 867.00/625, Horton to Secretary of State, Smyrna, 10 June 1914. Horton's evidence must be taken with some skepticism because he was anything but an unprejudiced observer, but the boycott does seem to have taken place. On Turkish chettU+000E9 attacks on Greeks at the time, see Smith, *Ionian Vision*, pp. 30-32.

131.Ladas (p. 16) estimated 150,000, but his figures were always high where Greeks were concerned. The Greek government gave vastly different estimates (all of them tremendous overstatements) of the numbers of Greeks who had been deported or fled from Anatolia before the war: 300,000 (F.O. 371-6535, no. E12720, "Memorandum Communicated by the Greek Delegation," received 14 November

-324-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 324.

1921) and 727,000 (Greece, *Anti-Greek Persecution in Turkey*, London, 1921). Ahmet Emin, on the other side, felt that the Greek migration situation was not serious (*Turkey in the World War*, New Haven, 1930, pp. 210-11). American Ambassador Morgenthau sent home information on the deportations of Greeks in 1914, all from Greek sources. See U.S. 867.00/630, Morgenthau to Secretary of State, Constantinople, 19 June 1914.

132.Approximately the boundaries of the Vilâyet of Trabzon in 1895, i.e., before the detachment of Canik Sancati.

133. F.O. 371-6526, no. E9289, Rumbold to Curzon, Constantinople, 10 August 1921, transmits copy of correspondence between Admiral Bristol and Youssouf Kemal. The Ottoman government gave essentially the same answer as the Nationalists, e.g., "Grand Vezier has now responded [to question on deportations] that removal of all men capable of bearing arms was necessitated by Greek bombardment of Black Sea coast towns and insurrectionary movement in Pontus" (F.O. 371-6526, no. E9144, Telegram from Rumbold, Constantinople, 10 August 1921).

134. The British Control Officer in the east, Colonel Rawlinson, estimated that 20,000 to 30,000 Greeks of the Pontus were in bands in the Black Sea range and acting against the Nationalists. This was undoubtedly an overstatement of numbers, but it is nevertheless indicative of the problem facing the Turks (F.O. 3717878, no. E5362, Rawlinson's conversation with Rendel, 23 May 1922).

135. On the Pontic Rebellion and the Greek Church, see U.S. 767.68116/30, Caffery to Secretary of State, Athens, 15 May 1922, transmitting letter from "The Central Committee of the Greek Dioceses of Pontus", Constantinople, 20 May 1922. See also Justin McCarthy, "Greek Statistics on Ottoman Greek Population," *International Journal of Turkish Studies* 1 (2), 1980, pp. 66-76, on the support of the Bishop of Trabzon for Greek separatism.

136. See other sources in notes 134 and 137.

137. See F.O. 371-7876, no. E 4648, telegram from Rumbold, Constantinople, 10 May 1922. Volume F.O. 371-7877 is full of material on the deportations. Reading that volume of documents, it quickly becomes evident that all was based on missionary reports. The most complete collection of the missionary accusations is contained in U.S. 867.4016/588, Bristoly to Secretary of State, Constantinople, 12 July 1922.

British Control Officer Colonel Rawlinson said that Greek villages on the Black Sea coast were indeed deserted, but that 20,000 to 30,000 Greeks had joined Greek bands against the Nationalists (F.O. 371-7878, no. E5362, interview with Colonel Rawlinson, 23 May 1922).

The Nationalists asked H. J. Jacquith, Director of the Constantinople

Area of Near East Relief, to go to Harput and investigate the charge of Richard Yowell. He went. (See F.O. 371-7878, no. E5381, telegram from the *Chicago Tribune*, 21 May 1922.) In a letter, Jacquith said that all was well with the Christians in Harput (F.O. 371-7880, no. E6575, 22 June 1922). The British could not believe that he had said such and he was interviewed. He said that he had indeed sent the letter (F.O. 371-7880, no. E7288, Henderson to Balfour, Constantinople, 18 July 1922).

For a rebuttal of Yowell by Near East Relief agents Billings and Jacquith,

-325-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 325.

see F.O. 371-7878, no. E5692, from the Anatolian News Agency. *The Times* of 25 May 1922 contained a Turkish rebuttal of the Yowell charges. See also F.O. 371-6538, no. 14360, U.S. Near East Relief Reports.

138. Approximately 65,000 Pontic Greeks died in the period from 1912 to 1922. (Actually, their population was 65,000 less in 1922 than in 1912, so the proper term is "population loss," not **death**.) This includes deaths from wartime conditions, mortality in forced and unforced migrations during the World War, attacks by bandits/chettés, epidemics, etc. Considering that by no means all the Greeks of the region were deported, a mortality of 8,000 on the forced march is not ridiculous (*Muslims and Minorities*, pp. 112-13. The Anatolian emigrants who first went to Greece, then to America and elsewhere, as well as those who died before being counted in the Greek census, have been distributed according to their percentage in the entire emigrant population). Other figures that give a much greater estimate of mortality are very unlikely.

For descriptive, bloody, and not necessarily accurate tales of the deportations, see F.O. 371-7381, no. E8286, "The Statement of Ethel Thompson, Boston, Mass". The missionary Dr. Kennedy estimated that 15,000 Greeks were deported from the city of Sivas alone (F.O. 371-6536, no. E13197, note from Dr. Kennedy, Constantinople, 21 November 1921). When one considers that the last Ottoman census

(the 1330*Nüfus*) showed only 728 Greeks living in the city of Sivas and surrounding villages, such a figure is indeed remarkable. On the numbers of deportees from various towns, see F.O. 371-4157, no. 83004, Webb to Curzon, Constantinople, 20 May 1919, transmitting the report of Lt. J. S. Perring.

139. This statement is more true for the west than for the east, because war was more or less constant in eastern Anatolia and the Caucasus.

140. See Toynbee, p. 278.

I have not included here any consideration of unsubstantiated claims made against Turks, some of which were probably true, but not easily accounted for or proved. Many seem to have been made up out of thin air. See, for example, the claims of the Greek ambassador at London, Mr. Ranyaki, that "Kemalist Bands" pillaged and tortured Greeks and Armenians in Kayseri. No further identification of the bands was given, nor any justification of the description as "Kemalist." There is, in fact, good reason to doubt that a massacre took place.

141. F.O. 371-4219, no. 104611, Morgan to Calthorpe, Smyrna, 24 June 1919.

142. F.O. 286-759, no. E6204, Rumbold to Curzon, Constantinople, 20th May 1921, transmitting the Interim Report of the Commission of Enquiry on the Ismidt Peninsula (Colonel Farmer).

143. F.O. 371-4157, no. 18850, Palmer to Calthorpe, Eski Shehir, 27 December 1918. See also F.O. 371-4157, no. 18835, Calthorpe to Balfour, Constantinople, 17 January 1919, transmitting a letter from Mr. King on Turkish refusal to give houses to Greeks in Samsun.

144. F.O. 371-4157, no. 49189, Perring to the British High Commissioner, Constantinople, 5 March 1919.

145. F.O. 371-7956, no. E11426, telegram from Rumbold, Constantinople, 21 October 1922.

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 326.

F.O. 371-7956, no. E11639, Summary of Intelligence, no. 4, 25 October 1922.

146. After the Greek army had left İzmir, all remaining Greek males from the ages of 17 to 45 were taken into custody by the Nationalists. Although most of these males may have been noncombatants, the Turks had reason to fear the actions of Greek males. There must also have been a large element of reprisal. The Greeks were mainly kept in labor battalions. Their lives surely cannot have been pleasant. I have found conflicting evidence on their treatment. The Greek Red Cross complained that the Greek P.O.W.s had been roughly used (The Anglo-Hellenic League, *The Treatment of the Greek Prisoners in Turkey*, London, 1923). On the other hand, the American Smyrna Disaster Relief Committee said that the Greek prisoners had been treated well (U.S. 867.4016/813, Treat to Secretary of State, Smyrna, 9 December 1922, transmitting the letter of the Chairman and Secretary of the Smyrna Disaster Relief Committee). The Greek P.O.W.s were finally exchanged for Turkish prisoners or in the general population exchange. See also F.O. 371-7956, no. E11251, enclosure 1, Dr. Nansen to High Commissioners of Allied Powers.

147. "The discipline of the Turkish troops [entering İzmir] was good, and except for a few minor incidents the situation was calm" (W.O. 106-1502, General Staff Report no. 12, 11 September 1922). See also W.O. 106-1501, C.R.A.F./131/5/ "GR"/2, "Greco-Turkish Operations Part II, September 3rd to September 11th." See Heath Lowry, *Turkish History: On Whose Sources Will It Be Based? A Case Study on the Burning of İzmir*, *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, vol. IX, 1988.

148. Like many of the questions arising out of this period, the fire in İzmir has generated debate, although many have been satisfied to simply blame the Turks without evaluating the evidence. For that type of

study, the most prominent work is Marjorie Housepian, *The Smyrna Affair*. For a study that considers other sources, see Lowry, "Burning of İzmir".

149. *Muslims and Minorities*, p. 132.

150. F.O. 371-4224, no. 10731 (duplicated in F.O. 608-271, no. 10731), de Robeck to Curzon, Constantinople, 27 December 1919. See also F.O. 286-759, High Commissioner to Curzon, 3 January 1920.

151. F.O. 371-4224, no. 10731 (duplicated in F.O. 608-271, no. 10731), de Robeck to Curzon, Constantinople, 27 December 1919.

152. F.O. 371-5133, no. E3866, Webb to Curzon, Constantinople, 17 April 1920, transmitting military intelligence reports.

153. F.O. 371-5133, no. E5032, Webb to Curzon, Constantinople, 22 April 1920.

154. Second Section of the General Staff of the Western Front, *Greek Atrocities in Asia Minor, First Part*, Constantinople, 1922, pp. 109-10.

155. F.O. 371-4221, no. 12447, Aivali Report by Hadkinson, 7 August 1919.

156. F.O. 371-4220, no. 115562, Calthorpe to Curzon, Constantinople, 1 August 1919. F.O. 371-4224, no. 170731, Advanced British Headquarters, General Staff, "Intelligence," Smyrna, No. 1021/S.I., "Report on the Situation at Odemish and Tireh by I. O. Odemish Dated 5-12-1919," and F.O. 371-4224, no. 170731, Advanced British Headquarters, General Staff, "Intelligence," Smyrna, No. 1023/ S.I., "Digest of Report from I. O. Aidin on Visit to Tireh."

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 327.

157.*Les Grecs à Smyrne, Nouveau témoignages sur leurs atrocités, Paris, 1920, pp. 32-37.*

158.F.O. 371-9061, no. E969, "*Memorandum respecting Turkish Claims against Greece*", by M. Lausanne İsmet, 20 January 1923.

159.F.O. 371-4221. no. 124447, Webb to Curzon, Constantinople, 24 August 1919, enclosure B, Lt. Comdr. Hadkinson to B.N.R. Smyrna, Aivali, 4.7.19, "Aivali Report."

160.F.O. 371-9061, no. E969, *Memorandum respecting Turkish Claims against Greece, by M. İsmet, Lausanne, 20 January 1923.*

161.Ottoman Government, *Rapports officiels reçus des autorités militaires Ottomanes sur l'occupation de Smyrne par les troupes Helléniques, Constantinople, 1919, pp. 50 and 51.*

162.See F.O. 371-6561, no. E813, Rumbold to Curzon, Constantinople, Jan 3, 1920, for a summary.

163.F.O. 371-9061, no. E969, "*Mémoire relatif aux dévastations grecques en Asie Mineure*" by İsmet Paşa (İnönü), Lausanne, 20 January 1923. Presented as the basis for Turkish claims for reparations at the Lausanne Peace Conference. İsmet Paşa included in his figures the number of buildings lost in İzmir, including the loss from the Smyrna Fire. Those figures (18,865 buildings destroyed, £175,905,108) have not been included in the figures in the tables.

The total value of the buildings destroyed, as listed in Table Five, was given by the Turks as £T305,271,214. This must have been a rough estimation, despite the seeming precision of the figures. One cannot believe that there was either an accurate method of evaluating property or the time to take such a detailed survey of losses. My own guess is

that they took a figure for what houses in a region should have cost, usually between £T200 and 400, multiplied that figure by the number of houses, then added the estimated replacement costs of the larger buildings, monuments, etc. Such a procedure would probably result in a not unreasonable set of estimates.

164.*ibid.* The total value of the rural buildings destroyed was given as £T177,310,945. The total for all buildings (excluding İzmir), urban and rural, was given as £T482,582,159.

165.U.S. 767.68116, a copy of Bureau de Presse de la Delegation Turque, *Atrocités et divastations Grecques en Anatolie, Lausanne, 1923. This volume contains pictures of towns, villages, government buildings, etc. that were burned or otherwise destroyed, along with pictures of dead bodies, wounded civilians, etc. See also an earlier publication of the Bureau, Le Régime d'Occupation hellénique en Turquie, Lausanne, 1921, which gives detailed personal stories and pictures.*

166.F.O. 371-4221, no. 121623, Summary Prepared for Lord Curzon, 26 August 1919. See also F.O. 371-4221, no. 124447, Morgan to High Commissioner, Smyrna, 12 August 1919.

167.See the mistreatment of Ottoman officials detailed in F.O. 371-6561, E813 and F.O. 286-759, High Commissioner to Curzon, 3 January 1920.

168.See, for example, the comments of de Robeck and of Ismail Djenany [sic] in F.O. 371-5132, no. E1336, de Robeck to Curzon, Constantinople, 8 February 1920. Also, F.O. 371-4224, no. 168764, de Robeck to Curzon, Constantinople, 20 December 1919.

169.F.O. 371-3658, no. 75891, intercepted telegram from Ethem Bey, mutessarif of Janik Sandjak to the Minister of the Interior, 9 April 1919.

170.F.O. 371-6561, no. E813, Rumbold to Curzon, 3 January 1920 and F.O. 286-759, High Commissioner to Curzon, 3 January 1920.

171."At Alashehir the Kaimakam Rifaat Bey sent five successive reports to the Greek Commandant complaining of various outrages by Greek troops. He received a conciliatory answer to his first complaint, with promises of redress, but no action whatsoever was taken, and to his further complaints he received no answer at all.

"As the excesses of the Greek troops continued, he then wrote to the Italian Consul at Smyrna, enclosing copies of his reports, and explaining the situation.

"The Italian Consul approached the Greek authorities at Smyrna, but their only action was the arrest and deportation of the Kaimakam, Mufti, and twenty-five other prominent citizens of Alashehir" (F.O. 371-6557, no. E10550, "Note by Mrs. Arnold Toynbee," 20 September 1921, no place listed).

172.U.S. 767.68116/3, Bristol to State, Constantinople, 22 April 1920, transmitting reports from the Society for the Defense of Ottoman Rights -- Smyrna.

173.Of those known. Most of the deportees, of course, were never individually identified. Statements would usually read "14 notables" or give titles of their positions (e.g., kaymakam, station master, etc.).

174.This summary is based on the description of Greek activities made by İzzet Paşa in a letter to the British High Commissioner. High Commissioner Rumbold commented that the report received from British consul Sir Harry Lamb "generally appears to corroborate the charges of the Turkish government in this respect" (F.O. 371-7921, no. E3039, Rumbold to Curzon, Constantinople, 14 March 1922, transmitting İzzet Paşa letter of February 20).

175.F.O. 371-4219, no. 98615, Appendix L.1, translation of a letter to the Representatives of the Allies in Magnesia.

176.F.O. 371-7931, no. E1433, telegram from General Harington to War Office, Constantinople, 31 January 1922.

177.F.O. 371-4221, no. 121623, "Memorandum respecting the Greek Occupation of Smyrna," prepared for Lord Curzon, 26 August 1919.

178.F.O. 371-5214, no. E14889, Rumbold to Curzon, Constantinople, 19 November 1920.

179.Greece, Bureau de la presse du Ministère des Affaires Entrangères [*sic*], *La Grece en Asie-Mineure, Athens, 1921. These figures are statistically highly suspect, but probably give a general idea of the number of Christian refugees, less a certain amount for exaggeration. Even if one did not know of the errors found in similar Greek statistics on Asia Minor (see McCarthy, "Greek Statistics"), one would doubt these figures on account of their form. The tables of refugees by place in the volume are precise to the single digit, but they always add up to very round numbers.*

For example (p. 29), the following is purportedly an exact count of the population:

-329-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 329.

Village	Households Inhabitants	
Kandirli Grecs	199	868
Fourladjik Grecs	55	285

Arvanitokhori Grecs	48	253	
Ortakeuy-Gheive Grecs	50	249	
Armoutlou Grecs	116	534	
Tchinar Grecs	109	467	
Veziir-Han Grecs	92	359	
Aghia-Kyriaki Grecs	182	939	
Houri Grecs	310	1,148	
Kyouplia Grecs	35	186	
Elmali Grecs	81	337	
Kiz-Derveni Greco-Bul.	606	<u>1,875</u>	7,500 [Greeks]
Bazar-Keuy Turcs	18	110	110 [Turks]
Yalova Armeniens	35	76	
Keramet Armeniens	45	91	
Tchenghirlar Armeniens	138	320	
Ortakeuy Armeniens	82	156	
Merdekhet Armeniens	23	51	
Yeni-Keuy Armeniens	300	<u>967</u>	1,661 [Armenians]
Vill. Circassiens (Cir.)	10	<u>70</u>	70 [Circassians]
Turcs de Kara-Bounar	14	63	
Turcs Divers		<u>596</u>	659 [Other Turks]
	2,548	10,000 [Total]	

That such figures would conveniently add up to exactly 7,500 Greeks and 10,000 total population seems impossible. It is much more likely that the totals were first decided, then figures assigned for the individual villages.

180. *ibid.*, p. 27 : "10,000 refugees, of whom 2,500 Turks, Circassians, and

Armenians."

181.F.O. 371-9890, no. C21226, "Extracts from a Report by Dr. Nansen", Geneva, 18 November 1922.

182.For a description of the process of granting loans to the Greek government, see Ladas, pp. 633-39. See also Louis P. Cassimatis, *American Influence in Greece 1917-1929*, Kent, Ohio, 1988, chapters 7 and 8.

183.F.O. 371-5140, no. 1448.

184.Toynbee, p. 169.

185.F.O.371-4220, no. 120245, copy of a letter from M. Fitzmaurice (Commander of the British Aegean Squadron) to the British High Commissioner, in which he forwards Giovannini's letter, Smyrna, 18 July 1919.

186.Morgan felt that there were 40,000 refugees at Soma; Hadkinson believed there were 50,000 (F.O. 371-4221, no. 124451, letters of 14 August and 29 June 1919).

187.F.O. 371-4236, no. 146926, "Report by Mr. Blair Fish," Constantinople, 30 September 1919.

188.F.O. 371-5135, Ottoman Foreign Ministry (Damad Ferid Paşa) to de Robeck, 31 July 1920.

189.F.O. 371-4218, no. 94623, Calthorpe to Curzon, Constantinople, 10 June 1919, telegrams from Ottoman officials to the Ottoman foreign Ministry.

190.F.O. 371-9061, no. 969, ismet Paşa to the President of the Third Commission, Lausanne, 20 January 1923, "Memorandum respecting Turkish Claims against Greece." This record contains village by village figures for many areas and includes costs of property and animals destroyed, as well as buildings.

191.Eight hundred thousand at five to a building. Of course, many of the buildings destroyed may have belonged to Greeks, who made up approximately 14 percent of the prewar population of the area. However, not all the houses of Muslim refugees were destroyed.

192.F.O. 371-4429, no. 146296.

193.F.O. 371-5824, no. 12031. This figure must include Russian and other refugees as well.

194.League of Nations, *Report of the Work of the High Commission for Refugees presented by Dr. Fridtjof Nansen to the Fourth Assembly*, Geneva, 4 September 1923. The refugee numbers in Istanbul had gone down considerably by the end of the war. See Clarence R. Johnson, ed., *Constantinople Today*, New York, 1922, p. 206.

195.For the mortality in the provinces occupied by Greek forces see Table 29.

Mortality for the provinces of Aydin, Hüdavendigâr, and İzmit was 704,283. However, many people must have been killed in Ankara Vilâyeti, which was a center of battle at the farthest point of Greek incursion. In addition, there was mortality, particularly refugee mortality, in Konya Vilâyeti. I have arbitrarily taken 95,000 from the mortality figures of those two vilâyets to make a figure of 800,000 from the Greek invasion. Again arbitrarily, I have assumed that 20 percent of that mortality took place during World War I, primarily the deaths of

soldiers who fought on the various Ottoman fronts and deaths from poor wartime conditions (e.g., malnutrition). World War I was not fought in western and central Anatolia, so 20 percent of that high figure of mortality seems to be, if anything, an overstatement (but since it works against my hypothesis to assume a large world war mortality, I have assumed a high figure, 20 percent). The resulting figure for mortality from the Greco-Turkish War is 640,000.

196. Consul Keel in Sofia stated (2 November 1920) that 9,000 had been counted, but that the numbers were probably greater (F.O. 371-5253, no. 613950).

197. The 1920 Greek census was inferior to other Greek censuses both in collection and publication. The statistics by religion and mother tongue for the region taken from Turkey have not, to my knowledge, ever been published. Only general figures of total population were printed and these often appear to be large undercounts. The census was published in various forms from 1921 to 1928. See especially Greece, Ministère de l'Economie Nationale, Direction de la Statistique, *Population du Royaume de Grece d'après le Recensement du 19 Décembre, 1920, Athens, 1921, and Greece, Ministère de l'Economie Nationale, Statistique Generale de la Grece, Recensement de la Population de la Grece au 19 Décembre 1920, Athens, 1928. The former included statistics from areas in eastern Thrace occupied by Greece, but later returned to Turkey; the latter did not.*

198. F.O. 371-5284, no. 12031.

199. This is a speculative figure. The British estimated 65,000 "destitute Muslim refugees" (F.O. 371-6561, no. 14164 and F.O. 371-7931) in Istanbul in 1921 and 1922, 75,000 by 1923 (F.O. 371-9098, no. 7663). Since most of the refugees from

Anatolia did not go to Istanbul, but rather went to areas held by Nationalists, 30,000 is a reasonable number. The British general Harrington reported to the War Office that "these (65,000) unfortunate Moslems have fled from Greek rule in eastern Thrace and the southern shores of the Marmara" (F.O. 371-7931, 31 January 1922).

200. Figures for the original population are taken from *Muslims and Minorities* and the in-migration figures from the Balkan Wars chapter. It is important to note that the "loss" column figures are actually of "population loss," not mortality.

That is, they are the remainder when the population of each province in 1922 is subtracted from the population in 1912. This is not strictly speaking "mortality," but is the closest possible approximation.

Mortality figures here are higher than those that appear in *Muslims and Minorities*, because of the inclusion of in-migration in the mortality equation. Not to include in-migration was an omission in *Muslims and Minorities*.

-332-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 332.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE END OF THE MUSLIM LAND

After the wars ended, Muslim communities in an area as large as all of western Europe ¹ had been diminished or destroyed. The great Turkish communities of the Balkans had shrunk to a fraction of their former numbers. In the Caucasus, Circassians, Laz, Abkhazians, Turks, and many from smaller Muslim groups had been forced out. Anatolia, the one region where the Turks had triumphed, was completely changed, its Christian minorities gone, western and eastern Anatolia in near ruins. One of history's

great tragedies had been acted out.

EFFECTS

As might be expected, but is seldom acknowledged in textbooks, the deaths and migration of millions of Muslims greatly affected the political, economic, and social systems of the Ottoman Empire and its successors. The main effects are obvious. The ethnic and religious homogeneity of regions from Serbia to the Caucasus was a result of the expulsion of Muslims. The size and power of Russia (later the U.S.S.R.) were also directly related to Russian expansion at the expense of Muslims in southern Russia, the Crimea, and the Caucasus. However, other effects, not quite so obvious, may need clarification. Among them are the effects of the Turkish national disaster on the policies of the Ottoman and Turkish Republican governments and on the makeup of the Turkish population.

-333-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 333.

THE POLICIES OF THE OTTOMAN GOVERNMENT AND THE LESSONS OF HISTORY

The Eastern Question has been a part of European diplomatic history for generations. Presented in calm and scholarly prose and accompanied by maps showing progressive loss of Ottoman territory, numerous volumes have detailed the wars and diplomatic machinations that resulted in the destruction of the Ottoman Empire. The human losses that accompanied the resolution of the Eastern Question are unmentioned. But for the Turks and other Muslims, the Eastern Question was more than a loss of territory, more than damage to the imperial prestige of the "Sick Man of Europe"; it represented massive loss of human lives. Judged by the proportion of deaths and refugees to the total population, no other European country had suffered such a loss since the Thirty Years' War.

Historians may have ignored the effects of demographic events on political decisions, but governments of the time could not. When the Ottomans battled the revolutionaries in Greece, they were attempting to avenge the murder of thousands of their Turkish compatriots and forestall a similar fate overtaking the other Turks of Europe, not simply trying to prop up a dying empire. After 1878, the danger to the Turks and other Muslims of Europe was brought home to the Ottomans by the presence of hundreds of thousands of refugees at their door. Therefore, when the Ottomans attempted to hold Macedonia or eastern Anatolia, they were protecting their people from what they could only expect to be **exile** and slaughter. It was not merely a political problem of the sort that might worry any other country. When France lost Alsace-Lorraine to Germany, it did not expect that the French in those provinces would be massacred and expelled. Austria did not expect such a fate would overcome the Germans of the Tyrol after Italian occupation. Yet that was precisely what the Turks could expect of the conquest of their territories. The effect of such rational expectations on Ottoman policy has seldom been considered or analyzed. Indeed, the Ottoman defense of territory is often made to appear as the act of a declining empire trying illegitimately to hold on to its lands, despite the wishes of the Christian inhabitants and in the face of inevitable defeat. The impression is of an empire either cruel or stupid, not of an empire trying vainly to defend the lives of its people. Viewing

-334-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 334.

late Ottoman history solely as a noble defense of Ottoman subjects would be an indefensible obfuscation of the many other factors that affected Ottoman political decisions. Ignoring the empire's attempted defense of its people is equally indefensible.

The best example of historical obfuscation may be the traditional treatment that World War I in the Ottoman East has received in contemporary histories. Most histories only mention the Ottoman deportation of Armenians. Devoid of its historical context, the Ottoman decision to deport the Armenians appears to have been irrational, motivated primarily by hatred of a minority. In fact, from the history of events in the Balkans and the Caucasus, the Ottomans knew what to expect from nationalist revolution and Russian invasion of eastern Anatolia. In Bulgaria, Greece, and

Macedonia, the same processes had led to the slaughter of Turks. Could the Ottomans expect any difference in Anatolia? For 100 years, the Russians had expanded by pushing out Muslims. They had forced out the Crimean Tatars and the Circassians. In the southern Caucasus, they had replaced Turks with Armenians. In 1915, the Russians were poised to advance once again. Armenian revolutionary groups had already begun their rebellion all over eastern Anatolia, killing Muslim villagers and even seizing the city of Van. What fate could the Muslims of the east expect when the Russians invaded? The same fate that befell the Turks of Bulgaria or Macedonia.

The Ottoman government could not ignore the lessons of Ottoman history. In its historical context, the deportation of Ottoman Armenians is logical. This is not to pass moral judgment on deportations -- the actions of all groups in the World War I period were so filled with inhumanity that no group should cast the first stone. However, if one examines the history of forced migration and mortality that Turks and other Muslims underwent, one finds an explanation for the Armenian deportations as part of a historical process. That is in every way preferable to theories that explain historical events simply as a series of irrational actions.

THE MAKEUP OF THE POPULATION OF TURKEY

The migrations of the nineteenth century greatly increased the number of Muslims in the Ottoman Empire. Because it is presently

-335-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 335.

impossible to estimate accurately the population of much of Ottoman Europe at the beginning of the nineteenth century, only eastern Thrace, Istanbul, and Anatolia can be used for purposes of comparison. In that area, approximately within the boundaries of modern Turkey, the Muslim percentage of the population increased through migration from roughly 70 percent to 80 percent of the total from 1800 to 1912, immediately before the Balkan Wars. The Armenian and Greek population, even though it greatly increased in size from natural increase, fell from 21 percent to 17

percent of the total. The in-migration of more than 400,000 Turks during and after the Balkan Wars further increased the Muslim majority, but these population changes, which took place in 1912-13, were dwarfed by the changes during and immediately after World War I, which resulted in a demographically Muslim and Turkish republic.

After the wars, the new Turkish Republic was a nation greatly affected by the in-migration of the past hundred years. Most histories recognize the great effect that out-migration of Christian minorities had on Turkey, but do not discuss the effect of the millions of Muslim immigrants and their descendants. There is no way to trace exactly the demographic impact of Muslim refugees on the population of Turkey. However, one can make a rough model of the place of the refugees and their descendants in the population of the Republic. If the refugees went through the same demographic conditions as the rest of the Muslim population of Anatolia and Thrace, they and their descendants would have been close to three million by 1923, or nearly one-fifth of the total Muslim population of Turkey. The refugees settled primarily in western Anatolia, Istanbul, eastern Thrace, and parts of northeastern and southern Anatolia. The descendants of the refugees would have made up almost one-third of the population of those "target" areas. ²

THE POLICIES OF THE TURKISH REPUBLIC

After the defeat of the Greeks in Anatolia, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and his fellow Turkish Nationalists set upon the radical restructuring of the Ottoman government, economy, and society and the creation of the Turkish Republic. One of the social and political bases of the new republic was the disastrous history of the past 100 years, particularly the losses of the 1912-22 wars. The

-336-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 336.

effects of the great Muslim and Turkish losses continued in the postwar years, affecting both foreign and domestic policy in the new republic of

Turkey.

The foreign policy of the Turkish Republic was one of pacific neutrality. Even in the 1930s, when nationalism and irredentism took on renewed strength throughout much of Europe, Turkey remained officially content with the territories that remained in Anatolia and eastern Thrace. To understand Turkish foreign policy one must consider Turkey as a land of recent refugee in-migration and massive mortality. Atatürk and his followers could never afford to forget that a large portion of the Turks had been forced out of the Balkans. Nor could they ignore the hatred created by the Greek invasion of Anatolia. Indeed, it would have been easy to fan the flames of irredentism and heed cries of "On to Salonica" in the period after the Anatolian War. To do so would have meant the survival of the old ideal of a military state. It may, or may not, have resulted in the expansion of Turkey, but it would surely have meant an outward-looking, expansionist state, not the inward-looking, reformist state envisioned by Atatürk. By denying any expression of irredentism, Atatürk turned the energy of citizenry and government to reform. In other words, the history of refugee migration and mortality forced the Turkish government into a quiescent foreign policy. Any other policy would have meant disaster for much-needed reform of the economy and society. This in no way diminishes the wisdom of the leaders who chose Turkish foreign policy. Lesser men would have chosen "glory" over the hard task of remaking society.

Can anyone believe that radical reforms of the type initiated by Atatürk would have been successful in the nineteenth century? Atatürk altered language, the place of religion, the form of government, education, clothing, even the self-identification of the people (from "Muslim" to "Turk"). No other Middle Eastern leader so succeeded in radical reform, though others tried. Would a people firmly embedded in the "old ways" and convinced of the righteousness of their conservative life-styles have accepted such reforms? Almost surely not. But the Turks of 1923 were not such a people. They had seen, in the most awful and impressive fashion, that the old ways did not work. Almost one-fourth of their fellow countrymen were dead. Hundreds of thousands who had depended on the sultan were displaced, living a precarious existence in a new land. A leader

-337-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 337.

of exceptional force and vision was needed to guide reform, but their own history must have convinced the Turks themselves that reform was needed.

CONCLUSION -- MORTALITY AND MIGRATION

Statistics are inadequate indicators of horrifying loss. They can but outline the enormity of human suffering. Numbers of dead enumerated in the millions stupefy one's senses. Strangely enough, considering the details of one person's **death** affects us emotionally more than the knowledge that millions died. Nevertheless, the statistics must be seen to gauge the scope of Muslim losses.

The numbers in Table 30 are low estimates of Muslim mortality. Many Muslim dead were never recorded or even estimated. Moreover, in calculating the figures in the table, low estimates have always been chosen. Had high estimates been taken, the final figures of both mortality and migration would have increased by millions. (For example, Kemal Karpat has estimated that 2 million Caucasian Muslims were driven out, of whom 1.5 million survived.) ³Deaths of Muslim soldiers and deaths of civilians who were not in war zones (from war-caused famine, disease, etc.) have not been included, even though they can justifiably be called the results of the same factors that killed those recorded in the table. (For example, Muslim population losses in Anatolia from 1914 to 1922 were actually almost three million; only 2.4 million are listed in the table because central and northern areas of Anatolia that were not in the war zone have been excluded.) With the exception of the figures for the period from 1914 to 1922, most of the Turkish soldiers who died in the wars are also not included. Soldiers from Anatolia, in particular, fought in all the Ottoman-Russian wars and died in great numbers.

If estimates for the "unknowns" are factored in, approximately five and one-half million Muslim dead are the result. More than five million ⁴refugees had been driven from their homes, many ultimately to be figured among the dead.

TABLE 30. MORTALITY AND MIGRATION OF MUSLIMS.

	Deaths		Refugees
Greek Revolution	25,000*	10,000*	(number setting out)
Caucasian Wars, 1827-29	unknown	26,000	(number surviving)
Crimean Expulsion	75,000*	300,000	(number setting out)
Caucasian Expulsion	400,000*	1,200,000	(number setting out)
Bulgaria, 1877-78	260,000	515,000	(number setting out)
Eastern War, 1877-78	unknown	70,000	(number surviving)
Balkan Wars	1,450,000	410,000	(number setting out)
Caucasus, 1905	unknown	--	
E. Anatolia, 1914-21	1,190,000	900,000	(internal refugees)
Caucasus, 1914-21	410,000	270,000	(number setting out)
W. Anatolia, 1914-22	1,250,000	480,000†	(number setting out)
		1,200,000	(internal refugees)
<hr/>			
	5,060,000	5,381,000	

* Rough estimates.

† Greco-Turkish Population Exchange.

NOTE: Most military mortality and some civilian mortality not included.

When the analyses are completed, the numbers of refugees and the dead tallied, and the blame apportioned, what remains is grief for all those who died, unwilling actors in the tragedy. The quantification of the demographer and the categorizing of the historian can too easily relegate the horror to

abstract ideas. Concepts such as "imperialism" and "nationalism" provide necessary and valuable explanations of historical phenomena, but they are not sufficient unto themselves. Although sympathy and empathy are seldom called upon in history books, they are necessary if one is to comprehend Muslim losses in the Balkans, the Crimea, the Caucasus, and Anatolia. One must try to comprehend the deaths of more than five million individual human beings and the destruction of the ordinary lives of millions of other individuals, millions of stories of individual horror. The task is impossible. Instead we are forced to

-339-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 339.

analyze statistics and consider mass movements of peoples, analyses by nature removed from the suffering that make up the data.

The true fate of these Muslims was only understood by those contemporaries who saw the dead and the dying, such as the railway official in Ottoman Bulgaria in 1878 who found one small Turkish girl alive among the frozen bodies of 400 refugees, some of whom must have been her family. The fate of these Muslims was the fate of her family, driven from their homes to die. It was also the fate of the small girl, rescued by strangers. The descendants of this girl as well as of all the others who survived form much of the citizenry of the modern Turkish Republic.

NOTES

1. Counting as "Western Europe": France, Spain, Portugal, Germany, and Italy -- not the British Isles.
2. These are extremely rough estimates, but can be taken to be generally true. To arrive at the totals, the refugees and their descendants were assumed to have kept a constant population until 1878, then to have increased at a rate of .013 per year until 1922. Twenty percent was subtracted for deaths in the period 1912-22. These rates were approximately true for the Muslim population of the "target" areas of immigration. No allowance was made for intermarriage of refugees and for

the original population. The actual proportion of refugee descendants was obviously a greater number than indicated here, and much more than one-fifth of the Muslim population of Turkey had at least one refugee ancestor, but the increase in the total population would have been unaffected; i.e., if the refugees had not come, the original inhabitants would have married others and had children. (The availability of n extra persons meant that n times the fertility rate extra children were born.)

3. Kemal H. Karpat, *Ottoman Population, 1830-1914: Social and Demographic Characteristics*, Madison, Wisconsin, 1985, p. 69.
4. The refugees in the table add up to slightly less than five million, but many are surviving refugees, not the greater number who set out; internal refugees, those within the Ottoman Empire, are often not included.

-340-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 340.

APPENDIX: METHODOLOGY AND CALCULATIONS

I. BULGARIAN MUSLIMS

There are only two sets of statistics upon which analyses of the pre-1878 Bulgarian population can be based -- The *salnames* (government yearbooks) of Tuna Vilâyeti and those of Edirne Vilâyeti. [Table 31](#) gives the recorded populations of the areas that were to become Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia in the salnames of the two provinces. The populations listed in [Table 31](#) were undercounted by approximately one-third, and the population figures in the text have been so adjusted. ¹The correction factor (original

population times 1.5) should not be taken to be exact. It is drawn from comparison with other Ottoman statistics and local conditions. For example, the correction factor drawn for Edirne Vilâyeti in 1911, when Ottoman statistics were much more accurate, was 1.2196, and the correction factor for Kosova Vilâyeti in the same year was 1.4056. ²In addition, this figure corresponds closely to the only accurate, contemporary estimate of the population of the Tuna Vilâyeti, that of British Consul Reade in Sumla, who corrected the Ottoman population undercount (a correction factor of 1.5470) in response to an inquiry from his government. ³When the correction factor of 1.5 is applied to the sections of Edirne Vilâyeti that remained in the Ottoman Empire, the results are fairly accurate. Unfortunately, because of the very events described in Chapter Three, such comparison cannot be made in the case of Muslims in Bulgaria. It does seem as if the correction factor, accurate for Edirne Vilâyeti, would probably be true for Tuna Vilâyeti. The figures arrived at, however, should be viewed as reasonable estimates, rather than as exact population statistics. Because the salname statistics were for the years 1285 (1868-69) and 1288 (1871-72), ⁴the populations were projected ahead to 1877 at a rate of .012 a year, the rate observed in Edirne Vilâyeti later, under similar conditions. ⁵

-341-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 341.

TABLE 31. RECORDED POPULATION OF BULGARIA IN 1285 (1868-69) AND 1288 (1871-72).

	Muslim	Non- Muslim	Gypsy*	Total
Edirne Sancađi				
Kizil Ađaç Kazasi	1,708	3,644		5,352

Pinar Hisar Kazasi	1,127	6,689		7,816
Filibe Sancađi (less Ahi Çelebi and Sultan Yeri kazas)	90,937	166,687		257,624
İslimiye Sancađi	35,577	49,287	1,496	86,360
<hr/>				
Edirne Vilâyeti Total	129,349	226,307	1,496	357,152
Tuna Vilâyeti (less Tulça Sancađi and Cuma Kazasi)	331,759	558,058		889,817
<hr/>				
Total	461,108	784,365	1,496	1,246,969

* Only listed as kibti. Not listed in Tuna Vilâyeti.

SOURCES: *Tuna Vilâyeti Salnamesi*, 1291. *Edirne Vilâyeti Salnamesi*, 1288.

TABLE 32. THE POPULATION OF BULGARIA IN 1887, BY RELIGIOUS GROUPS.

Religion	Population
Orthodox	2,424,371
Muslim	676,215
Catholic	18,505
Protestant	1,358
Jewish	24,352
Others	9,574

SOURCE: 1887 Census.

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 342.

The surviving population of Bulgarian Muslims in 1879 (Chapter Three) was found by taking the Bulgarian Muslim population as listed in the 1887 Bulgarian Census, ⁶ subtracting from it those Muslims who had migrated to the Ottoman Empire from 1879 to 1887, and adding the number of refugees surviving to 1879. ⁷ This procedure assumes that the Muslim population of Bulgaria had no natural increase between 1879 and 1887, a reasonable assumption given the conditions described in Chapter Three. It also assumes that the refugee statistics are relatively correct, which is a major assumption. I have assumed that the migration of Muslims from Bulgaria to the Ottoman Empire during the years from 1879 to 1887, which was not recorded as such, corresponded to that of 1887-92. The latter was assumed to be equal to the rate of diminution of the Muslim population of Bulgaria (assuming no natural increase) from the 1887 census to the 1892 census. ⁸ This would have been 52,731 migrants. In the same period, 1879-1887, the Ottoman government recorded 144,509 in-migrants, ⁹ many of whom would have come from Bulgaria. ¹⁰

When correction has been necessary, I have tried to correct statistics, in Chapter Three and elsewhere, so that they will "work against" my own hypothesis, in this case the assumption of an enormous Muslim loss in the period from 1877 to 1879. Therefore, the Muslim population of Bulgaria in 1877 may have been underestimated, the number of surviving refugees overestimated. If anything, the numbers of Muslim dead in the period might have been greater than I have stated.

II. CALCULATIONS OF MORTALITY, 1912-1922.

The calculations of mortality in the Balkans and western Anatolia have been explained extensively in my *Muslims and Minorities* and "The Population of Ottoman Europe". The system is basically one of finding population loss by subtracting the population of an area *after* the wars from that *before* the wars. Strictly speaking, the resulting figure is not mortality, but it is a close

approximation when allowance is made for migration.

The method of ascertaining deaths in World War I and the Turco-Armenian War in the Caucasus is the same as that applied for Anatolia, but there are specific difficulties due to the types of

-343-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 343.

population statistics available for Russia and the U.S.S.R. The Russian Empire kept population statistics by religion; the U.S.S.R. did not. Instead of religious identification, the 1926 U.S.S.R. census published extremely detailed statistics by ethnic group (190 groups). It is very difficult to compare two forms of data, because many ethnic groups were of mixed religions. Therefore, I have compared not religion, but the ethnic group "Turco-Tatar" in the last empire statistical document (the 1915 *Statistical Yearbook*) and in the 1926 U.S.S.R. census. I have assumed that the mortality for the "TurcoTatars" applied to Muslims as a whole. (Of the Transcaucasian Muslims in 1914, 79 percent were "Turco-Tatars.") This procedure should yield only mild discrepancies in calculating Muslim mortality. It yields a slightly lower estimate of mortality than the actual rate, because not all Turco-Tatars lived in war zones, but nearly all Kurds, the next largest group, did. The Kurdish mortality rate might have been higher than the Turco-Tatar rate, but has been necessarily figured at that rate.

Population figures for 1914 have been taken as they appear in the 1915 Russian statistical yearbook. The 1921 figures have been drawn by a more involved process: The population of three ethnic groups ("Turks," "Tatars," and "Ottoman Turks") were added to arrive at an approximation of the "Turco-Tatar" group counted for 1914. The result was projected back to 1921 at a rate of .01 increase per year. To the resulting factor was added the population of the Turkish Republican provinces that were part of Russia in 1914 (Kars Vilâyeti; Oltu, Iğdir, Kulp, Artvin, and Sivas sancaks) as recorded in the 1927 Turkish census and projected back to 1921.

As with all such procedures, the mortality figures for the Caucasus should be understood to be only approximations. Except as noted in the text, it has not been possible to account for migration. ¹¹ Since I have decided to always

err against my thesis of high Muslim mortality, one can assume that statements of Muslim mortality in the text are underestimates.

NOTES

1. For a description of the process of estimating an undercount, see McCarthy, *Muslims and Minorities*, Appendix 4. The 1291 Tuna Vilâyeti figures are listed in Kemal Karpat, *Ottoman Population, 1830-1914*, Madison, Wisconsin, 1985, p. 117. (Note that figures for Muslims and non-Muslims in Sofya Sancağ have been transposed on p. 117.)

-344-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 344.

2. See Justin McCarthy, "The Population of Ottoman Europe Before and After the Fall of the Empire," *Proceedings of the Third Conference on the Social and Economic History of Turkey*, edited by Heath W. Lowry and Ralph S. Hattox, Istanbul, 1990, pp. 275-98.

3. Population in the Vilayet of the Danube [Tuna Vilâyeti].*

	Christians		Muslims
Bulgarian	1,117,000	Turks	757,500
Greek	12,000	Tatar Emigrants	110,000
Armenian	2,500	Circassians	200,000
Others	65,000	Muslim Gypsies	35,000
Christian Gypsies	12,000		
Total	1,208,500	Total	1,102,500
Jews	12,000		

Grand Total 2,323,000

* "As presently constituted, that is minus the Sandjaks of Sofia and Nisch, the two South of the Balkans which about six months ago were detached from the vilayet of the Danube and formed under the Governor General of Sofia. The population of the latter is about as follows:"

	Sofia		Nisch
Mussulmans	16,500	Mussulmans	210,000
Bulgarians	13,000	Bulgarians	140,000
Jews	2,500	Jews	5,000
Total	32,000	Total	355,000
Total of the Vilayet of Sofia	387,000		

(F.O. 195-1077, *Reade to Elliot*, Constantinople, December 5, 1876)

Europeans obviously had little idea of the actual population of Bulgaria until the Ottomans began fairly accurate population registration there. For a detailed example of early efforts at estimation, see *F.O.881-684*, no. 9, "Statistical Report on the Province of Bulgaria", by Edward Neale, Varna, March 28, 1858. The most detailed compilation of European estimates of Bulgarian population (and perhaps the most detailed compilation of estimates on any population on earth at any time) is the collection published by N. Michoff [Mikhov], *La Population de la Turquie et de la Bulgarie au XVIII^e et XIX^e s.: recherches bibliographico-statistiques*, Sofia, 1915-1935. Unfortunately, those whose estimations Mikhov so laboriously collected seldom had anything but guesses as the bases of their estimations, so the work is of little demographic value.

4. The population figures printed in Ottoman provincial salnames were collected years before they were printed (see *Muslims and Minorities*, Appendix 4). I have rather conservatively estimated here that the Edirne and Tuna figures were collected three years before they were printed.
5. McCarthy, "The Population of Ottoman Europe Before and After the Fall of the Empire".

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 345.

6. Bulgaria, *Annuaire Statistique*, 1923-24, Sophia, 1925, p. 64.

7. See Table 6 in previous Chapter (3).

8. Muslims in Bulgaria

1887	676,215
1892	693,258
1900	643,300
1905	603,867
1910	602,078
1920	690,734

(Bulgaria, *Annuaire Statistique*, 1923-24, Sophia, 1925, p. 64)

9. 1313 *İstatistik*.

10. Whether migrants from Eastern Rumelia, legally part of the Ottoman Empire, would have been listed as "international immigrants" in the 1313 *İstatistik* is unknown.

11. No adjustment has been made for undercounts in the two sources. I have assumed they balance out, and there is no set of age-specific data that can be used to calculate undercounts.

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 346.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adamson, David. *The Kurdish War*. New York and Washington, 1964.

Adossidés, A. *Arminiens et Jeunes-Turcs: les Massacres de Cilicie*. Paris, 1910.

Akğiin, Seçil. *General Harbord'un Anadolu Gezisi (Ermeni Meselesi'ne Dair) Raporu*. Istanbul, 1981.

Aknouni, E. *Political Persecution: Armenian Prisoners of the Caucasus*. New York, 1911.

Ali Saip. *Çukurova Açıklı Olayları ve Urfa'nın Kurtuluş Savşları*. Transliterated into modern Turkish from the Ottoman by Selim Ak. Şanlıurfa, 1984.

Allen, W. E. D. *A History of the Georgian People*. London, 1932.

Allen, W. E. D. and Paul Muratoff. *Caucasian Battlefields*. Cambridge, 1953.

Altunay, Ahmet Refik. *Kafkas Yollarında*. Hz. Yunus Zeyrek, Ankara, 1981.

Anderson, M. S. *The Eastern Question, 1774-1923*. New York, 1966.

Andrew, Prince (of Greece). *Towards Disaster*. London, 1930.

Antoniades, Alexandre. *La développement économique de la Thrace*. Athens, 1922.

Arfa, Hassan. *The Kurds: An Historical and Political Study*. London, 1966.

Arikoğlu, Damar. *Hatıralarım*. Istanbul, 1961.

Arslanian, Artin H. "Dunsterville's Adventures: A Reappraisal". *International*

Journal of Middle Eastern Studies 12 (1980): 199-216.

Asaf, Mehmed. *1909 Adana Ermeni Olaylan ve Anilarim*. Hz. İsmet Parmaksizolu, Ankara, 1982.

Ashmead-Bartlett, Ellis. *With the Turks in Thrace*. New York, 1913.

Askerî Tarih Belgeleri Dergisi, no. 81. Aralık, 1982. -----, no. 83. Mart, 1983. -----, no. 85. Ekim, 1985. -----, no. 86. Nisan, 1987.

Association Macédonienne, Commission d'enquête de l', Atrocités Bulgares en Macédoine (Faits et Documents). Athens, 1913.

Ataöv, Türkkaya. "Procurement of Arms for Armenian Terrorism: Realities Based on Ottoman Documents". In *International Terrorism*. Ankara, 1984, pp. 169-77.

Atatürk, Mustafa Kemal. *Nutuk*. First printed in Ankara in 1927 in two volumes; numerous reprints.

Athens, University of. *The Crimes of Bulgaria in Macedonia*. Translated from Greek. Washington, D.C., 1914.

Atkin, Muriel Ann. "The Khanates of the Eastern Caucasus and the Origins of the First Russo-Iranian War". Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1978.

Atrocités Russes. Documents soumis à la Conference de Constantinople. Constantinople, 1877.

Ayvazian, Arthur A. *Armenian Victories at Khznalous and Sardarabad on May 23, 1918*. New York, 1985.

Azerbaijan. Claims of the Delegation of the Republic of Caucasian Azerbaijan Presented to the Peace Conference in Paris. Paris, 1919.

Babigian Effendi. *La Situation des Arméniens en Turquie, exposée par des documents, 1908-1912. Volume III of the Report of "the late Babigian Effendi, deputy from Adrianople."*

-347-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 347.

- Baddeley, John F. *The Rugged Flanks of the Caucasus* London, 1940.
- . *The Russian Conquest of the Caucasus*. London, 1908.
- Baker, James. *Turkey in Europe*. London, 1877.
- Baker, Valentine. *The War in Bulgaria*. London, 1879.
- Baldwin, Oliver. *Six Prisons and Two Revolutions: Adventures in Trans-Caucasia and Anatolia, 1920-1921*. London, 1925.
- Barton, James L. *The Story of Near East Relief (1915-1930): An Interpretation*. New York, 1930.
- Bayur, Yusuf Hikmet. *Türk İnkilâbı Tarihi. Volume III, parts 1-4*. Ankara, 1953, 1955, 1957, 1967.
- Belen, Fahri *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı*. Ankara, 1973.
- Bennigsen, Alexandre. "Muslim Guerilla Warfare in the Caucasus (1918-1928)". *Central Asian Survey* 2 (July 1983): 45-56.
- Bennigsen, Alexandre and S. Enders Windbush. *Muslim National Communism in the Soviet Union*. Chicago, 1979.
- . *Muslims of the Soviet Empire: a Guide*. London, 1986.
- Bernhard, L. *Les Atrocités Russes en Bulgarie et en Arménie pendant la guerre de 1877*. Berlin, 1878.
- Beylerian, Arthur. *Les Grandes puissances, l'Empire Ottoman et les Arméniens dans les Archives Françaises (1914-1918)*. Paris, 1983.
- Blanch, Lesley. *The Sabres of Paradise*, London, 1960.
- Blaquiere, Eduard. *The Greek Revolution: its origin and progress*, London, 1824.
- Bliss, Edwin Munsell. *Turkey and the Armenian Atrocities*. Philadelphia, 1896.
- Bournoutian, George A. *Eastern Armenia in the Last Decades of Persian Rule, 1807-1828 (A Political and Socio-Economic Study of the Khanate of Erivan on the Eve of the Russian Conquest)*. Malibu, California, 1982.
- . "The Ethnic Composition and the Socio-Economic Condition of Eastern

Armenia in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century". In Transcaucasia: Nationalism and Social Change. Edited by Ronald Grigor Suny. Ann Arbor, 1983, pp. 69-86.

Brancoff, D. M., La Macédoine et sa Population Chrétienne. Paris, 1905.

Bridge, F. R. Austro-Hungarian Documents relating to the Macedonian Struggle, 1896-1912. Thessaloniki, 1976.

Bremond, E. La Cilicie en 1919-20. Paris, 1921.

Bryce, James. Transcaucasia and Ararat. London, 1896.

Bryce, Viscount. The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, 1915-16. Documents Presented to Viscount Grey of Falladon. London, 1916.

Bujax, Col. Les Campagnes de l'Armée hellénique, 1918-1922. Paris, 1930.

Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. Macedonia: Documents and Materials. Sofia, 1978.

Carnegie Commission of Investigation. Report of the International Commission to Inquire into the Causes and Conduct of the Balkan Wars. Washington D.C., 1914.

Chaliand, Gerard (ed.). People Without a Country: The Kurds and Kurdistan. London, 1980.

Chesney, Colonel [Francis R.]. The Russo-Turkish Campaigns of 1828 and 1829, with a View of the Present State of Affairs in the East. London, 1854.

Churchill, Winston. The World Crisis: The Aftermath. London, 1929.

Cirilli, Gustave. Journal du Siege d'Andrinople. Paris, 1913.

-348-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 348.

Comité de bienfaisances des Emigrés Politiques des Ciscaucasiens en Turquie. *Aperçu historique sur les Ciscaucasiens pendant la Guerre*

Mondiale. Constantinople, 1918.

Défense Nationale or de Publication D. A.C.B. Les Atrocités des Bulgares en Thrace, no. 4. Constantinople, 1913.

-----. Les Atrocités des Coalises Balkaniques, no. 1. Constantinople, 1913.

-----. Les Atrocités des Coalises Balkaniques, no. 2. Constantinople, 1913.

-----. Les Atrocités des Coalises Balkaniques, no. 3. Constantinople, 1913.

-----. Les Atrocités des Grecs en Macedoine, no. 5. Constantinople, 1914.

Comité International de Secours aux Réfugiés des Provinces. Compte Rendu General. Janvier 1878-Avril 1879.

Comstock, John Lee. History of the Greek Revolution. Hartford, 1851.

Congrès Turc de Bureau Permanent du Lausanne. Le Rigime d'Occupation Hellinique en Turquie. Lausanne, 1921.

The Crimes of Bulgaria. Washington, D.C., 1914.

*Çay, Abdulhalfik. "The March 31, 1918 Baku Massacre". In *The Eastern Question: Imperialism and the Armenian Community*. Edited by A. Çay, Ankara, 1987, pp. 121-32.*

Cuinet, Vital. La Turquie d'Asie. 4 vols. Paris, 1890-94.

*Dadrian, Vahakn N. "The Naim-Andonian Documents on the World War I Destruction of Ottoman Armenians: The Anatomy of a Genocide". *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 18 (August, 1986): 311-60.*

*-----. "The Role of Turkish Physicians in the World War I: Genocide of Ottoman Armenians". *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 1 (1986): 169-92.*

Dakin, Douglas. The Greek Struggle for Independence, 1821-33. London, 1973.

*Davison, Roderic H. "The Armenian Crisis, 1912-1914". *American Historical Review* 53 (April, 1948): 481-505.*

Delegation Bureau de la Turquie. Atrocitis et divastations Grecques en Anatolie. Lausanne, 1923.

- . *Le Regime d'Occupation hellenique en Turquie*. Lausanne, 1921.
- Deliorman, Altan. Türklere Karşı Ermeni Komitecileri*. Istanbul, 1973.
- Demiroğlu, Faiz. Van'da Ermeni Mezalimi*. Ankara, 1985.
- De Paul Veou. La Passion de Cilicie, 1919-1922*. Paris, 1937.
- Dewdney, J. C. Turkey: An Introductory Geography*. New York, 1971.
- Dixon-Johnson, C. F. The Armenians*. Northgate, 1916.
- Djemal Pasha. Memories of a Turkish Statesman, 1913-1919*. New York, 1922.
- Documents sur les atrocités Armeno-russes*. Constantinople, 1917.
- Dominion, Leon. The Frontiers of Language and Nationality in Europe*. New York, 1917.
- Dunn, Robert. World Alive*. New York, 1956, p. 309.
- Duval, J. Histoire de l'Emigration*. Paris, 1862.
- Dwight, H. G. Constantinople Old and New*. New York, 1915.
- Dyer, Gwynne. "Turkish 'Falsifiers' and Armenian 'Deceivers': Historiography and the Armenian Massacres"*. *Middle Eastern Studies* 12 (January 1976): 99-107.
- Edib Halide. Memoirs of Halide Edib*. New York, 1926.
- . *The Turkish Ordeal*. New York, 1928.
- Emin, Ahmet (Yalman). Turkey in the World War*. New Haven, Conn., 1930.
- Eren, Ahmet Cevat. Turkiye'de Gé ve Gçnen Meselesi*. Istanbul, 1966.

----- . "Die Bedeutung des Flüchtlingsproblems in der Türkei". *Integration* (Vaduz) 3 (1959): 167-77.

Evans, Laurence. *United States Policy and the Partition of Turkey, 1914-1924*. Baltimore, 1965.

Fahrettin, Kîrziolu M. *Kars Çli ve Çevresinde Ermeni Mezalimi (1918-1920)*. Ankara, 1970.

----- . *Millü Miicadelede Kars, I. Kitap, "Belgeler."* Istanbul, 1960.

Field, James A., Jr. *America and the Mediterranean World, 1776-1882*. Princeton, 1969.

Finefrock, Michael M. "Atatürk, Lloyd George, and the Megali Idea: Cause and Consequence of the Greek Plan to Seize Constantinople from the Allies, June-August, 1922". *The Journal of Modern History* 52 (March 1980): 1047-66.

Finlay, George. *A History of Greece*, edited by H. F. Tozer, 6 (Oxford, 1877).

Fisher, Alan. *The Crimean Tatars*. Stanford, Calif., 1978.

----- . "The Crimean Tatars, the USSR, and Turkey". In *Soviet Asian Ethnic Frontiers* edited by William O. McCagg, Jr. and Brian D. Silver. New York, 1979, pp. 1-24.

----- . "Emigration of Muslims from the Russian Empire in the Years After the Crimean War". In *jahrbucherfir Geschichte Osteuropas* 35 (1987): 356-71.

----- . *The Russian Annexation of the Crimea, 1772-1783*. Cambridge, 1970.

Fisher, W. B. *The Middle East*. London, 1950; seventh edition, 1978.

France, Ministère Nationale Institut National de la Statistique et des Études Économiques . *Les Transferts Internationaux de Populations*. Paris, 1946.

Gaillard, Gaston. *The Turks and Europe*, London, 1921.

Gates, Frank Caleb. *Not to Me Only*. Princeton, 1940.

Gautherot, Gustave. *La France en Syrie et en Cilicie*. Paris, 1920.

Gehri, Maurice. *Report*, separately printed from the *Revue International de*

la CroixRouge, 3, no. 31 (July, 1921). Geneva.

Genov, Tsenko. "Military Operations in the Balkan Theatre during the 1877-78 War". *Southeastern Europe* 2 (1979): 136-53.

Gidney, James B. *A Mandate for Armenia*. Oberlin, Ohio, 1967.

Golodin, Ivan. *The Caucasus*. London, 1854.

Gontaut-Biron, Comte R. de. *Comment La France s'est installie en Syrie (1918-1919)*. Paris, 1923.

Gordon, Thomas. *History of the Greek Revolution*. Edinburgh and London, 1832.

Göyönç, Nejat. *Osmanh İdaresinde Ermeniler*. Ankara, 1983.

Gözaydin, Ethem Feyzi. *Kırım: Kırım Tirklerinin Yerleşme ye Göçmeleri*. Istanbul, 1943.

Grabill, Joseph L. *Protestant Diplomacy and the Near East: Missionary Influence on American Policy, 1810-1927*. Minneapolis, Minn., 1971.

Great Britain. *Documents on British Foreign Policy, 1919-1936*. First series, various volumes, London.

Great Britain, Foreign Office, Historical Section, no. 59. *Anatolia*. London, 1920.

Great Naval Staff Intelligence Department Britain. *A Handbook of Asia Minor*. Vol. III, pt. 2. London, July, 1919.

Great Parliament CMD Britain. *Reports on Atrocities in the Districts of Yalova and Guemlek and in the Ismid Peninsula*. Turkey No. 1 (1921). 1478, p. 11.

-350-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 350.

Les Grecs à Smyrne, Nouveau témoignages sur leurs atrocités. Un document

official probant. Paris, 1920.

Greece, Bureau presse du Ministère des Affaires Etrangées [sic]. La Grèce en Asie-Mineure. Athens, 1921.

Greece, Ministère Nationale Direction de la Statistique. Population du Royaume de Grece d'après le Recensement du 19 Décembre,1920,. Athens, 1921.

Greece, Ministère Nationale Statistique Générale de la Grèce. Recensement de la Population de la Grèce au 19 Decembre 1920. Athens, 1928.

Greece, Anti-Greek Persecution in Turkey. London, 1921.

-----. Les Cruatis Bulgares en Macedoine Orientale et en Thrace, 1912-1913. Athens, 1913.

Greene, F. V. Report on the Russian Army and its Campaigns in Turkey. New York.

Gürün, Kamuran. The Armenian File. London, 1985.

Hamlin, Cyrus. My Life and Times. London, 1900.

Hartill, Leonard Ramsden. Men Are Like That. Indianapolis, 1928.

Helmreich, E. C. The Diplomacy of the Balkan Wars, 1912-1913. Cambridge, Mass., 1938.

-----. From Paris to Sévres: The Partition of the Ottoman Empire at the Peace Conference of 1919-1920. Columbus, Ohio, 1974.

Henze, Paul B. "Fire and Sword in the Caucasus: the 19th Century Resistance of the North Caucasian Mountaineers". Central Asian Survey 2 (July, 1983): 5-44.

-----. "Marx on Russians and Muslims". Central Asian Survey 6 (1967): 33-45.

Helmreich, Paul C. From Paris to Sevres. Columbus, Ohio, 1974.

Hepworth, George H. Through Armenia on Horseback. New York, 1898.

Hocaoğlu, Mehmed. Arşiv vesikalartyla tarihte Ermeni Mezalimi ve Ermeniler. Istanbul, 1976.

Hoffmann, George W. "Evolution of the Ethnographic Map of Yugoslavia: a Historical Geographic Interpretation". In *An Historical Geography of the Balkans*. Edited by Francis W. Carter. London, 1977.

Holmes, Mary Caroline. *Between the Lines in Asia Minor*. New York, 1923.

Horton, George. *The Blight of Asia*. Indianapolis, 1926.

Housepian, Marjorie. *The Smyrna Affair*. New York, 1966.

Hovannisian, Richard G. "Armenia and the Caucasus in the Genesis of the Soviet-Turkish Entente". *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 4 (1973): 129-47.

-----, *Armenia on the Road to Independence*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1967.

-----, ed. *The Armenian Genocide in Perspective*. New Brunswick and Oxford, 1986.

-----, *The Armenian Holocaust*. Cambridge, Mass., 1978; revised, 1980.

-----, *The Republic of Armenia*. 2 vols. Berkeley, 1971 and 1982.

Howard, Harry N. *The King-Crane Commission: An American Inquiry into the Middle East*. Beirut, 1963.

-----, *The Partition of Turkey: 1913-1923*. New York, 1966.

Hurewitz, J. C. *Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East*. Vol. II. Princeton, 1956.

Immanuel, Oberstleutnant. *Der Balkankrieg, 1912/13*. Berlin, 1914.

Jelavich, Barbara. *History of the Balkans*. 2 vols. Cambridge, 1983.

Jelavich, Charles and Barbara. *The Establishment of the Balkan National States, 1804-1920*. Seattle and London, 1977.

Johnson, Clarence R., ed. *Constantinople Today: The Pathfinder Survey of Constantinople*. New York, 1922.

Karabekir, Kâzım. *İstiklâl Harbımız*. Istanbul, 1969.

Karal, Enver Ziya. *Osmanlı Tarihi*. Vols. 5-8. Ankara, 1956-62.

Karpat, Kemal, *Ottoman Population 1830-1914: Demographic and Social Characteristics*. Madison, Wisconsin, 1985.

-----, "The Status of the Muslim under European Rule: the Eviction and Settlement of the Çerkes". *Journal of the Institute of Muslim Minority Affairs* 1, no. 2 (1972): 7-27.

Katchaznouni, Hovhannes, "The Armenian Revolutionary Federation (Dashnagtzoutiun) Has Nothing To Do Anymore: The Manifesto of Hovhannes Katch-aznoui, First Prime Minister of the Independent Armenian Republic". Translated by Matthew A. Callender. Edited by John Roy Carlson (Arthur A. Derounian [sic]). New York, Armenian Information Service, 1955.

Kayaloff, Jacques. *The Battle of Sardarabad*. The Hague and Paris, 1973.

-----, *The Fall of Baku: Material on the Events of September 15, 1918*. Bergenfield, New Jersey, 1976.

Kazemzadeh, Firuz. *The Struggle for Transcaucasia (1917-1921)*. New York, 1951; reprinted 1981.

Kernaly, Ghalib. *Assassinat d'un Peuple*. Rome, 1921.

Kerr, Stanley E. *The Lions of Marash: Personal Experiences with American Near East Relief, 1919-1922*. Albany, 1973.

Kinross, Lord [Patrick Balfour]. *Atatürk: the Rebirth of a Nation*. London, 1964.

Kitromilides, Paschalis M. and Alexis Alexandris. "Ethnic Survival, Nationalism, and Forced Migration". *Bulletin of the Centre for Asia Minor Studies* 5 (1984-85): 9-44.

Kitsikis, Dimitri. *Propagande et Pressions en Politique Internationale: La Grace et ses revendications a la Conference de la Paix*. Paris, 1963.

Koçaç, Sadi. *Tarih Boyunca Ermeniler ve Turk-Ermeni İlişkileri*. Ankara, 1967.

Korganoff, General C. La Participation des Arméniens a la Guerre Mondiale sur le Front du Caucase (1914-1918). Paris, 1927.

Küçük, Cevdet. Osmanlı Diplomasisinde Ermeni Meselesinin Ortaya Çkış, 1878-1897. Istanbul, 1984.

Kurat, Akdes Nimet. Türkiye ye Rusya. Ankara, 1970.

Ladas, Stephen P. The Exchange of Minorities: Bulgaria, Greece, and Turkey. New York, 1932.

Lake, Atwell. The Defense of Kars. London, 1957.

Lambert, Rose. Hadjin, and the Armenian Massacres. New York, 1911.

Landau, Jacob. M. Pan-Turkism in Turkey: A Study in Irredentism. Hamden, Conn., 1981.

Lang, David Marshall. Armenia: Cradle of Civilization. 3rd ed. London, 1982.

----- *The Armenians: A People in Exile. London, 1982.*

Langer, William L. The Diplomacy of Imperialism. 2nd ed. New York, 1960.

Larcher, Commandant M. La Guerre Turque dans la Guerre Mondiale. Paris, 1926.

League of Nations. Report of the Work of the High Commission for Refugees presented by Dr. Fridtjof Nansen to the Fourth Assembly. Geneva, 1923.

-352-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 352.

Lemaitre, Alfred. Musulmans et Chrétiens. Notes sur la guerre de l'indépendance grecque. Paris, 1895.

Lewis, Bernard. The Emergence of Modern Turkey. London and New York, 1962.

Libaridian, Gerard J. "Armenia and Armenians: a Divided Homeland and a

Dispersed Nation". In Soviet Asian Ethnic Frontiers. Edited by William O. McCagg, Jr. and Brian D. Silver. New York, 1979, pp. 27-60.

----- . "Revolution and Liberation in the 1892 and 1907 Programs of the Dashnaktsutiun". In *Transcaucasia: Nationalism and Social Change*. Edited by Ronald Grigor Suny. Ann Arbor, 1983, pp. 185-96.

Ligue pour la Défense des Droits des Ottomans. Atrocités Grecques dans le Vilayet de Smyrne (Mai, 1919), Documents Inédits et Témoignages des Officiers Anglais et Français. Geneva, 1919.

Lloyd-George, David. Memoirs of the Peace Conference. New Haven, Conn., 1939.

Longrigg, Stephen Hemsley. Syria and Lebanon under French Mandate. London, 1958.

Lowry, Heath W. "Richard G. Hovannisian on Lieutenant Robert Steed Dunn". The Journal of Ottoman Studies 5 (1985): 1-44.

----- . "Turkish History: On Whose Sources Will It Be Based? A Case Study on the Burning of Izmir". *Osmanlı Arşivleri* 9 (1988).

Lynch, H. F. B. Armenia: Travels and Studies. 2 vols. Khayats Reprint, Beirut, 1965.

Mandelstam, Andre. Le Sort de l'Empire Ottoman. Paris, 1917.

Marx, Karl. The Eastern Question: a Reprint of Letters Written 1853-1856 Dealing with the Events of the Crimean War. Edited by Eleanor Marx Aveling and Edward Aveling . New York, 1897; reprinted 1969.

Mayewski, General. Les Massacres d'Arménie. 1916.

----- . *Van ve Bitlis İstatistikleri*. Translated by Mehmet Sadik. Istanbul, 330.

McCarthy, Justin. "American Commissions to Anatolia and the Report of Niles to Sutherland". Published in the proceedings of the Türk Tarih Kurumu General Conference XI. Ankara, 1990.

----- . *The Arab World, Turkey, and the Balkans. Boston, 1982.*

----- , et al. *Armenians in the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey (1912-1926)*. Istanbul, 1984.

----- . "Greek Statistics on Ottoman Greek Population". *International Journal*

of *Turkish Studies* 2 (1980): 66-76.

----- . "Jewish Population in the Late Ottoman Period". In *Jews of the Ottoman Empire*. Edited by Avigdor Levy. Princeton, 1994.

----- . "Muslim Refugees in Turkey: The Balkan Wars, World War I, and the Turkish War of Independence". In *Humanist and Scholar: Essays in Honor of Andreas Tietz*. Istanbul, 1993, pp. 87-111.

----- . *Muslims and Minorities*. New York, 1983.

----- . "The Population of Ottoman Europe Before and After the Fall of the Empire". *Proceedings of the Third Conference on the Social and Economic History of Turkey*. Edited by Heath W. Lowry and Ralph S. Hattox. Istanbul, 1990, pp. 275-98.

Mears, Eliot Grinnell. *Modern Turkey: A Politico-Economic Interpretation, 1908-1923*. New York, 1924.

-353-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 353.

Michoff, Nikola. *La Population de la Turquie et de la Bulgarie au XVIII^e et XIX^e s.: recherches biblio-statistiques*. 4 vols. Sofia, 1915 1935.

Miletitch, Dr. Lubomir. *Atrocités Grecques en Macédoine pendant la Guerre Greco-Bulgare*. Sophia, 1913.

Millman, Richard. *Britain and the Eastern Question*. Oxford, 1979.

----- . "The Bulgarian Massacres Reconsidered". *Southeast European Review* 58 (April, 1980): 218-31.

Monteith, Lieut.-General W. *Kars and Erzeroum: with the Campaign of Prince Paskiewitch in 1828 and 1829*. London, 1856.

Mordtmann, Drs., Gabuzzi et Sécouli. *Les réfugiés de la Roumelie en 1878: Rapport presenté au Conseil International de Santé*. Constantinople, 1879.

Morgenthau, Henry. Ambassador Morgenthau's Story. New York, 1919.

-----*(with French Strother). All in a Lifetime. Garden City, New York, 1922.*

Nalbandian, Louise. The Armenian Revolutionary Movement: The Development of Armenian Political Parties through the Nineteenth Century. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1963.

Nansen, Fridtjof. Armenia and the Near East. London, 1928; reprint, New York, 1976.

Nassibian, Akaby. Britain and the Armenian Question, 1915-1923. London, 1984.

Nestorova, Tatyana. American Missionaries among the Bulgarians. Boulder, Colo., 1987.

Nogales, Rafael de. Four Years Beneath the Crescent. Translated by Muna Lee. New York, 1926.

-----*. Memoirs of a Soldier of Fortune. New York, 1932.*

Norman, C. B. Armenia and the Campaign of 1877. London, 1878.

Nubar, Boghos. The Pre-War Population of Cilicia. Paris, 1920.

Öke, M. Kemal. Ermeni Meselesi. Istanbul, 1986.

Oliphant, Laurence. The Trans-Caucasian Campaign of the Turkish Army under Omer Pasha: A Personal Narrative. London, 1856.

Orel, Քինասի and Süreyya Yuca. The Talat Pasha Telegrams: Historical Fact or Armenian Fiction? London, 1986.

Ormanian, Malachia. L'Église Arménienne. Paris, 1920.

Ottoman Empire. Greek Atrocities in the Vilayet of Smyrna, Atrocités Grecques dans le Vilayet de Smyrne. Geneva, 1919.

-----*. Rapports officiels refus des autoritis militaires Ottomanes sur l'occupation de Smyrne par les troupes Helléniques. Constantinople, 1919.*

Ottoman Dahiliye Nezareti Sicil-i Nüfus İdare-i Umumiyesi Müdüriyeti Empire. Memalik-i Osmaniye'nin 1330 Senesi Nüfus İstatistiği. Istanbul,

1330 M.

Major Ottoman L'Etat Ottoman Empire. Atrocités Arméniennes, commises contre les Mussulmans du Caucase durant le mois du Juillet 1919. Istanbul, n.d.

Ottoman Ministère de l'Interieur Direction Générale des Immigrés Empire. Atrocités Grecques en Turquie. Second Livre [sic]. Publication No. 5. Constantinople, 1921.

Ottoman Nezaret-i Umur-i Ticaret ve Nafia Empire. Devlet-i Aliye-i Osmaniye'nin 1313 Senesine Mahsus İstatistik-i Umumisi. Istanbul, 1315.

Ökse, Necati. "The Turco-Russian War (1877-1878)". Revue Internationale d'Histoire Militaire 46 (1980).

-354-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 354.

Ozkaya, İnyetullah Cemal. Le Peuple Arménien et les tentatives de reduire le peuple Turc en servitude. Ankara, 1971.

Ozalp, Kazim. Milli Mücadele. 2 vols. Ankara, 1971.

Pallis, A. A. "Racial Migrations in the Balkans during the Years 1912-1924". Geographical Journal 16 (October, 1925).

-----. Greece's Anatolian Venture -- and After. London, 1937.

Pasdermadjian, Dr. G (Armen Garo) [sic]. Why Armenia Should Be Free. Boston, 1918.

Pasdermadjian, H. Histoire de l'Arminie. 3rd ed. Paris, 1971.

Patriarcat Arménien de Constantinople. Population Arménienne de la Turquie avant la Guerre. Paris, 1920.

Pentzopoulos, Dimitri. The Balkan Exchange of Minorities and its Impact upon Greece. Paris, 1962.

Permanent Bureau of the Turkish Congress at Lausanne. Greek Atrocities in the Vilayet of Smyrna. Lausanne, 1919.

Philip, Hoffman. Cholera in the Near East. Santa Barbara, Calif., 1947.

Phillips, W. Alison. The War of Greek Independence, 1821 to 1833. New York, 1897.

Pinson, Mark. "Ottoman Colonization of the Circassians in Rumili after the Crimean War". Études Balkaniques 3 (1973).

----- . "Russian Policy and the Emigration of the Crimean Tatars to the Ottoman Empire, 1854-1862". Güney-Doğru Avrupa Araştırmaları Dergisi 1 (1972).

Poidebard, A. "Rôle Militaire des Arméniens sur le Front du Caucase". Revue des Etudes Arméniennes 1 (1920).

Poynter, Mary A. When Turkey was Turkey: In and Around Constantinople. London, 1921.

Price, Clair. The Rebirth of Turkey. New York, 1923.

Ravitch, Norman. "The Armenian Catastrophe: of History, Murder, and Sin". Encounter (December, 1981): 69-84.

Rawlinson, A. Adventures in the Near East 1918-1922. London, 1923.

Rechad, Nihad. Les Grecs à Smyrne. Paris, 1920.

Representatives of Armenia. The Armenian Question before the Peace Conference. Paris, 1919.

Russia, Premier Recensement Général de la Population de l'Empire de Russia, 1897, redigé par Nicolas Trointisky. St. Petersburg, 1905.

Russian Atrocities in Asia and Europe. Constantinople, 1877.

Rustem, Ahmed. La Guerre Mondiale et La Question Turco-Arménienne. Berne, 1918.

Ryan, Charles. Under the Red Crescent: Adventures of an English Surgeon with the Turkish Army at Plevna and Erzurum, 1877-1878. New York, 1897.

Safrastian, Arshak. Kurds and Kurdistan. London, 1948.

Saip, Ali. *Çukurova Apklı Olaylan ye Urfa'mn Kurtuluş Savaşılan.*
Transliterated into Modern Turkish from the Ottoman of 1924 by Selim Ak.
Urfa, 1984.

Sarkissian, A. O. *History of the Armenian Question to 1885.* Urbana, Ill.,
1938.

Sax, Carl Ritter von. *Geschichte des Machtfalls der Turkei.* Vienna, 1908.

Schemsi, Kara. *Turcs et Arméniens devant l'Histoire, Nouveaux témoignages
russes et turcs sur les atrocités arméniennes de 1914 h 1918.* Geneva,
1919.

-355-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922.* Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 355.

Schurman, Jacob Gould. *The Balkan Wars, 1912-1913.* Princeton, 1914.

General Second Section of the Staff of the Western Front. *Greek Atrocities in Asia Minor, First Part.* Constantinople, 1922.

Seidahmet, Djafer. *La Crimée.* Lausanne, 1921.

Seton-Watson, Hugh. *Nations and States: An Enquiry into the Origins of Nations and the Politics of Nationalism.* Boulder, Colo., 1977.

----- *The Russian Empire, 1801-1917.* Oxford, 1967.

Shannon, R. T. *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation of 1876.* London, 1963.

Shaw, Stanford J. *Shaw and Ezel Kural. History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey. Vol. II.* Cambridge, 1977.

Shorter, Frederic C. "The Population of Turkey after the War of Independence". *Regional Papers (Giza, Egypt, 1983) and International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 17 (1985): 417-41.

Singer, J. David and Melvin Small. *The Wages of War 1816-1965: A*

Statistical Handbook. New York, 1972.

Smith, Michael Llewellyn. Ionian Vision, Greece in Asia Minor 1919-1922. New York, 1973.

Sonyel, Salahi Ramsdam. The Ottoman Armenians. London, 1987.

----- *. The Turco-Armenian 'Adana Incidents' in the Light of Secret British Documents (July, 1908-December, 1909). Ankara, 1988.*

----- *. The Turco-Greek Conflict. London, 1976.*

Sophia, Les Professeurs de l'Universite de. Réponse à la Brochure des Professeurs es Universités d'Athens, "Atrocités Bulgares en Macédoine. Sophia, 1913.

"A Special Correspondent". The Balkan War Drama. London, 1913.

Stavrianos, L. S. The Balkans Since 1453. New York, 1958.

Sumner, B. H. Russia and the Balkans, 1870-1880. London, 1962.

Suny, Ronald Grigor. The Baku Commune, 1917-1918. Princeton, 1972.

-----, *ed. Transcaucasia. Ann Arbor, 1983.*

Swietochowski, Tadeusz. "National Consciousness and Political Orientations in Azerbaijan, 1905-1920". In Transcaucasia: Nationalism and Social Change. Edited by Ronald Grigor Suny. Ann Arbor, 1983, pp. 209-32.

----- *. Russian Azerbaijan, 1905-1920: the Shaping of National Identity in a Muslim Community. Cambridge, 1985.*

Sykes, Mark. Dar ul-Islam: a Record of a Journey through Ten of the Asiatic Provinces of Turkey. London, 1904.

Şimşir, Bilâl N. British Documents on Ottoman Armenians. Vol. I (1856-1880) and Vol. II (1880-1890). Ankara, 1982 and 1983.

----- *. Documents Diplomatiques Ottomans: Affaires Arméniennes. Vol. I (1886-1893). Ankara, 1985.*

----- *. Rumeli'den Türk Göçleri. 2 vols. Ankara, 1968 and 1970.*

Tableau indiquant le nombre des divers elements de la population dans le

Empire Ottoman au let Mars 1330. Istanbul, 1918.

Tansel, Selahattin. Mondros'tan Mudanya'ya Kadar. 4 vols. Ankara, 1973 and 1974.

Tarbassian, Hratch A. Erzurum (Garin): Its Armenian History and Traditions. Translated by N. Schahgaldian. N.p., 1975.

Temperley, H. W. V. A History of the Peace Conference of Paris. Vol. VI. London, 1922.

Ter Anaide Minassian. Nationalism and Socialism in the Armenian Revolutionary Movement (1887-1912). Translated by A. M. Berrett. Cambridge, Mass., 1984.

-356-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 356.

Ternon, Yves. The Armenian Cause. Delmar, New York, 1985.

----- *The Armenians: History of a Genocide.* Translated by R. C. Cholakian. New York, 1981.

Toynbee, Arnold J. The Western Question in Greece and Turkey: a Study in the Contact of Civilizations. London, Boston and New York, 1922.

Trask, Roger R. The United States Response to Turkish Nationalism and Reform, 1914-1939. Minneapolis, Minn., 1971.

Turkey, Congr s National. Documents relatifs aux Atrocit s commises par les Arm niens sur la population musulmane. Constantinople, 1919.

Turkey, Genel Kurmay BaŐkanlıĐ. 1877-1878 Osmanlı-Rus Harbt Kafkas Cephesi Harekdti. Ankara, 1985.

----- *Balkan Harbi Tarihi. 7 vols. Istanbul and Ankara, 1938-1945.*

Turkey, Genelkurmay Askeri Tarih ve Stratejik Etüt BaŐkanlıĐk. Gazi

Osman Paşası ve Plevne Savunması. Ankara, 1982.

Turkey, Genelkurmay Başkanlığı Harp Tarihi Dairesi. Türk İstiklâl Harb. 6 vols. Ankara, 1962-1968.

Turkey, General Prime Ministry Directorate of Press and Information. Documents. Ankara, 1982.

Documents on Ottoman Armenians. Vol. II. Ankara, 1983.

Documents on Ottoman Armenians. Vol. III. Ankara, 1986.

Turkish Congress at Permanent Bureau of the. Greek Atrocities in the Vilayet of Smyrna Lausanne . Lausanne, 1919.

Türkîzî, Halil Kemal. Osmanlı ve Sovyet Belgeleriyle Ermeni Mezalimi. Ankara, 1983.

Twerdokhlebof, Lt.-Colonel. Notes of a Superior Officer on the Atrocities of Erzeroum, 1919.

----- . War Journal of the Second Russian Fortress Artillery of Erzeroum From Its Formation until the Recapture of Erzeroum by the Ottoman Army, March 12, 1918. Istanbul, 1919.

Ubicini, A. and Pavet de Courteille. État Présent de l'Émpire Ottoman. Paris, 1876.

United States of Department of State America. Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States: The Paris Peace Conference, 1919. Vol. xii. Washington, D.C., 1947.

Uras, Esat. Tarihte Ermeniler ve Emeni Meselesi. Ankara, 1950.

Ussher, Clarence. An American Physician in Turkey. Boston, 1917.

Villari, Luigi. Fire and Sword in the Caucasus. New York, 1906.

Wagner, Hermengild. With the Victorious Bulgarians. London, 1913.

Walker, Christopher. Armenia: the Survival of a Nation. New York, 1984.

The War Correspondance of the Daily News. London, 1878.

Weekes, Richard (ed.). Muslim Peoples: A World Ethnographic Survey.

Westport, Conn., 1978, pp. 174-80.

Werfel, Franz. The Forty Days of Musa Dagh. New York, 1934.

Williams, Charles. The Armenian Campaign. London, 1878.

Wimbush, S. Enders. "Divided Azerbaijan: Nation Building, Assimilation and Mobilization Between Three States". In Soviet Asian Ethnic Frontiers. Edited by William O. McCagg, Jr. and Brian D. Silver. New York, 1979, pp. 61-81.

Wirthwein, Walter G. Britain and the Balkan Crisis, 1875-1878. New York, 1935.

Yurtsever, Cezmi. Ermeni Terörü. Istanbul, 1987.

Zürcher, Erik Jan. The Unionist Factor: The Role of the Committee of Union and Progress in the Turkish Nationalist Movement, 1905-1926. Leiden, 1984.

-357-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 357.

INDEX

Two major headings, Turks and Muslims, are not included in this index, because those topics appear on most pages. End notes have been indexed only for major topics, not for every mention of names. For place names, there are often many different spellings in many languages. Only those variant spellings that might aid in finding places on maps have been included in the index.

Abdülhamid II, [117](#), [120](#), [136](#)

Abhaz and Abhazia, [2](#), [25](#), [32](#), [35](#) -37, [39](#), [48](#), [51](#), [333](#)

Adana, [120](#), [121](#), [126](#), [161](#), [203](#) -207, [222](#), [229](#)

Administrative discrimination and repression, [16](#), [17](#), [39](#), [82](#) -86, [100](#), [101](#), [112](#), [113](#), [172](#)

Afyon Kara Hisar, [280](#), [295](#), [297](#)

Agriculture, [10](#), [122](#)

Ahmed Muhtar Paa, [109](#)

Aid, assistance, relief, American Committee for Relief in the Near East, [224](#), [249](#), [289](#), [302](#)

British Compassionate Fund, [88](#)

Red Cross, [302](#)

Stafford House Hospital, [71](#), [99](#)

Akhalkalak (Ahilkelek), [33](#), [211](#)

Alaşehir, [281](#), [296](#), [297](#), [299](#)

Albania and Albanians, [1](#), [3](#), [5](#), [10](#), [141](#), [148](#) -50, [156](#), [163](#), [164](#)

Aleppo (Haleb), [45](#), [186](#), [203](#), [229](#)

Allied High Commission in Armenia, [215](#)

America, United States of, and Americans, [2](#), [3](#), [14](#), [42](#), [160](#), [183](#), [201](#), [204](#), [207](#), [214](#), [215](#), [223](#) -28, [248](#), [249](#), [259](#), [261](#), [265](#), [276](#), [280](#), [288](#), [289](#), [302](#), [317](#)

Anarchy and civil disorder, [41](#) -49, [55](#), [273](#), [298](#), [299](#) Anatolia, [1](#), [2](#), [5](#), [13](#), [18](#), [19](#), [23](#), [25](#), [26](#), [28](#), [29](#), [32](#), [42](#), [78](#), [91](#), [109](#), [111](#), [115](#), [126](#), [145](#), [156](#), [157](#), [160](#), [161](#), [179](#), [180](#), [186](#), [193](#), [197](#), [204](#), [205](#), [208](#) -210, [221](#), [223](#), [229](#), [230](#), [258](#), [259](#), [265](#), [267](#), [275](#), [285](#) -88, [291](#), [292](#), [298](#) -306, [333](#), [335](#) -39, [343](#)

central Anatolia, [183](#), [222](#), [287](#), [303](#), [336](#)

eastern Anatolia, [14](#), [23](#), [25](#), [26](#), [28](#) 30, [32](#), [40](#), [42](#), [44](#), [47](#), [48](#), [114](#), [116](#), [121](#) -23, [179](#), [180](#), [182](#), [183](#), [185](#) -87, [192](#) -94, [196](#), [202](#), [205](#), [209](#), [213](#), [219](#), [221](#) -25, [228](#), [230](#), [285](#), [305](#), [333](#) -35

northeastern Anatolia, [184](#), [197](#), [208](#), [211](#)

northern Anatolia, [1](#), [25](#), [33](#), [34](#), [71](#), [76](#), [90](#), [150](#), [162](#), [203](#), [222](#), [286](#), [338](#)

southeastern Anatolia, [46](#), [116](#), [208](#)

southern Anatolia, [1](#), [10](#), [15](#), [23](#), [25](#) 28, [30](#), [32](#), [65](#), [90](#), [113](#), [122](#), [123](#), [125](#), [138](#), [144](#), [145](#), [146](#), [148](#), [179](#), [180](#), [184](#), [208](#), [211](#), [219](#),

[222](#), [223](#), [230](#), [333](#), [335](#), [336](#)

western Anatolia, [1](#), [13](#), [39](#), [114](#), [115](#), [122](#), [161](#), [218](#), [256-58](#), [260](#),
[268](#), [278-80](#), [282](#), [284-88](#), [292](#), [294](#), [298](#), [300](#), [301](#), [305](#), [336](#), [343](#)

Andranik (Ozanian), [185](#), [214](#), [248](#)

Ankara, [161](#), [282](#), [305](#)

Antakya, [186](#)

Antep, [203](#)

Anti-semitism, [87](#)

-359-

Questia Media America, Inc. **www.questia.com**

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 359.

Arabs, [41](#), [44](#), [45](#), [173](#), [205](#)

Ardahan, [27](#), [42](#), [109](#), [111-14](#), [183](#), [185](#)

Argutinskii-Dolgorukov, Bishop, [27](#)

Armenia and Armenians, [1-3](#), [5](#), [7](#), [13](#), [19](#), [23](#), [25-32](#), [38](#), [41-49](#), [109](#)
[-26](#), [179](#), [180](#), [182](#), [183-202](#), [204-20](#), [222-30](#), [256](#), [258](#), [259](#), [267](#),
[273](#), [275](#), [276](#), [280](#), [281](#), [283](#), [286](#), [288-92](#), [299](#), [301](#), [333](#), [335](#), [336](#),
[343](#)

Armenian Gregorian Church, [3](#), [27-29](#), [49](#), [50](#), [123](#)

Armenian Patriarch Narses, [117](#)

Armenian Republic, [209-17](#), [227](#)

Socialist-Revolutionary Party, [216](#)

Armies and soldiers

Armenian, [204-9](#), [212-16](#), [225-28](#), [24](#)

Azerbaijani, [216](#)

Bulgarian, [138](#), [142](#), [143](#), [148](#), [160](#)

deserters, [234](#)

French, [204](#), [242](#)

Greek, [152](#), [159](#), [256](#), [258](#), [260](#) -83, [286](#), [288](#), [291](#) -93, [301](#), [303](#)

irregulars, [10](#), [27](#), [61](#), [84](#), [86](#), [87](#), [114](#), [119](#), [139](#), [140](#), [148](#), [150](#),
[158](#), [169](#), [171](#), [180](#), [182](#), [184](#) -86, [191](#), [193](#) -95, [197](#) -99, [201](#), [202](#),
[204](#) -9, [211](#) [214](#), [228](#), [266](#), [267](#), [269](#), [273](#), [277](#), [288](#) -90, [301](#), [313](#)

Ottoman, [6](#), [11](#), [27](#), [41](#), [42](#), [44](#) -46, [49](#), [60](#) -62, [68](#), [75](#) -77, [113](#),
[119](#), [120](#), [138](#), [141](#) -44, [147](#), [157](#), [160](#), [179](#) -89, [194](#), [197](#) -201,
[204](#), [208](#), [209](#), [211](#), [219](#), [225](#), [228](#), [264](#), [265](#), [269](#), [271](#), [286](#), [287](#),
[294](#), [299](#)

Russian, [6](#), [16](#), [27](#), [28](#), [31](#), [33](#), [34](#), [62](#) [72](#), [74](#), [77](#), [79](#), [81](#), [82](#), [103](#),
[109](#), [111](#), [127](#), [179](#) -82, [187](#), [190](#), [193](#), [196](#) -98, [209](#), [228](#)

Cossacks, [16](#), [36](#), [68](#) -72, [79](#), [84](#), [87](#), [111](#), [117](#), [125](#), [126](#), [139](#), [140](#),
[180](#), [189](#) -91

Turkish Nationalist, [183](#), [197](#), [206](#), [207](#), [215](#), [245](#), [259](#), [277](#), [279](#),
[283](#), [286](#), [290](#), [291](#)

Artvin, [27](#), [185](#), [220](#), [344](#)

Asia, Ottoman. See Anatolia Assassinations, [43](#), [93](#), [118](#), [120](#), [188](#), [265](#)

Assault, [69](#), [70](#), [86](#)

Atatürk. See Mustafa Kemal Athens, [11](#), [301](#)

Austria and Austrians, [65](#), [202](#), [334](#)

Aydin, [161](#), [217](#), [256](#), [258](#), [259](#), [261](#), [262](#), [266](#), [269](#) -73, [275](#), [283](#), [284](#),
[288](#), [290](#), [293](#), [294](#) -97, [299](#) -301, [303](#) 5, [316](#), [317](#)

Azerbaijan and Azeri Turks, [23](#), [25](#), [32](#), [182](#), [183](#), [209](#), [210](#), [214](#) -17,
[219](#), [230](#), [250](#)

Baku, [32](#), [124](#), [125](#), [211](#), [214](#), [230](#), [248](#)

Balkans, Ottoman Europe, [1](#), [2](#), [5](#), [11](#) [13](#), [18](#), [19](#), [34](#), [39](#), [59](#), [60](#), [64](#) -68,
[77](#), [79](#), [86](#), [87](#), [90](#), [92](#), [113](#), [122](#), [135](#), [136](#), [138](#) -40, [142](#), [142](#), [143](#),
[145](#), [147](#), [148](#), [149](#), [152](#) -57, [160](#) [64](#), [187](#), [188](#), [194](#), [256](#) -58, [261](#),
[265](#), [267](#), [268](#), [274](#), [285](#), [287](#), [288](#), [300](#), [302](#), [303](#), [305](#), [306](#), [335](#) -37,
[339](#), [343](#)

Balkan Mountains, [65](#), [77](#)

Bandits, [147](#), [186](#), [190](#), [286](#), [288](#), [289](#), [299](#)

Başı Bozüks. See Armies, irregulars Batum, [25](#), [33](#), [114](#), [179](#), [182](#)

Bayburt, [182](#), [199](#), [200](#)

Bayezit, [109](#), [179](#), [225](#), [227](#)

Beirut, [204](#)

Bergama (Pergamum), [259](#), [266](#), [269](#), [272](#), [273](#), [290](#), [303](#)

Biga, [159](#), [161](#), [256](#), [284](#)

Births, [228](#)

Bitlis, [42](#), [44](#), [179](#), [180](#), [182](#), [185](#), [186](#), [191](#), [192](#), [196](#), [218](#), [221](#), [223](#) -
27, [229](#), [230](#) Black Sea and region, [1](#), [14](#), [25](#), [34](#), [37](#), [39](#), [114](#), [121](#),
[182](#), [195](#), [222](#), [287](#) 90, [292](#), [299](#), [325](#)

Bolsheviks, [182](#), [209](#), [214](#)

Bosnia and Bosnians, [1](#), [3](#), [59](#), [60](#), [62](#), [65](#), [77](#)

Bristol, Mark, [207](#), [214](#), [217](#), [224](#), [276](#)

-360-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 360.

Britain. See Great Britain Bucharest, [155](#), [159](#)

Budapest Convention, [65](#)

Bulgaria and Bulgarians, [1](#), [2](#), [5](#), [13](#), [19](#), [38](#), [59](#) -62, [64](#) -87, [89](#) -94,
[100](#), [110](#) -12, [118](#), [135](#), [136](#), [138](#) -43, [145](#) -55, [157](#) -60, [162](#) -64, [256](#),
[300](#), [304](#), [306](#), [333](#), [335](#), [339](#) -43

Bulgarian revolutionaries, [59](#), [60](#), [64](#), [71](#)

Bulgarian Horrors, [59](#), [73](#), [75](#), [76](#), [96](#), [118](#)

Bulgarian Orthodox Church, [152](#), [153](#), [171](#), [172](#), [342](#)

Burgas, [61](#), [62](#), [65](#), [66](#), [77](#), [81](#), [88](#)

Burnings, fires, [10](#), [16](#), [35](#), [43](#), [60](#), [70-72](#), [74](#), [76](#), [77](#), [84](#), [87](#), [141](#), [142](#), [149](#), [152](#), [156](#), [159](#), [182](#), [188](#), [189](#), [191](#), [198](#), [200-202](#), [206](#), [207](#), [213](#), [215](#), [255](#), [271](#), [272-74](#), [276-83](#), [292](#), [301](#), [303](#)

Bursa, [114](#), [259](#), [283](#), [286](#), [295-97](#), [301](#). See also Hüdavendigâr

Byzantine Empire and Byzantines, [13](#), [41](#), [277](#), [288](#)

Canik, [161](#), [299](#)

Casualties, [11](#), [66](#), [67](#), [70](#), [112](#), [142](#), [188](#), [192](#), [201](#), [206](#), [210](#), [255](#), [263](#), [284](#). See also Mortality Catholics, [3](#), [38](#), [135](#), [148](#), [212](#), [342](#)

Caucasus and Caucasians, [1](#), [2](#), [5](#), [13](#), [15](#), [18](#), [19](#), [23-39](#), [48](#), [51](#), [54](#), [60](#), [68](#), [90](#), [109](#), [110](#), [111](#), [113-15](#), [122](#), [123](#), [125](#), [126](#), [136](#), [179](#), [180](#), [182](#), [89](#), [191](#), [192](#), [195](#), [205](#), [208-11](#), [213-15](#), [218](#), [219](#), [221](#), [227](#), [228](#), [229](#), [230](#), [258](#), [285](#), [305](#), [333](#), [335](#), [338](#), [339](#), [343](#), [344](#) Cavalla, [140](#), [143-45](#), [148](#), [151](#), [153](#), [157](#), [159](#) Chaldeans, [23](#)

Chechnia and Chechens, [25](#), [32-34](#), [110](#)

Cilicia, [120](#), [202-8](#)

Circassia and Circassians (Çerkes), [2](#), [5](#), [25](#), [32](#), [34-39](#), [44](#), [45](#), [47](#), [48](#), [53](#), [60-62](#), [70](#), [75](#), [76](#), [87-90](#), [95](#), [110](#), [114](#), [115](#), [258](#), [286](#), [321](#), [333](#), [335](#)

Commissions of Inquiry

Allied 1919-22, [212](#), [265](#), [276-78](#), [282](#), [283](#), [290](#), [291](#), [320](#), [322](#)

American 1919, [224](#), [252](#)

Bulgaria 1878, [83](#)

Carnegie 1912-13, [160](#), [167](#), [168](#)

Eastern Anatolian Christian-Muslim 1880s, [122](#)

Eastern Boundary, 1857 [32](#)

Eastern Rumelian 1878-79, [85](#), [86](#)

Ottoman Eastern 1916, [191](#), [236](#), [237](#)

Turkish Eastern, 1919

Commission to Investigate the Ismidt Peninsula. See Commissions of Inquiry

Committee of Union and Progress, [120](#), [287](#)

Communications, [148](#)

telegraph, [67](#), [72](#), [183](#), [186](#), [192](#), [193](#)

Control officers, [264](#), [274](#)

Corvée labor, [71](#), [79](#), [200](#)

Crete and Cretans, [261](#)

Crimea and Crimeans, [1](#), [5](#), [14-18](#), [21](#), [26-28](#), [30](#), [32-36](#), [39](#), [42](#), [46](#),
[59](#), [64](#), [88](#), [90](#), [258](#), [333](#), [335](#), [339](#)

Cyprus and Cypriots [37](#), [78](#)

Çatalca [138](#), [161](#)

Çorlu [78](#)

Çoruh [27](#)

Daghestan (Dağistan) and Daghestanis, [25](#), [32-34](#)

Danube (Tuna) River, [65](#), [76](#)

Debre, [156](#)

Denizli, [295](#), [297](#)

Derbend, [27](#), [32](#)

Dersim, [25](#), [46](#), [184](#)

Deserters, [186](#), [189](#), [205](#), [278](#), [286](#)

Destruction of houses, villages, property, [18](#), [34](#), [52](#), [71](#), [74](#), [76](#), [82](#), [87](#),
[104](#), [105](#), [107](#), [114](#), [115](#), [142](#), [143](#), [145](#), [149-51](#), [159](#), [171](#), [189](#) [91](#),
[198-202](#), [207](#), [210-13](#), [225](#) [28](#), [246](#), [264](#), [270](#), [271](#), [274-77](#), [279-83](#),
[292-97](#), [321](#), [328](#)

-361-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 361.

Dibra, [141](#), [149](#), [156](#)

Disease, [1](#), [19](#), [36](#) -38, [54](#), [66](#), [79](#), [80](#), [83](#), [91](#), [103](#), [139](#), [141](#), [144](#), [147](#), [156](#), [157](#), [208](#), [230](#), [258](#), [292](#), [338](#)

Disraeli, Benjamin, [64](#), [65](#)

Diyadin, [179](#)

Diyarbakir, [45](#), [123](#), [183](#), [185](#), [186](#), [203](#), [209](#), [222](#), [223](#), [229](#)

Dobruja, [65](#), [77](#), [90](#)

Doyran, [141](#), [158](#)

Drama, [140](#) -42, [144](#) -46, [157](#), [159](#), [162](#), [292](#)

Dunn, Lt. Robert, [224](#)

Eastern Rumelia, [82](#), [85](#), [86](#), [89](#) -91, [136](#), [304](#), [341](#)

Echmiadzin, [26](#), [28](#), [216](#)

Edib, Halide, [255](#), [324](#)

Edirne (Adrianople), [61](#), [65](#), [66](#), [70](#), [73](#), [75](#), [78](#), [80](#), [83](#), [89](#) -93, [110](#), [135](#), [138](#), [142](#), [143](#), [151](#), [155](#), [156](#), [160](#) 62, [341](#), [342](#) Egypt and Egyptians, [145](#), [157](#), [204](#)

Elbessan, [156](#)

Eleşkirt, [28](#), [109](#), [110](#), [113](#)

England. See Great Britain Erivan (Yerevan), [26](#), [31](#) -33, [124](#), [209](#) 11, [213](#), [215](#) -18, [220](#), [230](#), [333](#)

Erzincan, [25](#), [179](#), [182](#), [197](#) -202, [208](#), [241](#)

Erzurum, [32](#), [45](#), [110](#) -14, [120](#), [123](#), [182](#), [185](#), [198](#) -202, [208](#), [218](#), [220](#), [222](#), [223](#), [225](#), [226](#), [229](#), [230](#), 242 Eski Zagra (Stara Zagora), [69](#), [70](#), [74](#), [77](#), [87](#), [88](#), [141](#)

Eskişehir, [161](#), [280](#), [291](#), [295](#) -97

Europe, Ottoman. See Balkans European Commission of Control in Albania, [149](#)

Filibe, [65](#), [66](#), [75](#), [77](#) -79, [83](#), [86](#), [88](#), [91](#), [110](#), [342](#)

Finlay, George, [10](#)

France and the French, [16](#), [81](#), [86](#), [120](#), [186](#), [198](#), [203](#) -8, [259](#) -62, [265](#), [274](#), [283](#), [334](#)

Franks, British General, [276](#), [277](#)

Galatz (Galati), [11](#), [65](#), [110](#)

Ganja (Elizavetpol), [30](#)-33, [214](#), [230](#)

Garo, Armen. See Pasdirmajian Gemlik, [275](#), [276](#), [278](#), [290](#)

Gendarmerie and gendarmes, [41](#)-44, [46](#), [61](#), [73](#), [82](#), [180](#), [182](#), [184](#), [186](#), [191](#), [192](#), [194](#), [195](#), [204](#), [208](#), [210](#), [255](#), [264](#)-67, [270](#), [274](#), [275](#), [283](#), [286](#), [289](#), [293](#), [298](#), [299](#)

Genocide, [23](#)

Georgia and Georgians, [2](#), [23](#), [25](#), [27](#), [30](#)-33, [114](#), [182](#), [183](#), [209](#), [219](#)

Germanos, Archbishop, [11](#)

Germany and Germans, [7](#), [79](#), [183](#), [334](#)

Gevgili (Ghevgheli), [142](#), [159](#)

Gladstone, William E., [64](#)

Golden Horde, [14](#)

Great Britain and the British, [16](#), [35](#), [42](#), [44](#)-48, [57](#), [62](#), [64](#), [65](#), [69](#)-73, [76](#), [79](#), [81](#), [83](#), [84](#), [88](#), [91](#), [92](#), [110](#) 12, [114](#), [117](#), [124](#), [140](#), [142](#), [145](#), [146](#), [148](#), [149](#), [183](#), [205](#)-7, [211](#)-14, [216](#), [217](#), [224](#), [226](#), [228](#), [259](#)-65, [268](#)-71, [273](#)-79, [282](#), [288](#), [290](#), [293](#), [299](#), [300](#), [302](#)-4, [313](#)-15, [323](#), [324](#), 341 British High Commission, [278](#), [293](#), [299](#)

Greece and Greeks, [1](#)-3, [5](#), [7](#), [9](#)-13, [18](#), [19](#), [23](#), [38](#), [48](#), [59](#), [75](#), [76](#), [93](#), [111](#), [118](#), [121](#), [135](#), [136](#), [138](#)-41, [143](#), [145](#)-49, [151](#), [152](#), [154](#)-57, [159](#), [160](#), [162](#), [163](#), [164](#), [195](#), [201](#), [213](#), [217](#), [219](#), [255](#)-94, [296](#)-305, [333](#) 37, 339 Greek High Commission, [293](#)

Greek Orthodox Church, [3](#), [11](#), [13](#), [152](#), [155](#), [283](#), [285](#), [288](#), [323](#)

Gümülcine (Komotini), [77](#)

Hamidiye, [117](#), [119](#), [206](#)

Hamlin, Cyrus, [118](#)

Harput, [45](#), [209](#), [289](#)

Harrington, General Tim, [300](#)

Haymana, [295](#), [297](#)

Housing, [83](#), [141](#), [148](#), [222](#), [226](#), [291](#), [294](#)

-362-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 362.

Hungary, [135](#)

Hġdavendigâr, [114](#), [161](#), [256](#), [284](#), [305](#)

Iğdir, [344](#)

Imperialism, [179](#), [260](#), [339](#). See also Russian imperialism

Iran and Iranians, Persians, [18](#), [23](#), [25](#), [27](#), [29](#) -33, [185](#), [197](#), [216](#)

Irredentism, [337](#)

Islam, Sunni and Shia, [25](#)

Istanbul, [26](#), [28](#), [37](#), [41](#), [77](#), [78](#), [80](#), [81](#), [89](#) -91, [138](#), [145](#), [157](#), [160](#), [161](#), [193](#), [198](#), [214](#), [219](#), [259](#), [261](#), [266](#), [268](#), [274](#), [275](#), [279](#), [298](#), [299](#), [304](#), [336](#)

Italy and Italians, [7](#), [136](#), [149](#), [259](#), [261](#), [262](#), [265](#), [283](#), [303](#), [304](#), [334](#)

Ivan III, Tsar, [14](#)

Ivan IV, Tsar, "the Terrible," [14](#)

İskenderun (Alexandretta), [203](#) -6

İkodra (Shkodra), [135](#), [148](#)

İsmet Paşa (İnönü), [259](#), [294](#), [295](#), [303](#), [304](#)

İzmir (Smyrna), [157](#), [159](#), [258](#) -62, [264](#) 66, [268](#), [272](#) -75, [278](#), [280](#), [282](#), [288](#), [290](#), [291](#), [292](#) -97, [299](#), [300](#), [303](#), [310](#)

İzmit, [114](#), [161](#), [256](#), [259](#), [275](#), [279](#), [284](#), [286](#), [295](#), [297](#), [301](#), [305](#)

Jews, [7](#), [11](#), [69](#), [74](#), [75](#), [86](#) -88, [125](#), [135](#), [153](#), [157](#), [159](#), [162](#), [163](#), [189](#), [212](#), [270](#), [284](#), [291](#), [342](#)

Kara Hisar-i şarki (Karahisar), [180](#)

Karabag (Karabagh), [31](#)

Karabekir, KAzim, [183](#)

Karakilise, [179](#)

Karapapaks, [111](#), [127](#)

Karasi, [161](#), [295-97](#), [303](#)

Kars, [28](#), [42](#), [109](#), [110](#), [112-14](#), [182](#), [183](#), [185](#), [197](#), [200](#), [208](#), [210-15](#), [219](#) [21](#), [230](#), [344](#)

Muslim National Council (Meclis), [211](#), [213](#), [215](#)

Kars-Ardahan-Artvin Region, [185](#), [250](#)

Kasaba, [266](#), [272](#), [275](#), [296](#)

Kastamonu, [161](#)

Kayseri, [161](#), [205](#)

Kefe, [16](#)

Khanates, [27-32](#)

Khedive, [157](#)

Kirk Kilisse, [138](#)

Kizanlik, [70](#), [75](#), [87](#), [88](#), [90](#)

Konya, [161](#), [204](#), [305](#)

Kosova, [90](#), [135](#), [152](#), [156](#), [341](#)

Kumanova, [77](#), [138](#), [141](#)

Kurds, [5](#), [25](#), [26](#), [32](#), [40-47](#), [55](#), [56](#), [109](#), [113](#), [116-19](#), [121](#), [173](#), [182-84](#), [187](#), [188](#), [195](#), [211](#), [213](#), [229](#), [261](#), [344](#)

Kustendil, [77](#)

Kutais, [230](#)

Kütahya, [295](#), [297](#)

Language groups, [3](#), [25](#)

Law. See Administrative discrimination Layard, Henry, [45](#), [73](#), [92](#), [112](#), [117](#), [119](#) Lazistan and the Laz, [2](#), [25](#), [27](#), [48](#), [114](#) [16](#), [122](#), [333](#) League

of Nations High Commission of Refugees, [302](#)

Libya, [136](#)

Lloyd George, David, [259](#), [268](#), [311](#)

Looting. See Theft Loyalty, religious and ethnic, [3-5](#), [14](#), [25-27](#), [29](#), [110](#), [126](#), [153](#)

Lüleburgaz, [138](#)

Macedonia and Macedonians, [90](#), [138](#), [139](#), [142](#), [144-46](#), [149-52](#), [154](#), [155](#), [160](#), [261](#), [334](#), [335](#)

Mamahatun, [201](#)

Mamuretülaziz, [161](#), [189](#), [203](#), [222](#), [223](#), [229](#), [289](#) Manastir (Monastir, Bitola), [90](#), [135](#), [138](#), [149-52](#), [156](#), [159](#), [162](#), [163](#)

Manisa, [266](#), [269](#), [273](#), [296](#), [300](#), [301](#)

Maraş, [119](#), [161](#), [203](#), [206](#), [207](#), [222](#), [243](#), [244](#) Mardin, [44](#), [192](#), [203](#)

Marmara Islands and region, [275](#), [278](#), [291](#), [298](#) Menemen, [266](#), [269](#), [270](#), [288](#)

-363-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 363.

Menteşe, [161](#)

Mersin, [120](#), [205-7](#)

Midyat, [44](#), [45](#)

Migration

data, [16](#), [17](#), [20](#), [21](#), [32](#), [51](#), [53](#), [79](#), [80](#), [88-91](#), [102-4](#), [107](#), [108](#), [112](#), [113](#), [115](#), [116](#), [128](#), [155-64](#), [167](#), [174-77](#), [207](#), [210](#), [214](#), [217](#), [220-23](#), [459](#), [249](#), [261](#), [284](#), [300](#), [301](#), [303](#), [304](#), [325](#), [326](#), [332](#), [339](#), [346](#) deportations, [17](#), [32](#), [34-36](#), [110](#), [180](#), [187](#), [193-96](#), [217](#), [238](#), [275](#), [286-90](#), [299](#), [325](#) [326](#), [335](#)

economic and political, [121](#) -23

refugee migration, [1](#), [2](#), [5](#), [8](#), [13](#), [18](#), [19](#), [339](#)

Balkan Wars, [145](#) -48, [150](#), [151](#), [155](#) -61, [163](#), [164](#), [174](#) -76, [261](#), [339](#) Caucasian 1860s, [34](#) -39, [47](#) -49, [51](#) -54, [339](#) Cilicia 1918-21, [204](#), [205](#), [207](#)

Crimea, [16](#) -18, [28](#), [339](#)

Bulgaria 1877-78, [66](#) -68, [70](#), [71](#), [73](#), [76](#) -91, [98](#), [102](#) -8, [339](#), [340](#)

East, 1877-78, [28](#), [51](#), [110](#) -15, [128](#), [132](#), [133](#), [339](#)

East, 1914-21, [189](#), [190](#), [192](#) -96, [202](#), [339](#) Greek Revolution, [10](#), [11](#), [339](#)

Khanates 1796-1829, [18](#), [27](#) -29

Southern Caucasus (Transcaucasia) 1917-20, [208](#) -10, [213](#) -15, [217](#) -23, [225](#) -27, [229](#), [230](#), [253](#) Turkish Republic, [334](#) -30, [343](#)

western Anatolia 1919-22, [257](#), [258](#), [260](#), [261](#), [269](#), [287](#) -92, [294](#), [299](#) -305, [339](#)

resettlement, [31](#), [36](#) -39, [47](#), [48](#), [82](#) [86](#), [90](#), [91](#), [99](#), [113](#) -16, [161](#), [193](#), [194](#) -96, [221](#), [257](#), [327](#)

Missions and missionaries, [8](#), [30](#), [42](#), [43](#), [57](#), [58](#), [118](#), [206](#), [223](#), [224](#), [289](#)

Missolonghi, [11](#)

Montenegro and Montenegrins, [62](#), [136](#), [138](#) -40, [148](#), [149](#), [156](#)

Morea, [10](#), [12](#), [306](#)

Morel, Colonel, [198](#), [239](#)

Mortality

data, [12](#), [20](#), [36](#) -38, [64](#), [80](#), [89](#) -91, [96](#), [119](#), [120](#), [131](#), [140](#) -47, [164](#), [167](#), [192](#), [200](#), [213](#), [214](#), [217](#), [220](#), [221](#), [229](#), [230](#), [257](#), [270](#) -75, [284](#), [287](#), [305](#), [308](#), [314](#), [331](#), [339](#)

deaths, murders, massacres, passim

Mosul, [42](#), [46](#), [182](#)

Mudros Armistice, [203](#), [204](#), [259](#), [262](#), [298](#)

Murat, [198](#), [212](#), [239](#)

Mug, [182](#), [185](#) -87

Muslim meclis of Kars. See Kars

Mustafa Kemal (Atatürk), [182](#), [183](#), [258](#), [336](#)

Nadir Shah, [32](#)

Nahcivan (Nahichevan, Nakhichevan), [124](#), [210](#), [214](#) -17

Nationalism, [1](#), [2](#), [5](#) -9, [12](#), [13](#), [18](#), [28](#), [72](#) -74, [117](#), [118](#), [126](#), [148](#), [179](#), [285](#), [337](#), [339](#)

Nazilli, [266](#), [269](#), [271](#) -73, [284](#), [299](#), [301](#)

Near East Relief. See Aid, assistance, relief

Nestorian Church and Nestorians, [23](#)

Newspapers and reporters, [64](#), [67](#), [72](#), [79](#), [81](#), [92](#), [101](#), [111](#), [112](#), [143](#), [202](#), [216](#), [265](#), [275](#), [277](#), [282](#), [289](#)

Nicopolis (Niğbolu), [65](#)

Niles and Sutherland, [223](#) -27, [252](#)

Niş, [104](#), [110](#)

Nogay Tatars, [15](#) -17

Nomads, [25](#), [26](#), [40](#), [43](#), [122](#), [195](#)

Oltu, [27](#), [208](#), [212](#), [220](#), [344](#)

Ordu, [122](#)

Orphans, [87](#)

Orthodox Church, [13](#), [30](#), [163](#), [212](#). See *also* Bulgarian Orthodox Church, Greek Orthodox Church

Ottoman government and governmen-

tal system, [5](#), [8](#), [10](#), [26](#), [37](#), [39](#)-44, [46](#), [47](#), [49](#), [57](#), [59](#), [61](#), [64](#), [70](#), [71](#), [76](#)-78, [82](#), [88](#), [94](#), [97](#), [113](#)-16, [119](#), [121](#), [122](#), [147](#), [161](#), [180](#), [184](#), [191](#), [195](#), [197](#), [199](#), [205](#), [258](#), [259](#), [265](#), [269](#), [272](#), [285](#)-88, [293](#), [294](#), [296](#), [298](#), [299](#), [303](#), [334](#), [335](#), [336](#), [343](#)

Interior Ministry, [16](#), [33](#), [161](#), [201](#), [222](#), [223](#), [273](#), [281](#), [287](#), [288](#), [303](#)

millet system, [6](#), [7](#), [135](#), [136](#), [285](#)

religious toleration, [8](#)

Refugee Commission, [161](#), [176](#), [218](#), [303](#)

sultan, [15](#), [46](#), [85](#), [117](#), [120](#), [136](#), [255](#), [306](#), [337](#), [342](#)

Ozanian, Andranik. See Andranik

Ödemiş, [268](#), [274](#), [292](#), [293](#)

Panagiurishte, [59](#)

Pasdirmajian, Garo, (Armen Garo), [185](#)

Pazarcik, [65](#), [66](#), [77](#), [88](#), [296](#)

Persian government, [216](#)

Plevna, [65](#), [66](#), [68](#)

Police. See Gendarmerie

Pomak, Pomaks, [5](#), [89](#), [153](#), [154](#)

Pontus and Pontic Republic, [287](#)-89, [325](#), [326](#)

Population

data, [31](#), [38](#), [48](#), [88](#)-91, [131](#), [135](#), [136](#), [159](#), [161](#)-64, [212](#), [217](#), [220](#)-23, [229](#), [230](#), [245](#), [246](#), [251](#), [253](#), [256](#), [257](#), [287](#), [303](#)-5, [308](#), [326](#), [329](#), [330](#), [338](#), [339](#), [345](#). See *also* Migration and Mortality

exchanges, [14](#), [30](#), [31](#), [109](#), [135](#), [160](#), [163](#), [164](#), [210](#), [260](#), [287](#), [288](#), [302](#), [335](#), [336](#), [339](#)

Turkish Republic, [333](#)-36

Prejudices, [23](#), [64](#), [92](#), [115](#), [119](#), [224](#), [225](#), [260](#), [268](#), [289](#), [314](#)

Prisoners of war, [112](#), [141](#) -44, [146](#), [263](#), [275](#), [283](#), [327](#)

Priština, [141](#)

Propaganda, [23](#), [166](#), [237](#), [268](#), [269](#), [289](#), [307](#), [323](#)

Radovišta, [151](#), [158](#)

Rape, sexual crimes, [33](#), [67](#), [70](#) -73, [79](#), [82](#), [84](#), [87](#), [93](#), [112](#), [138](#), [140](#), [143](#), [147](#), [155](#), [171](#), [187](#), [189](#), [192](#), [197](#), [200](#), [202](#), [205](#), [206](#), [213](#), [225](#), [265](#), [266](#), [268](#) -71, [273](#), [274](#), [276](#), [277](#), [278](#), [282](#)

Rawlinson, Col. Alfred, [213](#), [247](#)

Razgrad, [67](#), [84](#)

Rebellions, revolts, revolutionaries, [1](#), [6](#) -9, [13](#), [27](#), [40](#), [335](#), [339](#)

Armenian, [26](#), [28](#), [29](#), [42](#), [46](#), [47](#), [109](#), [116](#) -21, [124](#), [126](#), [131](#), [179](#) -82, [185](#) -96, [204](#), [206](#), [214](#), [222](#), [234](#), [238](#), [239](#), [335](#)

Armenakan Party, [118](#)

Dashnak Party, [28](#), [118](#), [185](#), [214](#), [216](#), [233](#), [237](#)

Hunchak Party, [50](#), [118](#)

Bulgarian, [59](#) -64, [71](#) -73, [76](#), [82](#), [85](#)

Bosnian, [59](#), [62](#)

Chechen, Daghestani, [110](#), [129](#)

Crimean, [16](#), [17](#)

Greek, [10](#) -13, [18](#), [59](#), [288](#), [289](#), [334](#), [339](#)

Kars, [112](#)

Kurdish, [40](#) -47, [55](#), [116](#), [184](#)

Rhodope Mountains, [84](#)

Romanian, [11](#), [13](#)

Russian, [109](#), [123](#) -26, [133](#), [134](#), [182](#), [208](#), [209](#), [211](#), [214](#), [216](#), [219](#)

Reform and reformers, [2](#), [7](#), [13](#), [116](#), [337](#), [338](#)

Refugees. See Migration

Refugee camps, [49](#), [157](#), [218](#), [300](#)

Religion. See individual religions and sects

conversion, [7](#), [152-54](#), [172](#)

Reprisals, [20](#), [59](#), [60-62](#), [75](#), [76](#), [96](#) [125](#), [154](#), [155](#), [193-96](#), [279](#), [284-87](#), [290](#), [327](#) Rhodope Mountains, [77](#), [84](#), [89](#), [92](#), [106](#), [145](#), [153](#)

Rize [25](#), [182](#), [229](#)

Robert College, [118](#)

Romania and Romanians, [1](#), [11](#), [13](#), [138](#)

Rumbold, Horace, [278](#), [299](#)

-365-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 365.

Rumelia, [85](#), [86](#)

Rusçuk (Ruse), [66](#), [71](#), [90](#), [110](#)

Russia and Russians, [1](#), [2](#), [5](#), [6](#), [11](#), [13](#) [19](#), [23](#), [25-36](#), [38-40](#), [42](#), [44-49](#), [59-62](#), [64](#), [65](#), [66-87](#), [90-94](#), [99](#), [109-26](#), [136](#), [139](#), [140](#), [179](#), [180](#), [182](#), [184-88](#), [190-94](#), [196-98](#), [200](#), [201](#), [208-12](#), [214](#), [216-22](#), [224](#), [227](#), [228](#), [230](#), [256](#), [258](#), [300](#), [301](#), [333](#), [335](#), [338](#), [343](#), [344](#)

imperialism and expansionism, [1](#), [2](#), [6](#), [13-19](#), [29-31](#), [49](#), [50](#), [98](#)

October Revolution, [182](#)

revolution of 1905, [109](#), [123-26](#)

Russian government, [16](#), [17](#), [28](#), [81](#), [92](#), [111](#), [122](#), [123](#), [185](#)

Sakarya River, [259](#), [279](#), [280](#)

Salonica (Selanik), [77](#), [90](#), [110](#), [135](#), [138](#), [142](#), [146](#), [151](#), [156](#), [158-60](#), [162](#), [337](#)

Samsun, [34](#), [36](#), [37](#), [221](#), [223](#), [229](#), [289](#)

Sanitation, [194](#)

Sarikamiş, [27](#), [198](#), [211](#) -13, [217](#), [219](#)

Saruhan, [295](#), [297](#)

Sasun, [119](#)

Scutari, [138](#)

Serbia and Serbs, [5](#), [9](#), [59](#), [60](#), [62](#), [64](#), [136](#), [138](#) -41, [145](#), [146](#), [148](#) -52, [154](#) -56, [162](#) -64, [171](#), [300](#)

Serb, Greek, Bulgarian Commission 1912, [146](#)

Serres (Serrai), [143](#), [146](#), [147](#), [154](#), [158](#), [159](#)

Shamil, [33](#), [34](#), [51](#)

Shipka Pass, [65](#)

Silistria, [65](#), [66](#)

Sinop, [36](#)

Sistova (Svishtov), [65](#)

Sivas, [23](#), [113](#), [185](#), [186](#), [198](#), [203](#), [223](#), [229](#)

Slavery, [10](#), [11](#), [62](#)

Slavs, [17](#), [18](#), [30](#), [34](#) -36, [64](#), [68](#), [139](#), [153](#)

Smyrna Commission. See Commissions of Inquiry Sofia, [66](#), [77](#), [110](#)

Spies, [27](#), [28](#), [49](#)

Stalin, Joseph, [17](#)

Starvation, famine, malnutrition, [1](#), [17](#), [19](#), [27](#), [34](#) -36, [40](#), [46](#), [66](#), [79](#), [80](#), [83](#), [85](#), [91](#), [123](#), [139](#), [141](#) -44, [147](#), [148](#), [149](#), [150](#), [152](#), [156](#), [159](#), [189](#), [195](#), [201](#), [208](#), [210](#), [215](#), [218](#), [219](#), [225](#), [230](#), [255](#), [257](#), [289](#), [292](#), [302](#), [338](#)

Strumnitsa, [143](#), [145](#), [146](#), [158](#), [159](#)

Sukhumkale (Sukhumi), [25](#), [110](#)

Sykes, Mark, [129](#), [203](#)

Sykes-Picot Agreement, [203](#)

Syria and Syrians, [38](#), [78](#), [91](#), [203](#), [204](#), [206](#)

şevket Paşa, [61](#)

şumla (Shumen), [65](#), [66](#), [77](#), [83](#), [84](#), [89](#), [341](#)

Tatar Pazarcik, [65](#), [66](#), [77](#)

Tatars. See Crimea and Crimeans

Taxes, [7](#), [10](#), [16](#), [17](#), [39-41](#), [43](#), [45](#), [116](#), [119](#), [122](#), [150](#), [151](#), [210](#), [300](#)

Tercan, [200](#), [201](#)

Terror, terrorism, [12](#), [61](#), [82](#), [95](#), [125](#), [139](#), [140](#), [261](#), [262](#), [264](#)

Theft, pillage, plunder, [12](#), [16](#), [30](#), [18](#), [38](#), [43](#), [46](#), [47](#), [61](#), [62](#), [69](#), [70](#), [72](#), [74](#), [75](#), [79](#), [82](#), [87](#), [92](#), [93](#), [104](#), [105](#), [112](#), [115](#), [138](#), [140](#), [141-52](#), [158](#), [184](#), [195-97](#), [205-7](#), [212](#), [213](#), [216](#), [219](#), [228](#), [256](#), [263-77](#), [282](#), [284](#), [290-97](#)

Thrace, [13](#), [90](#), [141](#), [142](#), [151](#), [154](#), [160](#), [161](#), [261](#), [291](#), [336](#)

 Eastern, [1](#), [155](#), [160](#), [161](#), [259](#), [287](#), [304](#), [336](#), [337](#)

 Western, [77](#), [78](#), [138](#), [155](#)

Tiflis, [110](#), [111](#), [114](#), [213](#), [230](#)

Timber, [123](#), [148](#), [150](#), [294](#), [299](#)

Tire, [267](#), [268](#), [274](#), [293](#)

Tirnova (Turnovo), [65](#), [66](#), [77](#), [85](#), [162](#)

Torture, [60](#), [73](#), [112](#), [145](#), [187](#), [189](#), [213](#), [276](#), [282](#), [283](#)

-366-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 366.

Toynbee, Arnold, [277](#), [278](#), [319](#), [320](#)

Trabzon, [34](#), [36-38](#), [48](#), [110-12](#), [115](#), [182](#), [197](#), [201](#), [202](#), [222](#), [223](#), [229](#), [288](#)

Trade, commerce, [26](#), [37-39](#), [191](#)

Transcaucasia, [25](#), [123](#), [209](#), [219](#). See *also* Caucasus and Caucasians
Transcaucasian Federation, [182](#), [183](#), [196](#), [197](#), [209](#)

Transportation, [139](#), [194](#), [218](#), [222](#)

 railroads, [68](#), [78](#), [142](#), [193](#), [204](#), [215](#) 18

Treaties and Congresses

 Berlin, [83](#), [85](#), [114](#), [116](#)

 Bucharest, [155](#), [159](#)

 Kfiqfik Kaynarca, [15](#)

 Lausanne, [259](#), [294](#), [295](#), [297](#), [302](#), [303](#), [328](#) Paris (Versailles), [259](#),
[271](#), [275](#)

 San Stephano, [77](#)

Tribes, [15](#), [25](#), [26](#), [32](#) -34, [40](#) -42, [44](#) -47, [60](#), [113](#), [116](#), [183](#), [184](#), [187](#),
[188](#), [195](#), [211](#), [213](#). See *also* Abhaz, Circassians, Kurds, Nomads

Tripolitza, [11](#)

Tulça (Tulcea), [342](#)

Tuna, [89](#), [341](#), [342](#)

Tuna Vilâyeti, [89](#), [341](#), [342](#)

Turkish Nationalists, [197](#), [208](#), [279](#), [287](#) -92, [301](#), [336](#)

Turkish Republic, [2](#), [160](#), [163](#), [164](#), [183](#), [220](#), [221](#), [229](#), [287](#), [302](#), [305](#),
[333](#), [335](#) -37, [340](#)

Ukraine and Ukrainians, [2](#), [36](#), [125](#)

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, [33](#), [217](#), [218](#), [230](#), [333](#), [343](#), [344](#)

Urfa, [182](#)

Urla, [272](#), [273](#)

Uûak, [297](#)

Üsküdar, [138](#), [148](#), [156](#), [159](#)

Üsküp (Skopje), [77](#), [89](#), [110](#)

Van, [25](#), [28](#), [114](#), [120](#), [123](#), [179](#), [180](#), [183](#) -89, [191](#) -93, [196](#), [218](#), [220](#)
[30](#), [335](#)

Varna, [65](#), [66](#), [77](#), [88](#)

Venizelos, Eleutherios, [260](#), [261](#), [307](#), [308](#), [315](#), [316](#)

Victoria, British Queen, [65](#)

Vienna, [11](#)

Wars

Balkan Wars, [18](#), [90](#), [135](#) -64, [167](#), [168](#), [170](#), [187](#), [194](#), [256](#), [257](#), [265](#), [267](#), [287](#), [300](#), [302](#), [303](#), [305](#), [306](#), [336](#), [339](#)

civil and intercommunal, [29](#), [123](#) -26, [187](#) -92, [256](#)

Caucasian 1860s, [32](#) -36, [51](#), [52](#)

Crimean, [16](#) -18, [26](#) -28, [31](#) -33, [42](#), [46](#), [59](#), [64](#) Greek Revolution (Greek War of Independence), [9](#) -12, [18](#), [256](#), [290](#), [339](#)

Khanates 1796-1828, [27](#), [28](#), [31](#), [32](#)

Russo-Iranian 1827-28, [27](#), [31](#), [339](#)

Russo-Turkish 1828-29, [16](#), [18](#), [27](#), [32](#), [339](#)

Russo-Turkish 1877-78, [6](#), [12](#), [18](#), [31](#), [42](#) -46, [59](#), [64](#) -81, [89](#) -94, [109](#) 17, [136](#), [138](#) -40, [187](#), [256](#), [265](#), [267](#), [292](#), [303](#), [339](#)

Serbian 1876, [64](#)

Turkish War of Independence, [19](#), [160](#), [255](#), [257](#) -92, [307](#) -11

World War I, [2](#), [14](#), [19](#), [27](#), [28](#), [109](#), [126](#), [160](#), [163](#), [179](#) -202, [208](#) 11, [218](#) -20, [223](#), [231](#) -33, [238](#), [257](#), [268](#), [286](#), [287](#), [292](#), [294](#), [299](#), [301](#), [305](#), [334](#), [335](#), [336](#), [339](#), [343](#)

Widows, [80](#), [87](#)

Wilson, Woodrow, [259](#)

Yalova, [275](#) -78, [282](#), [290](#), [296](#), [303](#)

Yanya (Janina), [135](#), [138](#), [156](#), [162](#)

Yassy (Iaŭi), [11](#)

Yedisan, [15](#)

Yeni Zagra (Nova Zagora), [70](#), [74](#), [76](#)

Yenipazar, [89](#)

Ypsilantes, Alexander, [11](#)

Yugoslavia, [1](#), [2](#), [163](#), [164](#), [333](#)

Zagra (Zagora). See Eski Zagra and Yeni Zagra Zeve, [188](#)

Zeytun, [28](#), [41](#), [47](#), [119](#) -21, [180](#), [186](#), [187](#), [193](#)

-368-

Questia Media America, Inc. www.questia.com

Publication Information: Book Title: Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922. Contributors: Justin McCarthy - author. Publisher: Darwin Press. Place of Publication: Princeton, NJ. Publication Year: 1995. Page Number: 368.