

---

This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google<sup>™</sup> books

<https://books.google.com>



US Doc 550.5

CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS

---

67th CONGRESS/2nd SESSION

---

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS



HJ 29DL



HARVARD  
COLLEGE  
LIBRARY









# IN BEHALF OF THE ARMENIANS

## HEARINGS

BEFORE THE  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SIXTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

## H. RES. 244

IN BEHALF OF THE ARMENIANS

MARCH 7, 1922

### STATEMENTS OF

WALTER GEORGE SMITH, Esq., President of the  
Armenia-American Society

MR. GEORGE R. MONTGOMERY, Director, Armenia-  
American Society

REV. MIHRAN T. KALAJDJIAN

MR. G. H. PAPAZIAN

MR. CHARLES W. VICKREY, General Secretary, Near  
East Relief

REV. W. C. EMHARDT, Representing the Presiding Bishop  
and Council of Episcopal Churches of the United States

MR. M. VARTAN MALCOM



WASHINGTON  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
1922



COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIXTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION.

STEPHEN G. PORTER, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*.

JOHN JACOB ROGERS, Massachusetts.  
HENRY W. TEMPLE, Pennsylvania.  
AMBROSE KENNEDY, Rhode Island.  
EDWARD E. BROWNE, Wisconsin.  
MERRILL MOORES, Indiana.  
ERNEST R. ACKERMAN, New Jersey.  
JAMES T. BEGG, Ohio.  
HENRY ALLEN COOPER, Wisconsin.  
THEODORE E. BURTON, Ohio.  
BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD, New York.  
HAMILTON FISH, Jr., New York.  
THEODORE HUKRIEDE, Missouri.  
WALTER F. LINEBERGER, California.  
J. M. C. SMITH, Michigan.  
CYRENUS COLE, Iowa.

J. CHARLES LINTHICUM, Maryland.  
CHARLES M. STEDMAN, North Carolina.  
ADOLPH J. SABATH, Illinois.  
TOM CONNALLY, Texas.  
W. BOURKE COCKRAN, New York.  
R. WALTON MOORE, Virginia.

EDMUND F. ERK, *Clerk*.

# IN BEHALF OF THE ARMENIANS.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
*Tuesday, March 7, 1922.*

The committee this day met, Hon. Stephen G. Porter (chairman) presiding.  
The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order. The committee was called to consider House Resolution 244, a resolution dealing with the Armenian question, reading as follows:

[H. Res. 244, Sixty-seventh Congress, second session.]

## RESOLUTION.

Whereas the Armenians and other Christian peoples of Turkey continue in their evil plight and the refugees are unable to return to their homes; and

Whereas the evacuation of Cilicia, already, begun, has brought calamity to the Christian population there; and

Whereas the humanitarian sentiment of the people of the United States is strongly enlisted in behalf of these Christian populations, for whom American relief has been generously given: Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the President be requested to express to the de facto Government at Angora the moral protest of the United States against the persecution of the Armenians and other Christian peoples; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the President be requested, if not incompatible with public interest, to take up with Great Britain, France, and Italy the question of calling a conference for the purpose of considering methods by which the Armenians may be given an opportunity to establish themselves as a nation.

Mr. Smith is spokesman for these gentlemen.

## STATEMENT OF MR. WALTER GEORGE SMITH, PRESIDENT OF THE ARMENIA-AMERICAN SOCIETY.

MR. SMITH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the resolution before you was introduced by Mr. Rogers, of Massachusetts, as you are aware, at the request of a group of those of us who have been especially interested for some years in the relief of the Armenians. It is a matter of great regret that Mr. Rogers, owing to a domestic bereavement, is unable to be present at this meeting. I must assume at the outset, and I want to be as brief as possible, Mr. Chairman, that you gentlemen have at least a general familiarity with the history of Armenian relief and the Armenians and what their troubles have been.

In 1914, when the war began, there were under the domination of Turkey and of Russia about 4,000,000 Armenians. The Russian Armenians were in the Province of Georgia and Russian Armenia, to the northeast of the Taurus Mountains. The Turkish Armenians were at the southeast of those mountains and in the Province of Cilicia. They were the remnants of a once great and powerful nation. Being a people of unusual intelligence, they represented in the Turkish Empire almost all of the constructive ability. That is to say, in the villages, the cities, and towns they were the artisans and handcraftsmen, the workers in metal, the workers in leather, and, rising to the higher positions, they were clerks and secretaries. At one time the Turkish ambassador in London was an Armenian. They were members of the Turkish Parliament and members of the Turkish cabinet. When the war began in 1914 the Armenians were holding a national conference. The Turkish Government approached them and asked them, promising them autonomy, to throw in their fate with

Germany and Turkey against the allied powers, which meant that a large portion of the Russians, eventually 200,000 soldiers, would have been added to the German-Turkish forces. The Armenians refused this offer, saying that those of them who were Russian subjects would be obedient to the Czar and those Turkish subjects would be obedient to the Sultan. That was the signal for what had already been determined upon—a deliberate attempt, by massacres, by starvation, by deportation, to obliterate the whole Armenian people. It was so far successful, as near as we can estimate, that 700,000 Armenians in the Turkish Provinces of Diarbekir, Bitlis, and Van were actually massacred.

Then, taking the suggestion from the German deportations, all of the rest of them, all of the Armenians in the Turkish Empire, were deported. That is to say, their villages were surrounded and men and women and children were sent out on an impossible journey of hundreds of miles from the mountains down into the plains. They fell by the wayside, so that not less than a million of those people died of massacre and actual starvation. It is not necessary for me to go into details before a committee like this. I must assume, and it is no violent assumption, although you are clothed with authority and must keep your feet upon the ground, to use a common expression, and can not act under the impulses of sentiment, yet I can not doubt that individually every man of this committee, every man in Congress, every officer of the United States Government must have the same shuddering horror of this unprecedented tragedy in the history of the human race that we have. There have been in Turkey for 100 years American missions of the Congregational denomination. They have built schools, hospitals, relief stations during this 100 years, and when this tragedy began the Congregationalist missionaries and their friends in this country were practically the only people who had an intimate familiarity with the situation in Turkey. To the south, in Syria, the Presbyterian denomination had established missions, and the fugitives from the north were deported down as far south as Palestine.

Persecutions extended as far eastward as Bagdad over in the valley of the Tigris and the Euphrates, against one of the most ancient people in the world, more ancient than the Armenians. They were the Chaldeans, and they numbered about 400,000. The Turks destroyed 250,000 of the Chaldeans by actual massacre. Their religion was historical Nestorian, Jacobite, and very largely Catholic. The Catholics lost six bishops and all of their priests in their dioceses. Those people have been reduced to very small proportions. When this horrible news came to America, as I have said, the people who were most familiar with the situation in Turkey were those of the Congregationalist and Presbyterian denominations who had been either missionaries themselves or came from missionary families, or had the tradition, many of them, like gentlemen whose names I could give, who were born in that country and are distinguished as American citizens. They appealed to the whole American public at once to relieve the people who had fled. The war had been carried on in the Caucasus in Georgia and in Armenia, the objective point being the oil wells of Baku, on the Black Sea. As no doubt you gentlemen are aware, there is one line of railroad beginning at Batum on the Black Sea and running straight across to the Caspian Sea into Baku, with a branch running into Armenia at Erivan, and another branch running to the south into Persia, and another running down to Kars in the former Turkish province. Those who escaped from the Turkish provinces fled from the Taurus Mountains across the plains at Mount Ararat to the Caucasus and followed the line of railroad as far as Tiflis. It was winter time. The country had already been war-worn. All of its spare provisions had been destroyed. These people, mostly old men and women and little children, came into that country and there was literally nothing to feed them. They sat down on the curbstones and railroad tracks and fell over from inanition and were taken out and buried in trenches.

I must not digress. The American friends made an appeal and immediately \$10,000,000 were subscribed for the relief of these sufferers.

Mr. BROWNE. Can you point that out on the map, about where that is?

Mr. SMITH. There is Batum. There is Baku. There is Tiflis. Here comes a railroad into Persia. There is Erivan in Armenia. There comes a railroad extending into Turkey. Here is Constantinople, 570 miles distant by the Black Sea. Along this line is the ancient country where Xenophon ended his famous retreat of the 10,000, coming up from Mesopotamia through the mountains and having to fight his way through the same tribes now called the Kurds until he came here to the coast. This [indicating] is the Turkish Empire in Asia, or was, and that is the Turkish Empire and Thrace, back into Europe.

Mr. KENNEDY. Where is Angora?

Mr. SMITH. Down here in Anatolia. This [indicating] is the island of Cyprus.

Mr. BROWNE. Are those railroads owned by the Turkish Government?

Mr. SMITH. Those railroads, I think, were built by the Russian Government. The Russians, as you know, are very fine engineers and they have had built highways through this country to develop particularly the oil wells of Batum and then laid roads to the mountain districts, and in completing it they laid out a very fine highway road to Trebizond.

This \$10,000,000 that I have mentioned was raised in the name of the Armenian and Syrian relief, and those most responsible in raising it were these Congregationalist and Presbyterian gentlemen and their friends. But they soon found, large as that sum was, that it was totally inadequate to keep alive the 500,000 refugees and their orphans who had come over into Russian Armenia, and to take care of those who had escaped finally to Syria, and these gentlemen, with a fairness, for which, of course, the highest praise must be given, fearing lest there might be a flavor of proselytism, in a desire to advance their own special missionary interests invited all denominations to come in and help them. Then Congress, after considerable consideration, did an unusual thing, not an unprecedented thing, but an unusual thing. It chartered the Near East Relief. Mr. Vickrey, who will address you in a few moments, is managing director of the Near East Relief. That organization, I think, is unparalleled in the way in which it has carried on its work and in the success it has achieved. Roughly speaking—the exact figures will be put before you—but, roughly speaking, since 1915 a million dollars a month has been raised from the pockets of the American people and has gone out in the form of clothing, food, shoes, seeds, and agricultural implements to keep alive these unfortunate refugees who have been separated from their homes, from their farms, and have been pauperized, although they are the last people in the world to submit willingly to pauperism. I am not here to glorify the Armenian people, but I have been in that country myself. I have been as far south as Erivan. I have traveled through and have seen these people literally dying of starvation.

Then I have seen the children, their eyes hollow, emaciated to the last extent, kept alive on a teaspoonful of rice. When the American relief took hold of them, after a week or two of nourishing food and clothing I have seen those children throw themselves into manual training and do all sorts of work in a way that indicates their elastic temperament. It proves all that is said of the intellectual ability of these people, and the extreme pity of it for the whole country where our civilization took its birth that the only constructive element should be permitted to die. The difficulty has been not with the generosity of the American people, but an extraordinary combination of circumstances. When the war broke out there were 200,000 Armenians, Armenian soldiers from the Provinces of Georgia and Russian Armenia in the Russian Army. The Russians had taken those soldiers and added them to their army corps in Galicia. When the Russian revolution began and Kerensky came into power the Armenian soldiers went to Kerensky and said, "We must have defense upon our border," and Kerensky said, "Yes; I recognize that fact. We will send soldiers down there." But before they could get there the Bolsheviks came into power, and the result was that about 60,000 men under the command of General Antranck reached their own frontiers. I have met Antranck in Armenia and elsewhere. His campaigns have been written up in the most interesting way by Colonel Gibbons, of the British Army. He held that line of frontier from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean against picked Turkish divisions, 600 miles of that frontier, inadequately armed, inadequately fed, inadequately clothed, until in the meanwhile General Allenby, of the British forces, had succeeded in defeating the Turks after they had first won their success with the capture of General Townsend's troops. The record shows it. That was the military services of the Armenian people during the war. That was the first claim laid to the gratitude of the civilized world, and it was recognized.

Mr. ACKERMAN. What became of the other 140,000; did they go to the Russian Army or the Bolsheviks?

Mr. SMITH. They could not get down, and they all scattered and were destroyed or went back to their homes. What became of them it would be impossible to say.

Mr. ACKERMAN. They did not join the Bolsheviks?

Mr. SMITH. No; not so far as I know.

Mr. KENNEDY. What was the population of Armenia when the war broke out?

Mr. SMITH. About 4,000,000 Armenians in Turkey and Russian Armenia.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Were the Turkish Armenians in the Turkish forces?

Mr. SMITH. They had been in the army.

Mr. LINEBERGER. There were a considerable number?

Mr. SMITH. There was a very large number. When the Young Turks came into power they proclaimed a new era. There was to be no distinction between the Christian population of Turkey and the Turkish population. The Young Turks made every promise that could be desired, and for the first time they admitted Armenians as soldiers into their armies, but when they had made up their minds that the best way to overcome such a Christian population was to destroy them. There is the strongest evidence—I do not want to go back to old and unnecessary things, but there is the strongest evidence printed published from the records of the German Government that the Germans did not want the Armenians there and that the Turks took a leaf from the book of German instructions when they carried out this deportation.

Mr. COCKRAN. About how many of the population were left; what population is there now?

Mr. SMITH. I can only make a guess. There were at least 1,000,000 of them utterly destroyed. There were recently 150,000 of them who had been refugees in Syria who were brought by the French into Cilicia and were promised protection. Many of them are drifting about the Mediterranean Sea in ships and boats, and unless something is done the plans of the Young Turks and the Germans will be carried out by permission of the world.

Mr. LINEBERGER. A million massacred? Does that include battle casualties on both sides?

Mr. SMITH. I am not speaking of battle casualties. I am speaking of the actual massacres, estimated at 700,000, and those dying in deportation estimated at 300,000. I do not want to be held to the exact numbers.

Mr. COCKRAN. Were those massacres by troops or by infuriated people?

Mr. SMITH. By private persons, cutthroats, and other persons among the Turks. You can not indict a whole people. You can not indict the whole of the Turks. I could give you, if there were time, illustrations of persons among the Turks whose humanity overcame the wishes of the powers and cases where Armenians were saved here and there in that way.

Mr. COCKRAN. What I mean is this. The history of massacres shows it is done not by organized forces of the government but by forces inside the country let loose with the connivance of the government. Is this what happened in Armenia? Were troops and officers of the government actually taking part in the massacres.

Mr. SMITH. It happened very largely where the troops were actually drawn up. For instance, at Trebizond we have testimony of the Italian consul who was there during the massacre. The troops entered the town. Do not hold me to too strict accountability for my figures.

Mr. COCKRAN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. There were 16,000 Christians in Trebizond. They took them in boats and sunk them in the sea, and took them out on the hill and massacred them? The river ran red.

Mr. COCKRAN. Who were they?

Mr. SMITH. The Turkish troops, in many instances, officered by German officers.

Mr. LINEBERGER. A reign of terror.

Mr. SMITH. A reign of terror indescribable, and anyone who wishes to get the atmosphere of it should read Ambassador Morgenthau's book. He knows this country. He knows intimately Kemal Pasha, and the triumvirate who ruled the Young Turks. He did everything in his power, and his book shows it. He went to the German ambassador, Wangenheim, and talked to him.

Now, I want to get back to the history of what is happening to-day. I would like to impress this committee with these points. The American people should know that we have in the United States 60 separate headquarters which reach out to every organization and every individual, but, of course, even the generosity of the American people may eventually be exhausted. I may say parenthetically, at this time, upward of 100,000 Armenians and other Christians, orphans are under our direct charge. Young American men and women are with them now, facing the perils of typhus and smallpox and dying at their posts in the interior of Turkey, Cilicia, and Syria, the relief work extending from Jerusalem all the way north to Alexandropol. Unless there comes political relief, there must be destruction of these people.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Will you kindly show me on the map where Alexandropol is?

Mr. SMITH. Yes. The subject is so rich that I am running the danger of being discursive and getting off to points not vital to this resolution. So far as I can I would like to confine my argument to that.

At the present moment we find this situation. The great powers of Europe, Italy, France, and Great Britain, and joining to them, Japan, recognizing the independence of Armenia, made a treaty which they forced upon the Sultan's acceptance at Sevres about two years ago. Thereby they carved the Turkish Empire into about three separate spheres of influence.

The CHAIRMAN. Was France one of the signatory powers?

Mr. SMITH. Yes. That blocked out the boundaries of Armenia and included Russian Armenia and such portions of Turkish Armenia as the President of the United States should delimit. President Wilson, after taking thought of the situation, and studying statistics of population and history delimited certain portions of the Turkish Provinces of Van and Bitlis and Diabekir, and had the treaty of Sevres stood, this would have been the situation. There would have been an independent Armenia without an outlet to the Black Sea, without an outlet to the Mediterranean Sea, but it would have been a place where the Armenian race would have been able to stop and could have cultivated the land and attained its nationalistic aspirations.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Would it have had economic resources necessary to maintain a nation?

Mr. SMITH. That is a question. My own judgment is, not having any accurate knowledge on the subject at all, that such a Nation would have had to be elderbrothered for some time, but eventually it would have stood on its own feet.

I would like to say, although it is a digression, I would like to call the attention of the committee to a bit of history. In 1821 to 1831—that goes back to the time of our grandfathers and great-grandfathers—this whole country was aroused with sympathy for Greece and so was England. You all know that Lord Byron went to Greece and died at Missolonghi after writing his immortal poems appealing for the preservation of the national spirit. The Greeks were a small nation of about 500,000 people, in a country not to be compared in natural resources with that of Armenia. As to the intellectual capacity of the Greeks, as compared with the Armenians, there is a saying in the East that it takes two Jews to catch a Greek and two Greeks to catch an Armenian. I can not doubt it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that complimentary or otherwise?

Mr. SMITH. Consider the history of the Armenians in this country, 100,000 of them now. They number among them men of great ability and great power and great learning. They are professors in colleges. They are cultivators of the vine in Fresno, Calif., and I think it may be said there has never been found an instance of an Armenian mendicant. Give them one-tenth of a chance and they take care of themselves. So, in reply to the inquiry as to whether the people could have taken care of themselves economically with the same amount or proportionate amount of patronage that the Greeks had, they would have undoubtedly taken care of themselves when this treaty of Sevres had been signed. But Italy, France, and England, instead of enforcing that treaty, took different ground—I do not wish to criticise, perhaps I do not know enough to criticise it. It is a fact, however, that the Turkish general Kemal Pasha, who had won a great reputation in the command of Turkish troops on the Gallipolis Peninsula when they repulsed the British with a few thousand men, defied the whole continent of Europe, defied Italy, defied France.

The CHAIRMAN. May I interrupt you there? That was about two years ago?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. At that time was not France quietly aiding Turkey in her effort to put the Romanoffs back on the throne of Russia in order to rehabilitate the French bonds? In other words, do you think France was acting in good faith in her opposition to the Turks?

Mr. SMITH. It would seem not, Mr. Chairman. The evidence is almost irresistible that they were not acting in good faith, but I do not charge bad faith.

The CHAIRMAN. So far as France is concerned, the Turkish officer was perfectly safe in defying them?

Mr. SMITH. Perfectly safe; and I think safe so far as Italy was concerned. It is an open secret that arms were shipped from Italy and passed on to Kemal Pasha. It is inconceivable, Mr. Chairman, that had there been united action on the part of those three great powers most interested in the Mediterranean

that Kemal Pasha would not have been crushed like an eggshell. But there are obscure reasons that we can only guess at. Certain it is that the French, who had always claimed by reason of French Catholic missionaries being in Syria a special sphere of influence there, made demands that they be given also a special sphere of influence in Cilicia. It is a fact that their troops entered Cilicia. It is a fact that they put French uniforms on Armenians; and the Armenians, being human, wreaked vengeance here and there on the Turks. It is a fact that they took these uniforms off afterwards and surrounded the Armenian troops with Gatling guns and disarmed them, and it is a fact that in 1920 25,000 Armenians lost their lives at Aintala and Marash. At Urfa, after the French battalions—and those were men who had fought at Verdun—had marched out, they were massacred in the defiles of the mountains and their heads brought into Urfa. We have that from men who were personally there at the time it was done.

Notwithstanding these incidents, the French have sent M. Franklin Bouillon to Angora. He made a treaty with Kemal Pasha whereby, in consideration of certain commercial advantages, the French troops have all been withdrawn; and those 150,000 Armenians, many of whom were forced back over the borders into Cilicia, and all of whom received promises of protection, were left to the tender mercies of the Turks. Of course, they knew what that meant, and they fled. They are adding now to the burdens of the American people.

Mr. LINEBERGER. You do not mean to impute any connivance on the part of the French Government?

Mr. SMITH. No; not at all. What the French Government has done is that it has condoned it, a disgrace to its national honor, by making a treaty with Kemal Pasha.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Smith, as a matter of fact, those Turkish atrocities were committed with the tacit consent of France and Italy.

Mr. SMITH. You mean the recent atrocities?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. LINEBERGER. The atrocities committed in Mexico on the part of Villa might also have been said to have been committed with the tacit consent of the United States Government.

Mr. COCKRAN. Do not let us get off on that. It is a pretty serious thing to be making charges in a body like this.

Mr. SMITH. It is my great desire in presenting this subject to the consideration of this committee to let the facts state themselves and speak for themselves. I need not say to gentlemen whose special duty it is to deal with international relations how complicated the whole subject is and how readily a layman like myself might be mistaken in imputing motives. This fact stands out: It is expressed in an editorial that I cut from the Catholic Church paper in Philadelphia—the Catholic Standard and Times—a day or two ago, and it expresses the sentiment of the American people on this subject. Bear with me if I read it:

#### “THE PASSING OF ARMENIA.

“All laden with desolation and sadness is the well-nigh incredible story of the passing of Armenia from among the nations of the world. One reading the circumstances marking the end of Armenia's tragedy becomes convinced that there is no evading the responsibility and the guilt resting upon the nations that have stood idly by and thereby consented to this slaughter of a peace-loving, enlightened, and Christian people.

“Boasting that this country and its associates made war in the name of democracy and for the safeguarding of small peoples, they have allowed the Turk, a vanquished foe, to play the part of a victorious, a tyrannous, a brutal destroyer of a free, Christian, and blood-innocent people.

“The low and petty trafficking motives (petty even though they are concerned with the commerce of empires) which have been the reason and the basis of this shameful condonation of the Turk will long mar the records of the World War victors with the degradation of paltry designs.

“Once more the unspeakable Turk has butchered men and outraged women to the destruction of a whole nation, and Christendom, untaught by the experience of the centuries, again is silent and shamed. How shall we ask of God, the Father of us all, blessings of peace and plenty for our people while the red guilt of our sin of omission cries to Him of our inhumanity to our brothers?”

I read that to you, gentlemen of the committee, as an expression of sentiment—and I do not think I am exaggerating—of 20,000,000 American citizens of all ages, of both sexes, of all religious or nonreligious beliefs. I say that for this reason: The statistics that are kept in the office of the Near East in New York show that the contributions that have come are from the dime of the Sunday school child to the \$100,000 of the New York millionaire. They represent all the benevolent organizations, social organizations, institutions, that could be piled up one after another, showing the deep feeling of the American people on this subject.

MR. ACKERMAN. Can you tell me how many separate contributions have been made?

MR. SMITH. I am afraid that would be impossible, but the estimate, as near as I can make it, is that they are the contributions of 20,000,000 individuals.

MR. ACKERMAN. The total amount is \$84,000,000.

MR. SMITH. Not as much as that; between \$50,000,000 and \$60,000,000, but add to that the amount that the United States Government contributed through its Treasury, through the Hoover fund. Mr. Hoover authorized in the European relief a million dollars, to be contributed through his representative in Constantinople. Thus hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of flour were distributed through the Near East Relief agencies.

THE CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

MR. SMITH. Now, let us get back to this point. This is by private organizations. It would never do in the world for the Near East Relief to be considered pro or anti-Turkish or pro-Armenia or anti-Armenia. It is a benevolent organization wholly without regard to creed, religion, or race to sustain these unfortunate victims of conditions that seem to be in no other way possible to meet. You gentlemen will see at once that the characteristics of the Armenians, as I have endeavored to depict them to you, indicate that the Armenians would be a self-supporting people if they could go back to their farms and had seed corn. If a tithe—less than a tithe of what has been given to keep them alive—had been given to protect them, so that they would not be robbed by the Kurds or assassinated by the Turks, they would be a flourishing people to-day.

You gentlemen, when you come to consider this resolution in the privacy of your committee room, will be met by what at first seems an insuperable obstacle. You will agree among yourselves that the American people's verdict in the last Presidential election upheld the view that has come down from the time of Washington. I was reading his farewell address only yesterday, and my memory of it is fresh. While the American people are always responsive to the demands of sympathy, and of benevolence, yet America is not strong enough—strong as it is—to take up the burden of settling the political affairs in the Near East. There were two schools of thought, as you will remember, with regard to the settlement of the Turkish question. One is represented—perhaps I have not read it all the way through, because it was not published or available—but I am told that General Harbord's report, and you all know how thorough a man General Harbord is, with the training of a soldier and the eye of an engineer, and the dispassionate characteristics of a judge—General Harbord's report was made after a hurried tour through Turkey in 1919. I had the honor of meeting him in Paris. He had just accepted a mission to the Near East; and he explained to me an outline of his plans. I can not doubt that his examination was thorough. As I understand, Harbord's point was that in order to bring about proper conditions the United States would have to take a mandate, a protectorate, an elder brother's position, whatever term you choose to use, over the whole of the Turkish Empire, an impossible thing to accomplish, certainly under present conditions of public sentiment. We all know that at Versailles the United States was offered a protectorate over Armenia, which might or might not include Cilicia; probably did not; probably would be simply Russian Armenia.

Now, what can you do? You ask me, gentlemen, in frankness, ask my colleagues who have come here representing every shade of thought, what do we ask you to do? Is it to commit the United States Government to a change in its traditional policy? Not at all. We do not ask that. What we ask you to do is to set the seal of your approval upon the majority sentiment of the American people, to wit, that they look with anxiety and with the most marked disapproval upon this do-nothing policy of the European powers.

MR. MOORE. Did not Lord Bryce discuss this matter very fully several times with reference to the attitude of the European nations toward the Armenian question?



Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Have you available his expressions on that subject?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Can you furnish that to the committee later?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I can furnish it to the committee. The committee will find in a brief or memorandum which will be put into your hands, prepared by Mr. Montgomery, my colleague, and director of the Armenia-American Society, the quotations from debates in the British Parliament and from what is said by the French Government.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, there can not be more direct promises made than those of the Allies to Armenia when the Americans were fighting their battles and our battles.

Mr. BEGG. I am very much interested in your last proposition, what we can do, and what you want us to do.

Mr. SMITH. That is what I am coming to.

Mr. BEGG. Supposing this Congress by unanimous vote passes such a resolution as you suggest?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. What good would that do if the executive department just lets it die and did nothing?

Mr. SMITH. Little or nothing, little good.

Mr. BEGG. I quite agree with your answer. Supposing that you could persuade the executive department of the Government what you are trying to do with this committee?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Mr. BEGG. And the executive department would act? Would not that have the same force as if you had a Congressional act here?

Mr. SMITH. Hardly.

Mr. BEGG. In other words, is not the calling to notice by this Government of the other Governments interested, France, England, and Italy, that the United States disapproves of that—is not that the only good that would follow?

Mr. SMITH. That is what I want. But I want it, if I can get it, through the adoption of some such resolution as this. Of course, this resolution might be modified and changed. We have the precedents. I could give the chapter and the verse of the action of Congress in regard to the independence of Greece and in regard to Hungary in the time of Kosciusko, and in regard to Ireland recently.

Mr. BEGG. Is it not possible that the State Department has information we could not have?

Mr. SMITH. The State Department has, I can not doubt; I know it has those things. When I was in Constantinople—I may say that I went out there at the request of the Near East as one of the seven commissioners to see to the distribution of the relief in the spring of 1919, and remained in Constantinople until the 15th of June, 1919, and then came up to Paris and was present at the Peace Conference there. The reasons why those refugees in the Caucasus should be taken back to Turkey were made apparent, when I went subsequently to London and endeavored to get the British Cabinet to change its plan of withdrawing their troops from the line of railroad from Batum to Baku. I was answering your question.

Mr. BEGG. As to the information that the State Department might have that we could not get.

Mr. SMITH. Quite so. There was a commission sent down to Syria and took testimony and filed its report. That report is in the files of the State Department. General Harbord, with a staff of experts, has made his report. That report is in the State Department. I met young Army officers of great intelligence at Trebizond, and one or two of them went with our party from Constantinople to Batum.

All that is on file in the State Department. This is what is incredible to me and to my colleagues and to the ordinary citizen you meet on the street in the United States: With all this knowledge piled mountain high, all the nations of the world say, "It is not our responsibility."

Mr. KENNEDY. Has any effort been made, Mr. Smith, by the parties behind this resolution to get the executive department of the Government to make this moral protest which you want made through this resolution?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; but I wish to be distinctly understood as not criticizing in any way the State Department, particularly the State Department under its present distinguished, I might say, illustrious head. Delegations have waited on

the President, have waited on the Secretary and his predecessor, and the Assistant Secretary, and furnished him with documents. Before this resolution was introduced we were very careful to make it plain that we asked nothing, most of us supporters of the administration, that could in any way be taken as a criticism of its past action, or in any way endeavoring unduly to influence its own discretion. I am speaking carefully because it would be very easy to misunderstand this point, and I say we can not understand, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, why the civilized world must stand with its arms folded and see these people perish.

MR. COCKRAN. Supposing you get this resolution through for executive action? What definite action can the powers or any one of them take?

MR. SMITH. I reply to you in this way: In my humble judgment, and I think the recent epoch-making events of the conference in Washington prove it, all the armies in the world and all the navies in the world are not as strong as the moral influence of the world. The favorable sentiment of the American people is the best asset that any nation can have in the world to-day.

MR. COCKRAN. It does not seem as if France was doing very much in the way of reducing her army.

MR. SMITH. Query? If she realized the fact that she would be doing an act that would alienate the sympathy of the American people—did France realize, did public sentiment in France realize, that 20,000,000 of American people had invested in this benevolence? I think so.

MR. COCKRAN. This is really to my mind the crux of the whole business. No one would hesitate to vote for this resolution on its merits, but it is to extend further and is there anything in contemplation beyond mere diplomatic remonstrances or is it intended to take any more definite action, and is there any definite action that is possible?

MR. SMITH. I say to you that there is nothing in this resolution beyond what its words express. We have tried in France. We have tried in London. We have our international Philo-Armenia League at Geneva. I presented the matter there and have drawn resolutions and have sent them to every chancellery in Europe with the backing of that league. We secured from the League of Nations all that we could ask in the expression of their sympathy and sentiment. No one defends the present conditions. They are shocking to humanity. It is the rankest sort of commercialism triumphant over moral forces. We have no thought whatsoever, Mr. Cockran, beyond the expression of the sentiment by the American Congress of its sympathy for the Armenians and its hope and desire that the European powers, whose business it is, may stop this conditions.

MR. COCKRAN. Would it be possible for the European powers to stop it if they tried?

MR. SMITH. Yes, sir.

MR. COCKRAN. Tell us how. That is the definite thing. As far as I am concerned I would not hesitate to go the whole length.

MR. SMITH. I had an interview in London in 1919 with Lieutenant General—I forget his name. He had just come from the King, who had pinned a decoration on his breast, and he had lost a leg in the service of his country. He told me he could have marched from one end of Turkey to the other with a corporal's guard in 1918-19. That is the same sort of opinions given by those who have been in the Near East and who know the situation.

MR. MOORES. Coming back to Lord Bryce, was not he probably the most disinterested statesman in the world speaking at that time? He asserted that the direct and definite responsibility rested upon the European nations for the condition that existed in Armenia.

THE CHAIRMAN. May I interrupt there to read into the record a paragraph from General Harbord's report, which supports the statement made by Mr. Moores?

"In seeking a remedy for political conditions which shriek of misery, ruin, starvation, and all the melancholy aftermath, not only of honorable warfare but of bestial brutality unrestrained by God or man, but which nevertheless prevail under an existing Government with which the powers have long been willing to treat on terms of equality, one's first impulse is to inquire as to the possibility of reform from within."

MR. SMITH. Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. Is not that the meat of the whole thing, that the nations of Europe have been dealing for many years with Turkey on the assumption that reform must come from within Europe?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. COCKRAN. You mean from within Turkey?

The CHAIRMAN. Within Europe. Civilization stands solemnly by and allows these things to occur. How are we going to help it except through the moral force of America?

Mr. SMITH. Is this a fanciful view to take? The nations of the world are staggering under a burden of bankruptcy, all of them but the South American Republics, perhaps, and some of the northern countries of Europe and the United States of America. The nations of Europe are indebted to the United States of America for not less than \$10,000,000,000 without considering interest. If the Congress of the United States are willing to pass a concurrent resolution and it would be signed by the President, forgiving all of that indebtedness, still the nations of Europe would depend for their future upon the credit of the United States, and I have no doubt that anything they discover within reason, without sacrifice, of national economy or national honor, as the prevailing sentiment in this country, they would be agreeable to it.

Mr. COCKRAN. Assuming that to be true, although I doubt it very much, supposing all that fails, can you tell us just in the last analysis that we should use force, and how could it be used? Because, unless force is in the background, I do not believe than anything can save the situation.

Mr. SMITH. There was a time when any American citizen whose rights, let alone his life or property, were threatened in any part of the world, that the United States Government was quick to defend those rights.

Mr. COCKRAN. We did it in Cuba when it was not our citizens who were involved. What would be the actual task before this country or other countries of the world in stopping this permanently and forever and without any unnecessary delay in time, which merely means, at the best, prolonged delay in the atrocities? What could be done now if we started out to stop it? What are the resources of civilization?

Mr. SMITH. It seems to me if the properly accredited representative of the United States Government—for instance, Admiral Bristol, the American high commissioner in Constantinople—were dispatched to Mustapha Kemal Pasha and told to say to Kemal Pasha that further destruction of Christian lives and interference with American citizens under his jurisdiction, injury to American property under his jurisdiction, would be sternly punished, then it seems to me it would stop in a moment.

Mr. COCKRAN. That would be your proposition. This, as suggested in this resolution, is the problem of a discussion in an international conference.

Mr. SMITH. I need not say to so experienced a man as yourself that a complicated situation such as this meets with diversified views, and that the old underlying spirit which controls the policies of government, and has for generations, one that we hope is now going to be ended in international affairs—that spirit of commercialism that represents what has been the first consideration, instead of questions of humanity, is becoming a secondary consideration. We have got to go with our feet on the ground. I can not come before this committee and take its time asking it, in view of the present condition of the world, to sanction, indirectly, in the remotest degree, the use of force in Turkey. We could not do it.

Mr. COCKRAN. You think something else is effective.

Mr. SMITH. I do think the sincere expression of opinion by the American Congress of disapproval of the policy of letting fellow creatures—I will not say only fellow Christians—die, and letting civilization stand idly by, letting this investment of the American people of a very significant amount of money go to waste, would be heeded.

We have received \$60,000,000 in contributions to be expended, and those who contributed will say, "Where are the people you expended it on?" We may have to reply, "They are dead."

Mr. MOORE. To be specific, in this resolution as I have it here, as I understand it, there is no expression for the employment of force ultimately; but, leaving that altogether aside, what you desire now is to enlist the persuasive influence of this Government?

Mr. SMITH. Exactly.

Mr. MOORE. Exactly as that influence was exerted in the House of Representatives, under the leadership of Mr. Webster, when it passed a resolution with reference to the situation that then existed in Greece?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOORE. In that situation where the Greeks were being oppressed and murdered by the Turks?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOORE. That is a parallel case.

Mr. SMITH. Perfectly so.

Mr. MOORE. And you think we should take that course in this instance?

Mr. SMITH. Quite so. I will not go beyond that. It would be futile for me, in the first place. I have studied this situation, giving much time to it in the last three years, and it would be futile to come before this committee concealing anything in it. We must be sincere or the result will be a discredit to us.

Mr. COOPER. I was not here in the beginning of the gentleman's remarks. I notice in the first resolution, in line 2, the words "de facto government."

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Mr. COOPER. What is the de facto government. Of what does it consist, and who is the head of it?

Mr. SMITH. The de facto government is headed by Mustapha Kemal Pasha, a distinguished soldier in the Turkish army, and as I said earlier in my remarks, he won military renown in repulsing the British on the Gallipoli Peninsula.

Mr. COOPER. Has that de facto government been recognized by the European powers?

Mr. SMITH. There has been a quasi recognition by France. France has made what she insists is not a treaty.

Mr. COOPER. You say France?

Mr. SMITH. I mean the French Government.

Mr. COOPER. Was it an official utterance?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Do you think that the French people, that is, public opinion in France, are informed at all on this subject?

Mr. SMITH. Not at all.

Mr. COOPER. I have read with a great deal of interest some very persuasive articles by apparently disinterested Americans to show that the press in some of the continental European countries are absolutely controlled in their utterances on this matter by the great commercial interests.

Mr. SMITH. There is no question about that.

Mr. COOPER. That being so, there is not anything like an enlightened opinion on this subject?

Mr. SMITH. There is none in France.

Mr. COOPER. I say when the government consists of a few officeholders, aided and abetted, if they seek to do injustice, by distorted facts through a subsidized press, they can do practically as they please on the question.

Mr. SMITH. Absolutely.

Mr. COOPER. Now, then, I think from what the gentleman says that the object of this resolution would be to secure by its adoption a statement of the public opinion of the United States of America on what are indisputed and indisputable facts.

Mr. SMITH. You have put it admirably. That is exactly what we are seeking.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not true that the indignant protests, a forceful protest of the American people, supposedly the most independent and most powerful and most disinterested, on this question, of any in the world, that these protests sent to European officials without any threat of physical force in contemplation, would have a tremendous effect in arousing public sentiment in continental Europe on that question?

Mr. SMITH. I have no doubt of it.

Mr. COOPER. And no government over there can withstand public opinion any more than our Government?

Mr. SMITH. Absolutely not.

Mr. COOPER. Now, then, if this would do or tend to accomplish that, would it not be a very beneficent purpose to attempt?

Mr. SMITH. At any rate it would be doing all that we can do at this time.

Mr. COOPER. How much would Kemal Pasha care about public opinion of this country if he was sure he would not be harmed?

Mr. SMITH. He is surrounded by very wise people.

Mr. COOPER. I am not speaking about public opinion with its consequences on Kemal Pasha. I am speaking about public opinion in France condoning these outrages. It is uninformed. But I do not know that I would now support it

without some amendment. What it seeks to do is not so much to arouse the public opinion of the Mohammedan Turks surrounding Kemal Pasha but it is to arouse the uninstructed and unenlightened public opinion in France and other countries.

Mr. SMITH. Undoubtedly, and that would block Kemal Pasha, who has played the old Turkish game of playing one interest against another. Anyone who has read the history of Europe since the Crimean War, when the statesmanship was to make Turkey one of the family of nations. Decorations were exchanged and the Sultan was sustained. Yet there followed massacres that occurred periodically at intervals of 20 years—1856, again in 1876, 1896, 1906, and in 1915—and conditions got progressively worse. Our memorandum shows that at the close of the war no one supposed that anything of that sort could ever possibly occur again.

Now, the same statesmanship is presented to us. Maybe I am wrong, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, but the word has become so discredited when it touches anything political that one hesitates to use it, and that is the word "idealism." In the use of idealism America is distinguished from all other people. I can not doubt that the civilization of the world to-day depends upon the wisdom and statesmanship of the leaders of the American people, and if we fall back into the same cynical selfishness that has brought ruin on Europe the civilization of the world may not be lost, but it is largely impaired. We come to you gentlemen asking not for a dollar of money or a gun or a bayonet, but we ask you as representatives of the American people to express officially what has been expressed unofficially by thousands and thousands and thousands from San Francisco to New York and from Portland, Me., to New Orleans.

Mr. KENNEDY. This is a House resolution, I notice.

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is that all you want—an expression on the part of the House?

Mr. SMITH. If we can get it through the House, we can ask the Senate subsequently. The Senate has done this.

Mr. KENNEDY. Why do you not make it a House joint resolution? Then it would go to the Senate committee.

Mr. MOORES. It would be vetoable.

Mr. KENNEDY. That may be.

Mr. SMITH. I submit to the wisdom of this forum. It may be that this resolution not made by expert hands is not the sort of resolution the committee would report.

Mr. KENNEDY. You have no premonition that a House resolution would be vetoed?

Mr. SMITH. No.

Mr. MOORES. Is it not a fact that many million pounds of Turkish bonds are held by investors in England?

Mr. SMITH. I am afraid that is the melancholy truth.

Mr. MOORES. Is that true with regard to France?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir; I think it is.

Mr. MOORES. And most of continental Europe.

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOORES. Have we any evidence at all that Mustapha Kemal Pasha or anyone in the Turkish Government has agreed or promised or given any assurance of any nature that this bonded indebtedness would be taken care of?

Mr. SMITH. I have nothing but surmises on that point. Perhaps those of the committee who are lawyers have had experiences similar to it in prosecuting a case before a court and finding that on every technical point the court acquiesces but there is an intangible something to be overcome. It happened to me once and finally I asked the court, "Is it that the court thinks that this case is not just?" That is it. And it was my business to convince it. We come here up against an invisible something. You meet it in London. You meet it in Paris. Every argument you present is acquiesced in, the logic of it, and then something else happens. That probably is this financial interest that runs all through things and moves cabinets. It has moved cabinets and nations and it has been the cause of war. It is the cause, in my humble judgment, of the present condition. Now, gentlemen, you have listened with patience that is beyond praise. I must stop and you can see my heart is full of this thing. I have walked those streets and seen the suffering of those people. It is seared into my brain. If there is anything we could do and did not do to relieve this situation I should feel derelict. I have argued this matter before the subcom-

mitte of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on my return from Constantinople in 1919 when the President, who was a distinguished Senator then, was chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Foreign Relations, and the matter is of record. I have presented it before the American people in many cities. I find one universal sentiment. English sentiment is the same as ours. Their hands are tied as our hands are tied by these invisible threats. Go to the House of Commons, go to the committee room, and you see distinguished members of Parliament, such as T. P. O'Connor, and Aneurin Williams, and other distinguished men. The last thing that Lord Bryce did after his marvelous summer at Williams College was to address a luncheon in New York given him by the Armenians at which he presented the matter with his entire force and strength. Lord Bryce ascended Mount Ararat 45 years ago. He was undoubtedly familiar with these people and with all their peculiarities. But, gentlemen, eliminating from this case, if you can, all who have passed judgment on Armenia, eliminating humanity, or benevolence, is it not a loss to the world and a loss to the United States that these people are being slowly eliminated when they can be saved? It comes now simply to begging you, so far as you represent the sentiment of the people, and it is the last appeal we have, as far as I can see, to say to the world that you disapproved of it: Is it not your duty to end this scandal?

**STATEMENT OF MR. GEORGE R. MONTGOMERY, DIRECTOR  
ARMENIA-AMERICAN SOCIETY, NEW YORK.**

MR. MONTGOMERY. I will just say this with regard to the propriety of Congress acting on a resolution of this sort. I have kept the State Department fully informed with regard to this resolution, and I do not think that I am committing any breach of confidence in saying that there has been no objection on the part of the State Department. On the other hand, there has appeared to be a little encouragement, feeling that Congress does represent the public opinion; and it is not without precedent that the administration sometimes makes suggestions to the Congress with regard to certain actions where the initiative properly belongs in Congress, nor is it without precedent that Congress has made suggestions, and the suggestions have been welcomed by the administration, where the initiative properly belongs with the administration. Then, with regard to what can be done through this resolution, which seems so harmless—I think you are a little suspicious of it because it is so harmless. We have cut it down to the minimum. We had resolutions coming to us from all over the country, full of teeth. We simply have put forward something which Congress will be willing to accept. If Congress would accept the resolution, we feel that it would be tremendously effective, because the great thing is to bring about an agreement among the European powers, Great Britain, France, and Italy.

As has been pointed out by Mr. Smith, and I think by some of the members of the committee, it is a fact that it is the disagreement among the powers that perpetuates the present condition, and will continue the present condition, unless influence should come in from the outside, from the United States, as suggested here. We do not ask the United States to call the conference, but simply take up with Great Britain, France, and Italy the question of calling a conference. It becomes an offer of good will, of the use of good offices. If it could go so far that the conference would be called, the mere presence of the United States in that conference would serve to bring about a different attitude on the part of some of those powers.

There is an extremely interesting map there on the wall. I think that you members of the committee can get that map for nothing. It is in two parts. It is quite long, and there is a second section of it, the two sections making up a map of Europe and Asia Minor. It is gotten out by the State Department. The pale blue represents the Mediterranean Sea and the Black Sea. The part that I wish to call to your attention is the olive-colored portion, marked Armenia. This map is used by the State Department at the present time in determining matters of immigration, so that it has a certain official character.

Unfortunately, Armenia is not as big as that, because the eastern portion on the west of that part that is marked Armenia is still under the domination of the Turks. This is the part in dispute. The question is in regard to whether it would be possible to establish that western part as the Armenia national home. The other portion being under soviet control, and our Government not being in political relations with the soviet, it is a little difficult to handle that.

It complicates the situation. But the place where the effort must be made in behalf of the Armenian national home is in Europe. If Mustapha Kemal Pasha appreciates the fact that Great Britain and France and Italy are pulling together, he will come across. It has been his ability to play the jealousy of one against the other which has enabled him to prosper, and we believe that if the United States uses its good offices, without being entangled in foreign alliances at all, a tremendous lot of good could be accomplished. You must appreciate the fact that this very dark purple-colored portion of the map is called Greece. That is, it has been assigned to Greece. That is the part that annoys both Italy and France.

Mr. COOPER. Please indicate that.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. They did not wish the expansion of Greece into that territory. I feel that is the principal reason why they have been supporting Mustapha Kemal Pasha in the hope that the Greeks would be prevented from expanding; because Italy and France are Mediterranean powers and it looked, after the treaty of Sevres, as though Greece was going to be a dominant Mediterranean power; and, as one of the secretaries of the French foreign office said to me, "See how Greece comes up along there, just like the two points of tweezers, through Thrace and through Smyrna, until they meet and will finally close in on Constantinople, and that is what we are afraid of." It becomes commercial rivalry.

The CHAIRMAN. What proportion of Armenia is under the control of the soviet; one-half or one-third?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Probably one-third.

The CHAIRMAN. How are the soviets treating Armenia?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. They are treating them very well. There is a nominal independence given to the Armenians. That is to say, they have their own diplomatic representatives from Erivan up in Moscow; but the independence is nominal. If it could be made effectual and actual under European sanction it would be splendid and we hope that some conference of this sort mentioned in the resolution might be able to accomplish that. That is, in negotiations with the soviets, if it could be brought about that the independence of Russian Armenia should be made actual, then it would be easy to add to that the territory of Turkish Armenia, and the country could settle down and the people begin to establish themselves. The refugees could return to their homes, and except for the care of the orphans the relief from America could stop.

The CHAIRMAN. This de facto government at Angora exercises no sovereignty over Armenia, which is in control of the soviets?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. None over the soviet part. They are supposed to be in alliance with the soviet government, but it is an alliance that can be broken up any time when convenient to either party.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the soviet government treat the portion of Armenia which is under its control about the same as it does, say, the Far Eastern Republic, recognizing in part the autonomy of the people?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I understood that the Far Eastern Republic is more independent from Moscow than this section is.

The CHAIRMAN. Taking in what other republics?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Georgia and Azerbaijan. The position of Azerbaijan is about the same as the Georgians. Moscow is a little more sympathetic toward the Armenians than toward the Georgians.

Mr. COOPER. Will you please indicate the boundaries of Armenia again?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. What is the country marked blue to the left of the map?

Mr. KENNEDY. Bordering on the two seas?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. That is Turkey.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is that the territory over which the de facto government of Angora exercises jurisdiction?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. It is supposed to exercise jurisdiction over most of that. Of course, the Greeks have advanced so that their line is not confined to the purple portion here at the extreme west, but is a great deal larger at the present time.

Mr. KENNEDY. What city is that to the extreme left?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. The international city of Constantinople, which now apparently the expectation is, is to be restored to Turkey.

Mr. KENNEDY. Where is the country called Azarbaijan?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. It is the pink portion here to the east. That is inhabited largely by Tartars.

Mr. COOPER. There is one interesting statement. That little place about which Mr. Kennedy inquires is to be restored to Turkey?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Constantinople? That is the expectation.

Mr. COOPER. By whom and when?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. England and France. That comes to me quite directly from the British Foreign Office.

Mr. COCKRAN. It is understood to be one of the conditions upon which they expect to pacify India.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. It also satisfies France, in making it more difficult for the Greeks to obtain control of the country. At the present time this international area is divided into zones of control, and the part which lies northwest of the Dardanelles is under Greek control.

Mr. COCKRAN. As I understood, the difficulty in getting united action by all the powers for the preservation of that part of the human race which is in Armenia was caused by the jealousies of these powers with respect to the Dardanelles.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. That is one of the jealousies.

Mr. COCKRAN. Your idea, or the idea of this resolution is to get them all around a table and eliminate those jealousies?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. If they were around the table with the United States also around the table.

Mr. COCKRAN. I mean that. Suppose the United States had a few ships of war there and said to Kemal Pasha, if you continue to assassinate these Christians we have a few halts that we may have prepared to use on you. What effect would that have?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I do not think it would be very important.

Mr. COCKRAN. You think he would defy it?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. No.

Mr. COCKRAN. If he did not defy it he would submit.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. He would personally submit; but the persecutions would continue by those not under his control.

Mr. COCKRAN. Then he is not responsible.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. The feeling is very bitter and there would be murders and injustices before the courts. You must realize, gentlemen, that the pressure here that is being brought upon the Armenians is different from the pressure in the places where there is mere racial conflict, because these Armenians who suffer are really martyrs to their faith. Were they to abandon their Christianity and become Turks, it would be very easy for them to avoid persecution; if it were not for their firm hold on their faith they could find an easy way out of their difficulties.

Mr. COCKRAN. You think this can be arranged here, that racial prejudice can be allayed by the action of the united countries?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. This resolution is to provide for methods by which the Armenians may be given an opportunity to establish themselves as a nation. We do not think that mere pressure on any one of the headquarters, such as Constantinople or Angora, will prevent conditions from dropping back into the nineteenth century. We think there should be a neutral zone of safety for the Christians established in the strategic Taurus country. I will explain that Taurus region, which is extremely important from many standpoints.

The Armenians are a mountain race. Laughter went around when Mr. Smith said that one Greek is equal to two Jews and one Armenian is equal to two Greeks, and the suggestion was raised whether that was complimentary or not. I think, perhaps, some of you have heard that the Armenians are the Jews of the Orient. That is an entirely misleading statement. I think it is fairer to say that the Armenians are the Scotch of the Orient, because they are a mountain race. Their home is along the backbone ridge of the mountains which are called the Taurus Mountains, extending from the middle of Asia Minor east and northeast nearly to the Caspian Sea, and the anti-Taurus range, which is a spur extending down to the southern coast of Asia Minor.

The fact that the Armenians are a mountain race has enabled them to survive through the centuries. This mountain origin accounts in part for their love of freedom and for their progressive spirit.

The territories and the heights and slopes of the main Taurus range constitute Armenia Major, and the regions of the Anti-Taurus constitute Armenia Minor. The Anti-Taurus comes down to the coast with ranges from 7,000 to 10,000 feet high. This portion here [indicating] constitutes the Armenia Minor



of history. It is the portion we now call Cilicia. To-day Armenia Major is represented by the six Armenian Provinces of Turkey and by Trans-Caucasian Armenia.

It is important to realize that these Armenians are a mountain race in order to appreciate their character, their love of liberty, their ability, and their progressiveness. In these mountain fastnesses they have been able to maintain themselves against the attacks of the Persians, the Arabs, the Turks, the Tartars, and the Cossacks. It is a question whether the Turks would ever have been able to drive them from their mountain homes had it not been for the World War, which cut off outside help and which brought to the aid of the Turks German leaders and German military assistance. The Armenians come down into the cities as merchants and go back into the mountains for the summer. They are essentially a mountain race. It is a very remarkable history that during the entire Christian era they have been able to hold these mountain ranges against the Persians, the Arabs, the Turks, Tartars, and the Cossacks.

The Armenians are a Christian nation. They would be able to hold out even to-day had it not been for this recent war, when outside help was cut off and the Turks had the aid of German leadership, German munitions, and German supplies, which brought about what seems to be almost an extermination of the Armenians in the Turkish sections. The refugees have been driven out. At the present time there are very few Armenians to be found in Turkey. At the present time there are very few Armenians in the mountain regions in the Turkish portions of the Taurus ranges, but there are a great many refugees who have gone to Syria and Russian Armenia waiting to go back to their ancestral home, where they may be safe.

MR. COOPER. Can you indicate on the map the boundaries of Armenia before the war?

MR. MONTGOMERY. There was no Armenia before the war except as a Province of Russia.

The CHAIRMAN. In Turkey?

MR. COOPER. What was the boundary? Can you point it out?

MR. MONTGOMERY. There was no Armenia in Turkey. There were Armenian Provinces, six Provinces, which did not include Trebizond, the portion to the north, but did include six Provinces there [indicating]. Then, in addition there was Cilicia, which is not one of the six Armenian Provinces, yet the Turkish official statistics show that before the war the Armenian population of Cilicia, the Christian population of Cilicia, was greater than the Mohammedan population. Fifty years ago the Armenian population of the six Provinces was also greater than the other populations, but they have been driven out, persecuted, massacred during the last 50 years, and before the war they were not as numerous there as they had been.

MR. COCKRAN. What is that green portion on the map?

MR. MONTGOMERY. Georgia. One of the propositions is that if Armenia be established with actual independence, that Georgia, Armenia, and Azarbaijan might be able to form a confederacy which would be thoroughly viable or economically possible.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any conflict now going on between the Turks and the Soviets?

MR. MONTGOMERY. No. The Turks have taken a wider frontier since the war. Although the Turks make a great deal of the fact that since the war they have lost Mesopotamia and Syria, they were more or less lost before. Especially Syria and Arabia were entirely dissatisfied with Turkish rule, and there was a separatist movement that was quite successful before the war came about. Actually it does look as though the Turks were coming out of the war victors. In a war which is supposed to have defeated the Germans and Austrians, the Turks are coming out victors, having a larger boundary east than before the war.

MR. MOORES. Have you any tables showing the percentage of Christian and Mohammedan population and the proportion of the Syrian Christians as distinguished from the Armenian Christians in various parts of the country in those Provinces?

MR. MONTGOMERY. The Syrian Christians came largely from the district of Urumia.

MR. MOORES. They are all through there.

MR. MONTGOMERY. The larger portion of them were in Persia and from the district of Urumia; but they had centers also in Diarkebir and Mardin, and islets in Syria. There were, perhaps, two or three hundred thousand aside from those in Urumia. This word really is the word "Rome," and it shows

the history back to the time of the eastern Roman Empire. The city of Erzeroum also gives the word Rome (Roum), and the boundary of Rome came to there [indicating]. Rumania is the last of the remnants of the eastern Roman Empire. The Greeks in Turkey are not called Hellenes and they are called Roums. The Roman Empire was cut down and cut down until, finally, only Rumania was left to carry on the name of eastern Rome. Rumania had nothing directly to do with Rome, but to-day represents what was left of eastern Rome.

Mr. MOORES. Have you any table to show the proportions of population; and, if so, what?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. The proportion of population?

Mr. MOORES. Of those different provinces?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Yes.

Mr. MOORES. Is there anywhere where the Mohammedans exceed the Christians?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. The Mohammedans outnumber the Christians in practically all of those regions now; until last fall the Christians outnumbered the Mohammedans in Cilicia. There were probably 200,000 Christians, mostly Armenians in Cilicia. Since the withdrawal of the French, which was talked about over a year ago, they have been traveling out of these regions and now there are very few Armenians left. There are 4,000 at Marash and 4,000 at Aintab, but very few up there in the northeast.

Mr. MOORES. Is there any conflict between the Armenian Christians, who are under the jurisdiction of the Catholigos, and, as I understand it, the Armenians under the jurisdiction of Rome?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. No; within the Armenian race there are three groups: The Protestant Armenians, the Catholic Armenians, and the Gregorians, as they call themselves. All three of these denominations are working in harmony. And the Syrians—they are orthodox Syrians and there are Armenian Catholics, and they work in harmony.

Mr. MOORES. They work in harmony?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. In General Harbord's report, I find this statement:

"Armenia was evangelized by apostles, fresh from the memory of our Lord, as early as 33 A. D. and as a nation adopted Christianity and founded a national church in 301 A. D., which has outridden the storms of the centuries and is vital to-day. Armenia was the first nation officially to adopt Christianity with all that that act involved in a pagan world."

Is that statement correct?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I think it is correct. Dikran was king of Armenia, and was supposed to have been in Urfa, on the boundary here, and in a letter he sent an invitation to the Christ when he knew that he was being persecuted in Jerusalem, to come up there and take refuge or at least to visit them; and he replied—this is tradition, which may or may not be true—the reply of Christ was that it was impossible for him to come but he would arrange to send some of his disciples up there; and that is, as General Harbord mentions, in the year 31 A. D.

Mr. COCKRAN. It was A. D. 331 when Christianity was recognized as the religion of Rome and in 311 A. D. it was tolerated. Constantine issued an edict of toleration, but it did not become the official religion of the empire until 331 or 332 A. D.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Yes.

Mr. COCKRAN. I understood from Mr. Smith that Kemal Pasha was the head of or center of all this mischief.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Yes.

Mr. COCKRAN. You tell me it comes from a general feeling of the Moslem population against the Christian population?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Racial feeling runs very high there.

Mr. COCKRAN. Then if Kemal Pasha was strung up at the end of a rope by an American expeditionary force that would not end it?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I can not feel that it would because of the fact that Mustapha Kemal Pasha is on his good behavior at the present time and appreciates the importance of having everything run as well as possible, and I can not believe but that with the connivance of Government officials the massacres have been taking place as recently as last fall, and we have

letters showing that as recently as December the situation in the interior was as bad as at any time since the outbreak of the war.

Mr. COCKRAN. Your judgment is, in view of the fact that it is the population and not the Government, that there would not be anything to be done with force and this is all we can do, to express our sympathy?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I do not think it would be necessary to be done by force, but if there should be an agreement among the powers Mustapha Kemal Pasha would change his attitude, and if we could have established in what we call the Taurus region, a neutral territory, under European sanction, the problem would be solved. This is a very strategic region, because it lies in between the factions of the Persians and the Arabs, and the Turks, the Kurds, and the Tartars. If the establishment of a neutral region there under the protection and authorization of the European powers could be brought about somewhere in that Taurus region, it would be a place to which the Armenian refugees could return and it would be a great center of stability. The revolutionary factions among the Armenians that are now, perhaps, still working without any special aim, would find a more useful outlet to their energies. If the Turkish troops would get out of that region it would become an Armenian national home. We say Armenian national home because there are not enough Armenians at the present time to undertake the administration of any such territory in Turkey. That is why last February the supreme allied council used the phrase Armenia national home as a place into which the Armenians would be encouraged to immigrate, with the expectation that at the end of 30 to 50 years there might be enough of them there to be established into a coherent group. The Turks likewise would have a very different feeling, realizing that the matter had been settled, and no longer would this racial feeling be rife in Turkey.

Mr. COCKRAN. Your idea of settling is to have a place in which Christian Armenians could set up a place of their own?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. A place called the Armenian National Home in this strategic Taurus region.

Mr. MOORE. This Government is without any official representative in Armenia now.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. That status is similar to the status when the resolution I spoke of, the Webster resolution, was passed with reference to Greece.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. At that time we had no representative in Greece, and action taken by the Government of the United States then was more direct and definite and individual than the resolution we have here now.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. If I recall the facts, President Monroe was President when that resolution was passed, and President Monroe did not act upon the resolution as passed by Congress.

Mr. MOORE. The House of Representatives at that time did not hesitate to express popular opinion by the passage of a House resolution, but it was not a joint resolution.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. No.

Mr. KENNEDY. That was responsive to a message which James Monroe sent to Congress, was it not?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. My memory is not that it was.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am quite sure there was something concerning Greece embodied in the message of President Monroe.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. But it was a very different one from the resolution which was actually adopted.

Mr. MOORE. That resolution was followed later by a similar resolution that Mr. Clay introduced in the House, a House resolution that bore upon the situation in South America, was it not?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I do not know about the South American situation.

Mr. MOORE. The point I am making is this, that the House of Representatives has never hesitated to express itself with reference to such a condition as exists now in Armenia.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I think there are plenty of precedents for the expression of opinion of that sort and I simply repeat what I said, that I do not believe myself to be committing any breach of confidence when I say that the State Department appeared to look favorably upon the fact that this matter was to be discussed and bruited here, because Congress is pretty close to the people,

and I do not think there is any jealousy on the part of the State Department with regard to a matter like this.

Mr. MOORE. You are not asking for any independent action by the House or by Congress. You are only asking the House of Representatives to pass a resolution bringing this matter in a respectful way to the attention of the executive department.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. And the reason we did not make it a joint resolution is not because we were afraid of any veto, but we were not sure that we had selected the thing best to present and wished to have the advice of your committee and of Congress in determining some sort of action that might be feasible, and then with our eyes better opened we would be in position to introduce a resolution in the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. I am inclined to think that Mr. Kennedy is correct in regard to Greece.

Mr. KENNEDY. No question about it having been embodied in the message of the President.

The CHAIRMAN. In the case of Texas the action of Congress was taken squarely in the face of a message by President Jackson three months before.

Mr. KENNEDY. If I had the facts here we could clear it up at once.

The CHAIRMAN. In two of the cases the resolution was one of recognition of the independence of a country.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. The one that I am speaking of is a resolution to send a consul to Greece.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a form of recognition.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. That was not recommended by President Monroe.

Mr. KENNEDY. I do not say it was recommended by President Monroe, but I do say that President Monroe prior to the passage of that resolution passed quite fully upon that question of Grecian independence in a message which he sent to Congress, I think, in December preceding the passage of this resolution.

Mr. COOPER. My recollection is that Daniel Webster introduced that resolution without any reference to any message at all and that he made a speech, and it is plain from his speech that he did it from his own initiative because it was a matter of justice and not as an expression of opinion in a resolution.

Mr. MOORE. That is my recollection exactly; the resolution stating, in substance, that the House of Representatives desired to advise the President that it would support him in any action he might take in the way of creating an official representation of this Government in Greece.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Do you consider it essential in this resolution that in requesting the President to call this conference that he should be instructed, or practically instructed, because that is the purport of the words, "For the purpose of considering methods by which the Armenians may be given an opportunity to establish themselves as a nation."

Mr. MONTGOMERY. We feel that there should be something concrete in the resolution, otherwise it would be extremely vague language, and we do feel very strongly that the establishment of an Armenian National Home should be made.

Mr. LINEBERGER. You do not say national home. You say a separate nation.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Because we do not wish to specify. That may be all worked out in the conference. It may be that Russian Armenia will be the whole thing in the conference.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Why not amend it to make it clear?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I would be perfectly willing to accept any amendment of that sort, provided that specific element remains in it.

Mr. BEGG. Can you state how many of the representatives here are here as volunteers or officials of some organizations? Is there any way you could put that into the record?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. We are all volunteers.

Mr. BEGG. Are there no salaried people here?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I am salaried personally. But this organization of which I am the head was organized and I was invited to be the head of it. I am a director of the Armenia American Society. The society was organized by friends of Armenia. These very people who are giving the money look to the relief of suffering, and yet all over the country letters keep coming to the organization saying that there should be some political settlement so that we should not continue to send relief but to put the Armenians in a position to take care of themselves.

Mr. BEGG. I appreciate that, and I appreciate that you have to have some officials, some men who get salaries. I am not criticising that. I just wondered what percentage of the representatives here were that kind of people.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Only myself and Mr. Vickrey.

Mr. BEGG. Raised and promoted by their own humanitarian ideas.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I will say, gentlemen, that I was born out there. My father and mother are both buried out there. They were missionaries, and their work has all been wiped out and I feel that I am doing a fillal duty in trying to reestablish some of the work that they gave their lives to. I was special assistant in Constantinople to Mr. Morgenthau and I practiced law in Constantinople 25 years ago. I was connected with the peace conference as an assistant specialist on western Asia and I was one of the technical advisers of the commission on mandates in Turkey, and have all my life been interested in the welfare of the Near East.

Mr. FISH. Have you any relief workers in Armenia now?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Yes.

Mr. FISH. What organizations have you?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Vickrey will speak of it.

I will not take up your time any longer now. I will submit what I have to say more in a brief and I wish you would read it. It is not very long. I hope it may be printed.

(The brief referred to is as follows:)

#### AMERICA AND JUSTICE TO THE ARMENIANS.

##### A MOUNTAIN RACE.

The Armenians are a mountain race. It is this fact that has enabled them to survive through the centuries. This mountain origin accounts in part for their love of freedom and for their progressive spirit. Their home has been the main range of the Taurus Mountains extending from the middle of Asia Minor, east and northeast, nearly to the Caspian Sea, and the anti-Taurus range which is a spur extending down to the southern coast of Asia Minor. The territories on the heights and slopes of the main Taurus range constituted Armenia Major and the regions of the anti-Taurus constituted Armenia Minor, To-day Armenia Major is represented by the "Six Armenian Provinces" of Turkey and by Trans-Caucasian Armenia. Armenia Minor is represented by Cilicia. In these mountain fastnesses they have been able to maintain themselves against the attacks of the Persians, the Arabs, the Turks, the Tartars and the Cossacks. It is a question whether the Turks would ever have been able to drive them out from their mountain home, had it not been for the World War which cut off outside help and which brought to the aid of the Turks German leadership and German military assistance.

At the present moment comparatively few Armenians are to be found in the Turkish portions of the Taurus ranges, but there are many refugees waiting for the designation of some district in their ancestral homes to which they may return and where they may be safe. The location of the Taurus range makes it an extremely strategic region and the establishment of a neutral territory there under the guarantee of the European powers becomes an essential factor in any attempt to do justice to the Armenian race, and an essential factor in any policy that looks to the permanent peace of western Asia. If the European powers could come to an agreement as to this neutral territory, there appears to be no question but that the surrounding nations would observe the neutrality of the territory. Whatever else is done, conditions should not be allowed to drift back into the 19th century, and the good offices of the United States would be effective, we believe, in preventing this drift. There are indications that the foreign offices of both Great Britain and France are headed toward a policy of restoring the 19th century conditions, but there is very good evidence that the manifestation of interest in the fate of the Armenians by the United States would be effective in bringing a new era of opportunity to the Armenians.

##### THE ALLIES AND ARMENIA.

In considering justice to the Armenians, there must be remembered the distinct promises made by the Allies to them. In his mansion speech on November 9, 1916, Lord Asquith, then prime minister, referring to the Armenians, promised "an era of liberation and redemption for that ancient people."

Lloyd George speaking to the trades-union congress on January 5, 1918, said: "Arabia, Armenia, Mesopotamia, Syria, and Palestine are in our judgment entitled to a recognition of their separate national conditions. \* \* \* It would be impossible to restore to their former sovereignty the territories to which I have already referred."

On July 23, 1918, M. Clemenceau wrote: "The government of the Republic, like that of the United Kingdom, has not ceased to include the Armenian nation among the peoples whose fate the Allies count on determining according to the supreme laws of humanity and justice."

On the 3d of October, 1918, the Assistant Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs wrote to Viscount Bryce as follows: "In the autumn of 1914 the Turks sent emissaries to the national congress of the Ottoman Armenians then sitting at Erzerum and made them offers of autonomy if they would actively assist Turkey in the war. The Armenians replied that they would do their duty individually as Ottoman subjects, but that as a nation they could not work for the cause of Turkey and her allies. On account, in part, of this courageous refusal, the Ottoman Armenians were systematically murdered by the Turkish Government in 1915. Two-thirds of the population were exterminated by the most cold blooded and fiendish methods—more than 700,000 people, men, women, and children alike. From the beginning of the war that half of the Armenian Nation which was under the sovereignty of Russia organized volunteer forces (of both Russian and Turkish Armenians), and, under their heroic leader Andranik, bore the brunt of some of the heaviest fighting in the Caucasian campaigns. After the breakdown of the Russian Army at the end of 1917, these Armenian forces took over the Caucasian front, and for five months delayed the advance of the Turks, thus rendering an important service to the British Army in Mesopotamia."

In reply to Damad Ferid Pasha in June, 1919, the council of the principal allied and associated powers said: "It can not admit that among the qualities of the Turkish people is to be counted the capacity to rule over alien races. The experiment has been tried too long and too often for there to be the least doubt as to its result."

In the House of Lords on the 11th of March, 1920, the secretary of state for foreign affairs said: "It is true that the French are anxious, not unnaturally, to limit their engagements in that part of Turkey (Cilicia); but let it be remembered that they have entered into definite obligations to protect the Armenians there; and that obligation I am certain they have not the slightest intention of evading; and I think we may hope that this, which is our main object—namely, the security of those minorities in that part of the world—in future will be undertaken by them."

Later in the same speech he said: "The principles upon which we are acting are these: We want to create an Armenia in those parts where there is a distinct predominance of the Armenian population, where we can provide them with a defensible frontier, where they will have the possibilities of economic development and an access to the sea."

Lloyd George in the House of Commons on the 29th of April, 1920, said: "The French are to exercise guardianship over the minority in Cilicia. I believe there are considerable forces in that Province and there is a struggle going on which I hope will, in the end, achieve the result of securing efficient protection for these poor threatened people. But I assure my honorable friends that we can not dissociate ourselves from the responsibility. We shall have to consider the whole position, and will undoubtedly take our share in the matter of helping the Armenian community to equip themselves for their very difficult and perilous task."

The reply of the supreme council of the Turkish delegates' observations on the draft of the treaty of Sevres, signed by M. Millerand and dated 16th of July, 1920, contains the following passage: "Not only has the Turkish Government failed to protect its subjects of the other races from pillage, outrage, and murder, but there is abundant evidence that it has been responsible for directing and organizing savagery against people to whom it owed protection. \* \* \* It would neither be just nor would it conduce to lasting peace in the Near and Middle East that large masses of non-Turkish nationality should be forced to remain under the Turkish rule."

The Sevres treaty failed to do justice to the Armenians in Cilicia, but made provision for territory in the northeast of Turkey to be attached to the Armenian Republic. This republic has been taken over by the Soviets and its

exact relation to Moscow is not clear. Last March the Allied Powers affirmed the principle of an Armenian national home in the northeast of Turkey and last fall the assembly of the League of Nations reaffirmed the same principle.

There were special allied promises with respect to Cilicia. In 1916 the head of the Armenian national delegation had several interviews with the French foreign office with respect to any army of Armenian volunteers to fight under the French flag in Palestine. In October of that year he was called to London for a conference with Sir Mark Sykes and M. Georges Picot, and the assurance was given to him that if the Armenians cooperated in Palestine the French would take over Cilicia within the limits set by the Sykes-Picot agreement of May, 1916, and would create there an autonomous Armenia. In consequence, a cipher telegram was sent to Egypt through the French foreign office, that the Armenian national aspirations would be satisfied and that the Armenians should enroll themselves into a "Legion of the Orient." This contingent fought valiantly and were the first troops under a French flag to occupy Cilicia, at which time the name of the contingent was changed into "The Armenian Legion." M. Georges Picot went out to Syria as high commissioner for Syria and Armenia and the official communications from Adana, the capital of Cilicia, went out from "the administrative Bureau in Armenia." The Armenian refugees from Mesopotamia, Syria, and Egypt were settled in Cilicia.

The manner in which France has made a separate treaty with Angora and withdrawn her troops from Cilicia, thus causing the new exodus of the very people whom she had sheltered in the country, is recent history. There are reasons for believing that if the United States had used its good offices in behalf of the Christians of Cilicia, means might have been found to prevent or postpone the abandonment of this district to the Turks.

#### THE UNITED STATES AND THE ARMENIANS.

There is no need here to give the remarkable history of American philanthropic institutions in Turkey nor the wonderful history of the Near East Relief. It is important, however, to realize that President Wilson held out to Great Britain, France, and Italy the expectation that America would share in the responsibilities involved in the defeat of the Turks. America was one of the nations that recognized the Armenian Republic. Leaders of the Republican Party as well as of the Democratic Party, had publicly and officially shown the deepest interest in the fate of the Armenians. The commission under General Harbord went out to study the question of a mandate, and in its enthusiasm set forth far too grandiose a project. President Wilson accepted the task of delimiting the boundaries in Turkey of Armenia; and now Europe can not understand the absolute silence of the American administration with respect to the fate of the Armenians.

Article 89 of the treaty of Sevres, which refers to the boundaries of Armenia, reads as follows: "Turkey and Armenia as well as the other high contracting parties, agree to submit to the arbitration of the President of the United States of America the question of the frontier to be fixed between Turkey and Armenia in the Vilayets of Erzerum, Trebizond, Van, and Bitlis, and to accept his decision thereupon."

We believe it to be realized by the people of the United States that we can not go into a war, accepting the aid of other nations, and then refuse to show any concern when one of our allies, even a lesser one, is being deprived of the agreed fruits of the victory. The least that our Government could do under the circumstances would be to use its good offices with Great Britain and France in behalf of the Armenians.

#### THE ARMENIANS AS AN ALLY.

The obligation of the United States in this respect becomes clearer when it is understood that the Armenians have been officially recognized by the Allies as an ally. An Armenian representative was one of the signatories of the treaty of Sevres in August, 1920. The preamble of that treaty mentions the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan as the principal allied powers, and names Armenia, Belgium, Greece, the Hadjas, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, the Serb-Croat-Slovene State and Czechoslovakia, as the "Powers which with the principal powers mentioned above, constitute the allied powers."

The Armenians were not signatories to the treaty of Versailles only because their Government had not been recognized at that time. After their recognition they signed the treaty of Sevres as an ally.

The Armenians had volunteers on all the fronts. Aside from the 200,000 Russian Armenians who fought with the Russian armies, there were several battalions of Turkish Armenian volunteers with their own Armenian officers who fought along with the Russian armies. Later, when the Russian Government collapsed, the Armenian Republic declared its independence, refused to withdraw when the soviet troops abandoned the allied cause, and placed its own armies in the field. These troops fought German and Austrian troops, and by engaging the attention of the flower of the Turkish armies, helped definitely in the northeast, and indirectly elsewhere to hasten the final victory. With respect to the part taken by the Armenians in preventing the Central Powers from reaching the oil fields of the Transcaucasus, after the collapse of the Russian Government, General Ludendorf in his recent book makes the statement that by cutting off from the Germans at a critical period the supply of oil from Baku, the Armenians rendered an inestimable service to the allied cause.

We have recognized the war as a single war and have made no distinction between the Allies. Mr. Hughes in his notes of last March made the very obvious point that American aid in France made possible the victory in Turkey and conversely it may be said that help in Turkey aided the victory on the western front. If we have the right to object to oil settlements we have the right to object to settlements which affect human lives.

#### THE VALUE OF GOOD OFFICES.

The mere use of its good offices by the United States would do a great deal toward settling in a right way the Near East matters. A European statesman who is in a position to know all the currents of European politics writes in a recent letter: "I am not in a position to judge whether there is the slightest hope of the American Government's intervening to assist all the devoted work which so many American subjects have carried on in Asia Minor. I believe that a decided action by Washington would change the whole situation in the most startling manner. I fear that I do not see what else could do so."

The United States might legitimately and very reasonably take up with its allies in the war the question of calling a conference on the Armenian situation. This could serve to show interest even though, having taken up the question, the decision might be reached that a conference was not the way to accomplish anything. Then, in any settlement with Russia, the actual independence of Russian Armenia under European guarantee could be made one of the conditions.

The American Government, furthermore, might very well raise the question whether the Armenians had not as good a claim to share in the German indemnity as have Serbia, Rumania, and Poland. The Armenians fought German soldiers in Turkey; the Turkish troops were largely drilled and led by German officers; German munitions and money kept the Turkish troops effective; Germans it was who forced Turkey into the war and counseled the deportations; German armies fighting alongside the Turkish armies overran the territories inhabited by the Armenians; the Germans were accessory in fact to the great crime of the massacres.

Three and one-half per cent of the indemnity has been set aside to be apportioned among Serbia, Rumania, and Poland. A quarter of 1 per cent would amount to \$80,000,000 and this would more than suffice to establish an administration for an Armenian national home. This matter of finance is mentioned here because it has been said officially in England and France that if funds were found a mandatory power could easily be found.

The phrase "Armenian National Home" has been used because the future of the Armenian Republic in the Transcaucasus is not clear. Of course, if the actual independence of that Republic could be established under a proper protectorate or mandate, the Armenian portions of Turkey could be joined to it and thus at the very start there would be an Armenia with a population four or five times as large as the population with which independent Greece started out 100 years ago. While the fate of this Armenia in Russia is still undecided, the proposition approved by the supreme allied council and by the League of Nations has been to establish an Armenian national home into which the Armenians would be encouraged to immigrate. Such a national home, under European protection, would provide a place of return to the Armenian refugees and would facilitate the complete independence of Russian Armenia. The natural place for such a national home would be in the region that was defined by the Wilson boundaries. If this region should be deemed less practical, Cilicia



would offer a good location. The Turkish official figures gave a preponderance of Christians and Mohammedans in this latter region before the war. After the armistice and before the recent exodus, the Christian preponderance was even greater.

Franklin-Bouillon, who negotiated the separate treaty between France and the Kemalists, said last month, in an interview with a Philarmenian delegation at Paris, that the Turks were entirely ready to accord an Armenian zone in Turkish territory. It is the fact that Great Britain, France, and Italy are not in agreement, which is allowing the Turks to defy them and to issue victorious from a war where Germany and Austria were overwhelmingly defeated. The existence of a strong group of holders of Turkish public-debt bonds is in part responsible for the threatened reestablishment of a Turkey with the maximum power possible. Other influences have also been at work to pervert justice. The recognition by the United States of its responsibilities to the lesser ones of the Allies who cooperated in the World War, and the use of its good offices by the United States in trying to obtain the largest measure of justice possible, would serve to clear the atmosphere and would be a distinct aid to a fair settlement of the issues in western Asia.

#### THE UNITED STATES AND THE GENERAL NEAR EAST SETTLEMENT.

There are special reasons why the United States should take up with its late allies the question of calling a conference to consider the methods of establishing the Armenians as a nation. There are more general reasons why the United States should participate in the negotiations that are to lead up to an allied treaty with Turkey.

One of these reasons is the importance of establishing peace in the Near East on a firm basis. With the success of American participation in far eastern settlements freshly in mind, there comes the incentive to bring about similar equitable settlements in the Near East. As was said at the peace conference at Paris by a man conversant with the Near East situation: "The world's permanent peace will not be accomplished until the problems of the Near East are settled and settled right."

Moreover, America's commercial and philanthropic investments and their probable development in Turkey are of such a character and of such an importance as to give by themselves a warrant for America's taking official part in the Near East settlements. Our Government did not take part in the deliberations which resulted in the treaty of Sevres; nevertheless our Government has found it necessary to protest vigorously against the decisions that were made in that treaty. On November 24, 1921, notes were reported by the press to have been sent from Washington to the British Government objecting decidedly to various provisions of the agreements reached by the European powers. The present administration, also, found it necessary to object to the provisions of the Near East settlement, and on March 28, 1921, Mr. Hughes was reported by the press to have taken the stand in a note to the European powers that the consent of the United States must be had to the provisions of a treaty which defined the rights and obligations of the various European powers. In this connection the point can not be too strongly emphasized that the United States should not hold herself in isolation during the discussions if she finds herself forced to intervene after the discussions have resulted in decisions.

Still another reason for our participating in the Near East discussions is found in the fact that "the enfranchisement of populations subject to the bloody tyranny of the Turks, and the expulsion from Europe of the Ottoman Empire, decidedly alien to western civilization," were included by the Allies on January 10, 1917, among their definite war aims. This statement of war objects formed the basis of the understanding upon which America entered into the war, and the American people will have cause for surprise if the Government holds aloof from the discussions which deal with these particular war objects, especially if there is an indication that these war aims may be widely departed from.

The discussions are now under way, precedents will be established with regard to the capitulations, and we believe it to be the general American public sentiment that settlements involving our interests, our allies, and the very objects of the war should not be made with our Government outside of the council halls.

MARCH 7, 1922.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I would like also, with your permission, to make a part of the record the following extracts from recent reports from Turkey showing conditions there. Full copies of these reports are on file in the State Department, and the names of the writers are also on file there.

[Extract from a letter from Constantinople, written in November by a man "who is neither a missionary nor a relief worker." The statement, therefore, is not to be regarded as official from the standpoint of the American board.]

The American board work is now practically confined to Constantinople, Smyrna, and Broussa. How long Broussa will be in the game is a great question. It seems very probable that all missionary work will be held up so long as Mustafa Kemal is in power. All the missionaries in the interior have been taken over by the Near East Relief. They would not be able to remain long under the board. In some places the relief work is very limited and may be stopped.

The deportations and destruction of life in Anatolia have been as bad and nearly as extensive as in 1915. The suffering of the people has been worse, and perhaps the hangings and the killings have been more numerous. Most of the Greeks have been deported or killed from the Black Sea coast and interior towns. Along with them have gone many of the Armenians and some of the other races in those regions. The Turks are now sending these people to Van, Bitlis, Diarbekir, and those regions. They are dying by the hundreds of the cold and from lack of food. No help seems to be possible. It is worse than you and I had dreamed of when we talked over the possibilities.

[Extract from a report made to the State Department by an eyewitness, December 12, 1921.]

About the middle of September some 250 Greek men were executed at Amasia. These men were gathered during last spring, and included all the Greek men of any prominence from the various points along the coast. Five or six were from Marsovan, among them Pastor Pavlides, Professor Theocharides, two other teachers, and one or two students. Between 70 and 80 were from Samsoun. None of the evidence in connection with the trial of these men was published.

The condition of relief work in Marsovan, Sivas, and Samsoun is very bad. In Marsovan Americans were not able to move outside of their compound to give aid of any sort. No matter how serious need there might have been 15 miles away, they could not lift a hand to meet the need. At present also the orders are to add no additional orphans to the list. At Sivas the Relief can not aid deportees constantly passing through the city in any way except by native agents working below the surface. In Samsoun also work was considerably interfered with, particularly in regard to schools.

[From a report on conditions in Sivas and Harpoot.]

Miss Graffam, at Sivas, gave aid in the form of money and clothes to the Greeks deported from Samsoun. When the officials learned of this she was severely reprimanded and ordered to discontinue such service.

Deportees who reached Harpoot were allowed to rest overnight there. The Americans sent them food. When this became known, they were not allowed to stop in Harpoot. Truck loads of bread and water were then sent to them on the road whenever groups were being sent through. Such trucks came back loaded with babies, which exhausted mothers threw into them in their desperation. The drivers reported that there were many dead and dying along the road. These are Armenians as well as Greeks.

[Extracts from a report made to the State Department by an eyewitness, covering the period since last April, with special reference to the events in Marsovan. The American missionaries had been sent out of Marsovan in March and the American college there closed.]

The Marsovan governor was removed about three weeks before the massacre [in July]. Some three days after the arrival of the new governor, an Armenian who went to the governor's office was questioned by him concerning 10 Armenian men. Who were they? What was their business? Except Hiharan Effendi, our druggist, who was in hiding, all these men were killed.

\* \* \* \* \*

Screaming and crying kept up all night, mainly in the Greek quarter, but also in the Armenian district to some extent. Just at dawn the crying was worse. Women who had hidden in the shrubbery were discovered. During the night there had been much inquiry for both our foreman and our pharmacist. The foreman went out to Saduk Bey's to find out what was wanted and came back safely. He deliberately put himself in danger, because he had heard them threaten to search the compound for him.

Monday morning the police commissar and two gendarmes—not the regular troops who had started the massacre—came to the gate and took our foreman, our master of the tailor shop, and our former bath master. We never saw them again. The gendarme commandant's brother said the foreman was beaten to death. All these were Armenians.

\* \* \* \* \*

About noon on Tuesday the wife of one of the wealthiest of the Armenian merchants came over the wall. She said that Saduk Bey (he was the man appointed by the Kemalists to oversee the distribution of relief) with one of the Laz leaders came to her house and said they would give her 12 hours to find her husband and Hurabel, the manager of the Ibranosian store, and send them out of the compound. A servant told where they had gone. Also, some Turkish women sent word that the cheteh (the irregular troop) leaders threatened to kill them and search the compound if three women who had been entrusted to them were not sent out. One of these was our American professor's wife; the others I have forgotten. We found them all, and the result of the conference was that they went out. The professor's wife returned on Saturday, the other two women we never heard of again, and the two men were reported killed soon after they went out.

\* \* \* \* \*

Wednesday, while we were at lunch, word came that there was a fire just outside the compound near the girls' school. We went out and found four separate and distinct fires, one just two houses away from our wall. One was the Armenian professor's house; he was probably burned in it. A few moments later the French school, some blocks distant from the other fires, began to burn. There was a very strong wind blowing from the north, which carried the fire away from the compound. Turks whom I watched sat in the garden of a burning house eating fruit, and did not turn a hand to save the next house, which needed only a wet blanket to save it. It is said that women who tried to save things from their houses were shot or beaten and taken away. \* \* \* People who came into the compound on Saturday said that dead bodies were thrown into the fire; that people escaping were shot; and that some live people were seen being thrown in.

\* \* \* \* \*

The stories of the women who returned were essentially the same. They had been taken to two places, a big house and the French school. If there had been men in the group they were usually taken ahead, and either not seen again or found dead in a room of the first house. Later the women were gathered in the French school. All night the chetehs moved them from room to room and up and down stairs. In this way they prevented the mothers from concealing their daughters, and they picked and chose as they liked. Some of the prettiest were taken away; others were raped and left. \* \* \* The governor told us afterwards that he had great difficulty in persuading the chetehs to release these women. They were taken to the barracks. On the way some were shot. An Armenian nurse, who had been in training in our hospital before it was closed, was lame and couldn't keep up. She was shot. \* \* \*

"In the latter part of the week (I can not remember whether it began Thursday or Friday) they began to carry out the dead to the Christian Cemetery, across the little mill stream. I do not know how many cartloads there were, for I watched it only at times. They dug five big pits, and at least one load was dumped into a shallow hole by the steep roadside, because the horses could not pull the load. Through glasses I saw them strip the bodies and discovered that they were not all dead. It is impossible to say how many were killed, but I think about a thousand, or half of the Christian population, is not too big an estimate. \* \* \* An investigating committee came from Anasia. They saw Mr. Compton, but when he began to talk of the trouble they had other business and excused themselves. The Marsovan officials all expressed their horror of the affair, and seem to be very anxious to put themselves in a favorable light with the Americans. \* \* \* From my knowledge of one small

corner of the situation, I am convinced that the plan of the Young Turk committee in 1915 has not been abandoned by those Turks who are in power, and that unless there is some unforeseen intervention, the Christians in Asiatic Turkey are doomed."

[Extract from a letter from Adana, dated November 5.]

In a recent issue of the *Yeni Adana*, the paper published in Bozanti, the Turkish Kemalist capital of Adana, the Armenians were warned: "We hear of preparations by the Armenians to emigrate. Have patience. When we come we will have accounts to settle, after which you may think of emigration." This was put in brutal form and there could be no doubt of the meaning. The paper was printed entirely in red ink. The tone was crimson. \* \* \* It is not that we anticipate massacre on the arrival of the nationalist forces. The danger that threatens is the absolute impossibility of these communities to live in any sort of confidence and tranquillity under the present circumstances without the presence of a paramount power that would hold the balance fairly even. There is absolutely no assurance.

[Extract from a letter from Constantinople, written in February of this year.]

I am told by those who are in a position to know that leading Turkish statesmen have decided upon a system of extermination in order that the trouble which the presence of the Christian populations bring upon them may be eliminated, vainly supposing that by so doing they can get rid of a troublesome question. It makes one's blood boil to witness the evident tendency toward smothering the interests of the Christian populations in the Near East and a determination to reinstate the Turk again in a place of power. It is my strong belief that the League of Nations is destined to be the graveyard of the hopes of these people who during the war period put implicit faith in the Entente Powers.

I feel very deeply concerned in regard to the condition of the orphans in the interior of Asia Minor. Affairs are moving in the interior in such a way as to make the future of these children painfully uncertain, if not really hazardous. Notwithstanding all protestations that have been made by the friends of the Angora Government, we begin to see unmistakable signs of the recrudescence of the same spirit and attitude toward the Christian populations in the interior as was exhibited by the Young Turk Party at the time of the deportations. I have been told by persons whose opinion I feel is entitled to the highest respect that leading Turkish statesmen have been known to express the determination to practically exterminate the Christian populations in the interior of Asia Minor. From certain locations we have heard that already the demand is made upon the orphanages to turn out all boys who have reached the age of 15 years. This means that the Government proposes to superintend the further life and activities of the Christian youths, thus seriously interfering with our plans for higher education. We know too well what the demand for these boys means. The horrible circumstances attending conscription into military service of Christians who have reached the age of 15 and 16 years show too clearly the mind of the existing Government, and indicates the probable future of the Christian male population if the Kemal government comes to power. I have recently been told that a like demand for the expulsion of girls of 15 and 16 years from the orphanages has been made. I know it was Miss Allen's strong determination to get the children out of the interior and in cooperation with her intention it has been my endeavor to get suitable locations here for their accommodation and development.

My purpose in writing is to emphasize the need which I think exists for having suitable representations made at any meeting of Allied Powers that has for its object the revision of the treaty of Sevres with Turkey. Adequate guarantees must be taken from the Turkish Government in regard to the safety of the Christian populations in the Near East. These guarantees should be executed at the present time if the armistice period is to be continued on indefinitely, for there are considerable numbers of Christians still existing in Anatolia who are unable to either adequately defend themselves or to emigrate to other places.

#### STATEMENT OF REV. MIHRAN T. KALAIDJIAN.

MR. SMITH. I will introduce the next speaker. Mr. Kala'djian.

THE CHAIRMAN. Kindly give your name and address to the reporter.

MR. KALAIDJIAN. My address is 287 Fourth Avenue, New York.

MR. SMITH. We will file with you various documents bearing on the matter, with your permission. You might use them or not as you think wise.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. I will get the Harbord report on Armenia.

Mr. KALAJDJIAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am pastor at large for Armenians under the Congregational Home Missionary Society. I am also the secretary of the Armenian department of the Twenty-third Street Y. M. C. A., doing immigrant aid and Americanization work.

The CHAIRMAN. Where were you born?

Mr. KALAJDJIAN. In Capadocia, Asia Minor.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you lived in Asia Minor?

Mr. KALAJDJIAN. Until 1902, when I came over to this country, and after I was here five years I was a citizen of the United States and cast my vote in the presidential election. I did not wait one more minute than I had to wait in order to become a citizen.

I am a Yale graduate. At that time I voted for a Yale man for President, and he is now on the other side of the Capital in the Supreme Court. My work has been as pastor of the Armenian churches. For seven years I was in Troy, N. Y., and I was also pastor of the American Congregational churches for seven years. I have been a connecting link between Armenians and Americans and am now engaged in helping those who come over here, to understand the spirit of America and help them to become assimilated and initiated into the mysteries of American citizenship.

In Turkey, as you have already been told, before the war, there were 2,000,000 Armenians, of which 1,000,000 were in the six Armenian Provinces, and the other 1,000,000 was scattered all over the Turkish Empire. But I am here just to say in a few moments that while the Armenians were small in number in proportion to their number they have made themselves indispensable to the country, in the development of the commercial and the economic life of that country. There were many skilled laborers among the Armenians and in Turkey. To-day in the reduced Asiatic Provinces Armenians represent a greater economic force than their numbers suggest. They are very intellectual and from the industrial point of view the most active among all the eastern peoples.

A German observer, Paul Rhorbach, who was in Armenia, says:

"In the Turkey of to-day, now reduced almost within its Asiatic confines, the Armenians represent a greater economic force than their numbers would suggest. They are, most assuredly, from intellectual as well as the material points of view, the most active element among all the eastern peoples. It can readily be asserted that, in the region where they are found, they are the only people with innate national qualities. The Armenian is endowed with an energy and a tenacity of purpose or character which differs absolutely from that which we are accustomed to regard as oriental character.

"In order to give an idea as to the economic activity of the Armenians in Turkish Armenia, we present here below the commercial and industrial statistics of the vilayet of Sivas, which is the least representative Armenian among the six vilayets. (The Armenians in Sivas constitute about 34 per cent of the population.) It will be seen that even here all the commercial and industrial activities were centered almost exclusively in the hands of the Armenians.

"Commerce: One hundred and sixty-six importers—141 Armenians, 13 Turks, and 12 Greeks; 150 exporters—127 Armenians and 23 Turks; 37 bankers and capitalists—32 Armenians and 5 Turks; 9,800 shopkeepers and artisans—6,800 Armenians, 2,555 Turks, 150 other elements.

"Industries: One hundred and fifty-three factories, of which 130 belong to Armenians. The technical staff of all factories are principally Armenians. Number of factory workers, 17,700, of which 14,000 are Armenians.

"The important fact should be noted that, prior to the war, 2,000,000 Armenians controlled over 35 per cent of the commerce of the Ottoman Empire, which had an estimated population of 18,000,000 to 20,000,000. But commerce has never been the principal occupation of the Armenian people. The greater portion of the Armenians, or from 85 to 90 per cent, have always been engaged in agriculture and in smaller crafts in Turkey, in the Caucasus, and in Persia. The Armenians have been, before everything else, tillers of the soil and artisans.

"In the vilayet of Van they control 90 per cent of its commerce and 80 per cent of its agriculture. Goldsmiths, engravers, furniture makers, tailors, shoemakers, architects, carpenters, masons, blacksmiths are all Armenians. Also those in liberal professions such as physicians, lawyers, druggists, are likewise Armenians. The same state of things are to be found in all the other regions. The activity of the Armenian element is also noteworthy in the field of public

instruction and educational organizations. The Armenian schools are better and more numerous than those of all the other nationalities in Turkey; and what should be particularly appreciated here is that they have been constructed and maintained with the voluntary contributions not only of wealthy Armenians, but more so with those of the common people and poor communities. In 1903 there were 818 Armenian schools in Turkey with 82,000 pupils of both sexes. These schools are under the supervision of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. To these schools should also be added the Armenian Catholic and Protestant schools, and private schools. In Turkish Armenia alone, that is, in the six Provinces and in Cilicia there were, in 1903, 585 Armenian schools with 52,000 pupils, as against 150 Turkish schools with about 17,000 pupils in the same region."

The CHAIRMAN. Who said that?

Mr. KALAIDJIAN. Paul Rhorbach, a German who went to Turkey as a German propagandist to study the situation and report to his people and government.

Mr. COOPER. That is from a German official report by a representative who was sent there for an express purpose?

Mr. KALAIDJIAN. That is the report of an enemy which ought to have a double meaning. This is the testimony of an enemy. We can say more—Abdul Hamid II, had an Armenian for his personal treasurer, which speaks volumes for the honesty of the people. I do not think the Armenians are angels as their friends claim, or fallen angels according to their enemies, but substantially an honest people and may fairly be considered a most honest people according to the standard of that country.

So much for the Armenians as they have been in Asia Minor and in their home country. I have here now facts in regard to what they have done in the few years that they have been in this country. Where they had opportunity, where they had freedom, I find that among the new immigrants who came to the United States they are the most literate people that come to us, and there is less illiteracy among them than among the Greeks or the Italians.

Mr. ACKERMAN. How many entered the country last year?

Mr. KALAIDJIAN. 1921?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Yes.

Mr. KALAIDJIAN. Of course, due to this new law, the Armenians come on three different quotas, that is Armenia, 1,585, and we had about 50 to 60 more to come in that quota. The Turkish quota was 685 and it is exhausted, and the Syrian quota of 900 was exhausted. So that the total number of Armenians we have coming in since this new restriction law has passed has not been more than 2,500, and I find from statistics that most of the Armenians that come to this country came after the massacres in Cilicia in 1909, that is our 9,000. In two other years they numbered over 5,000, in other years there has been less than 3,000.

Mr. FISH. Where did they mostly go to? To what States?

Mr. KALAIDJIAN. We have the Armenians scattered all over the United States, the New England States and the South Atlantic States have the largest number. We have about 25,000 in New England; 20,000 in the South Atlantic States; New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, 10,000; 15,000 in the Middle West, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan; and 20,000 to 25,000 on the Pacific coast.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the total?

Mr. KALAIDJIAN. The total, so far as I can make it, is between 85,000 to 100,000. You remember that until recent years (1898) we had no record of the different races, but that is approximately correct, as we can get it, 85,000 to 100,000 in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any way you could furnish the committee with information as to the occupations of these Armenians in America?

Mr. KALAIDJIAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Giving the number engaged in trade, the number of farmers and mechanics, etc.

Mr. KALAIDJIAN. Yes, sir; I had the privilege of making a survey of the Armenians in America for the Interchurch Movement and have the facts. Mr. Malcom, my friend who is going to testify, has published a book on the Armenians in America and has gathered quite a little valuable data, and will be very glad to furnish that data.

The CHAIRMAN. You said you came from Troy.

Mr. KALAIDJIAN. Yes, sir; I was pastor of the Armenian church there for six and a half years.

Mr. FISH. How large a congregation was it?

Mr. KALAIDJIAN. There were 1,500 Armenians in the capital district, mostly in Troy and Watervliet.

Mr. FISH. What are the occupations of most of them?

Mr. KALAIDJIAN. They work in the collar factories, and a few of them in the iron factories in Watervliet. In New England they work in the textile and shoe factories. In the Middle West they work in automobile and tire factories, and in California they are mostly farmers. They have made the San Joaquin Valley blossom where it was a desert, making it a garden spot, and 40 per cent of the raisin industry in this country to-day is controlled by Armenians, not by speculation but by production; they own the land that produces 40 per cent of the raisins in this country. We have 20 professors in different American colleges and universities, and some very eminent doctors. We have Doctor Kazanjan, Doctor Gregory of Bellevue Hospital in New York, and Doctor Malejian. Doctor Kazanjan was at the head of the Harvard medical mission which rendered valuable services to the British armies in the World War, and because of his wonderful facial operations he has been decorated by the King of England. As an American citizen he has brought distinction and honor to his adopted country and glory to his race.

The CHAIRMAN. I see in this book that of the 55,000 who entered the United States since 1899, only 1 is engaged in the brewing business.

Mr. KALAIDJIAN. I am glad to say that the Armenian people are a temperate people.

Mr. MOORES. In my district they are nearly all of them in trade, in Indianapolis.

Mr. KALAIDJIAN. Yes, sir; we have a good many small tradesmen. They are not used to factory life. As soon as they get some capital they go into business, into groceries, butcher shops, etc., and in that way they build homes and take their share in American life. I have statistics here to show that the Armenians who come here become naturalized sooner than other races among the new immigrants.

The results of investigation among the immigrant employees in the manufacturing and mining industries shows that 58.2 per cent of the Armenians were naturalized, 32.9 per cent of the Italians, 24.1 per cent of the Hebrews, 21.9 per cent of the Lithuanians, 20 per cent of the Syrians, 17.1 per cent of the Czechoslovaks, 14.7 per cent of the Ruthenians, 5.2 per cent of the Portuguese, 3.7 per cent of the Greeks, and none of the Bulgarians.

In that investigation the Armenians were at the head of the list in literacy and in the way they became naturalized.

Mr. FISH. Where is that information filed?

Mr. KALAIDJIAN. It is from the report of the Commissioner of Immigration.

Mr. FISH. What occupations does it comprise?

Mr. KALAIDJIAN. The manufacturing industry. We have hundreds of engineers, doctors, and other professional men who are respected and honored in their professions.

In closing, let me say one word—that these people that have been the first Christians known to accept Christianity as their national religion and have served as the outposts of Christianity and civilization in the Middle Ages have been robbed of everything because of their Christian faith, due largely to the Turkish barbarism. We can not blame the Turks for the suffering of this people, because the world knows what to expect from the Turks, and it is due to the jealousies of the Christian powers; they are to be blamed for it. As suggested by one of the committee, it is the modern Shylocks who wish to restore the Turk to make their holdings good and to get new concessions. But, as an American citizen, I feel that we failed in our duty when we failed to declare war against the enemy of civilization, and it is necessary to get a remedy for these massacres against these people. The Congress, as accredited representative of this great Christian Republic, should raise its voice and make known to the world that we do not approve it. We appeal to you because the destiny of a Christian nation and the extinction or revival of Christian civilization in Armenia will depend on America raising its voice in behalf of Armenia, and I believe it will be heard in the chancelleries of Europe and bear good results. This morning in reading the paper I read that the foreign ministers have a conference in the Near East on the 20th of this month. If this Congress could pass a resolution and the executive branch of the Government could participate in that conference, I am sure, without a battleship, without spending a dollar of American money, without any soldiers, our moral influence will be enough to bring harmony and union among the allied powers

and give Armenia what has been recognized as the minimum, the Wilson boundry, in the treaty of Sevres. We stand upon that declaration in the treaty, and we have no doubt that if Congress will adopt this resolution the Armenians will live and have a new lease of life.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Is this conference that you speak of a subcommittee of the League of Nations?

Mr. KALAIDJIAN. No; it has no relation to the League of Nations. It is a conference of the ministers of foreign affairs of three powers—England, France, and Italy.

Mr. LINEBERGER. They are not acting upon the suggestion or the request of the League of Nations?

Mr. KALAIDJIAN. No, sir. They are going to see if they can make peace between Greece and Turkey and settle the question of the Near East.

In closing, let me read these words of the distinguished Secretary of State in connection with a banquet at the American Committee for the Independence of Armenia:

"We have always been the friends of the Armenians, admiring their industry, their intellectual alertness, their keenness, their sobriety, their aptitude for education and affairs, and we have revolted at the thought of such a people being under the yoke of the Turk.

"Now we rejoice that the hour of liberation has come. The vain ambition of brute force has overreached itself and has resulted in the emancipation of the downtrodden and oppressed of centuries. There is to be a settlement of this long account, and the credit balance is to be found in the opportunity for a free and independent life.

"There is no doubt of the capacity of the Armenians for freedom. They are as capable of self-government as any people. They have shown a racial solidarity and a capacity to survive incredible misfortunes, they have rare intelligence, and no people prize more highly the advantages of education. Even in the midst of suffering they have proved their capacity. Despite their persecution, their ability has made them essential even to Turkish administration, and they have furnished the brains of the Ottoman Empire. All they need is a fair opportunity, that decent opportunity which only civil and religious liberty can provide.

"We propose to-night to throw such influence as we have into the scale for Armenian independence."

Those are the words of the Secretary of State, Hon. Charles E. Hughes.

Mr. MOORE. When?

Mr. KALAIDJIAN. In 1919, February 8, at a banquet at which James W. Gerard and others were also present.

Mr. FISH. Whom do you represent?

Mr. KALAIDJIAN. Myself as a citizen.

Mr. FISH. No organization?

Mr. KALAIDJIAN. No organization. I am employed by an organization. I come here as an American citizen, an Armenian also by descent, to give my views, to express my sentiments to you.

Mr. FISH. Are you connected with the Near East organization?

Mr. KALAIDJIAN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the purpose of the committee to give you gentlemen all of the time you desire.

Mr. SMITH. If possible, I would like to have 40 minutes more. We have Mr. Papazian, Mr. Vickrey, Mr. Emhardt, and Mr. Malcolm. We can file our letters.

The CHAIRMAN. How much more time do you want?

Mr. SMITH. Forty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well; proceed.

#### STATEMENT OF MR. G. H. PAPAIZIAN.

Mr. Chairman, among the nationalities oppressed by the powers against whom the Allies and the United States struggled in the late war, the Armenians, because of the atrocious tyranny under which they suffered, easily stood first in the sympathies of mankind. From the outset of the war they had declared their sympathy for the allied cause, and through their representatives in the Turkish Parliament had endeavored to dissuade Turkey from joining forces with the Central Powers. Meanwhile, on the other side of the border, their brothers of Russian Armenia to the number of 160,000—enlisted as regulars



in the Czar's army—had been sent to the Galician front, and of those who remained a volunteer force was formed to aid the army of Grand Duke Nicholas. They also fought as volunteers in France, Syria, and Palestine under the allied flag and as Americans in our own Army.

This activity of the Armenians in behalf of the allied cause involved tremendous risk and sacrifice. Massacres and deportations followed with inconceivable atrocities. According to the figures of the British War Office more than a million four hundred thousand Armenians (about one-third of the entire population) thus lost their lives in the world conflict. The loss of wealth was enormous. Their towns and villages were laid waste and their property confiscated. The record is one unparalleled in the annals of history.

During the war governments repeatedly and solemnly pledged that in the final settlement justice should be upheld; that the Armenians should be liberated; that the territory which they occupied and which from the earliest time had been historically theirs should be restored to them; and that the Turks should be compelled to respect the world's judgment and to abide by the decisions of the allied and associated powers.

Under the treaty of Sevres, because of their services in the World War, the Armenians were recognized as an ally and were promised independence. Their right to territory in the former Ottoman Empire has been internationally conceded. But to the amazement and to the disappointment of the world, Armenia's claims have been almost entirely overlooked. In the words of Viscount Bryce, "The allied powers have grievously mismanaged the Armenian situation." Reparation of any kind, political or financial, has been denied to them, and since the armistice their plight has been tragic beyond comprehension. The evacuation of Cilicia by the French has greatly aggravated the situation, and to-day nearly half a million Armenian men, women, and children are homeless and seeking refuge in vain.

As to other suffering peoples so to the Armenians, the American people in the kindness of their hearts have subscribed much for relief—more than \$63,000,000 since the armistice. But it is needless to say that many times this sum will not avail unless the so-called "Armenian question"—long the scandal of the world—is properly and permanently settled. It is evident that the only solution to the problem lies in the constitution of an independent state where the Armenian people may find safe refuge and where they may devote themselves to the work of reconstruction.

The Armenians are known the world over as a thrifty, industrious, and progressive people. Once given the opportunity to govern themselves, there is little doubt about the result. As a nation they would soon become self-supporting and be able to contribute to the advancement of production and commerce in general and to that of the arts and sciences. What is needed is political justice.

If the United States had declared war on Turkey, as was proposed by some of our most far-sighted statesmen, we would certainly have taken an important part in the settlement of the Armenian question, as of all other Near East questions, in accordance with our war aims and purposes. But even as it is, as one of the associated powers our Government has the indisputable right in international law to take up with the Allies any of the questions which the war situation involved. Surely it is the duty of our Government not to permit the perpetuation of wrong and injustice in a situation to the redemption of which the country has pledged its honor.

Considering that the humanitarian sentiments of the people of the United States are strongly enlisted in behalf of the Armenians, and considering that the two principal political parties of the country in response to this universal interest and sympathy have pledged themselves to aid Armenia in all proper ways, the resolution before this committee, Mr. Chairman, may be said to be in perfect accord with the will and sentiment of the American people. It is also in line with the noble traditions and ideals of the Republic.

Mr. LINEBERGER. How many Armenians did you say lost their lives in the World War?

Mr. PAPAZIAN. One million four hundred thousand.

Mr. LINEBERGER. How many were there at the beginning of the World War?

Mr. PAPAZIAN. That is one-third of the entire population.

Mr. LINEBERGER. You did not include any of the massacres?

Mr. PAPAZIAN. Everything.

Mr. LINEBERGER. You include those that lost their lives in the massacres and also those that were incident to the World War? Is that the idea?

Mr. PAPAZIAN. Precisely.

The CHAIRMAN. As to the treatment accorded the Armenians by the soviet, is that at all harmful?

Mr. PAPAZIAN. No; there is no complaint of that.

The CHAIRMAN. It all comes from the Turkish?

Mr. PAPAZIAN. The Turkish masses, and as Mr. Montgomery said, the only solution is to form the four Turkish Provinces into an independent State.

The CHAIRMAN. I gather from your testimony that it is your opinion that if we had declared war on Turkey at the time we declared war on Germany and Austria-Hungary this Armenian question could have been settled by treaty when we adjusted our differences with Turkey?

Mr. PAPAZIAN. That is my opinion.

Mr. SMITH. The next witness is Mr. Charles V. Vickrey, of the Near East Relief, who has been very recently on a tour of inspection of our relief stations in the Near East and who has statistics fresh in his mind.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

#### **STATEMENT OF MR. CHARLES V. VICKREY, GENERAL SECRETARY NEAR EAST RELIEF.**

Mr. VICKREY. I have no formal statement to present. I will try to throw myself open to questions. It chances to have been my lot to travel in Armenia and the Near East each summer since the armistice. I have observed conditions in the summer of 1919 after the war ended and each summer since. In the summer of 1919 I traveled from one end of the former Ottoman Empire to the other, a considerable part of the distance with General Harbord's party, not as an official member of the party, but as a guest of the general from Constantinople to Aleppo. At that time it was the general assumption that the Allies had won the war, and even the Turks thought that they had been defeated. At that time the solution of the Armenian and the Near Eastern problems seemed comparatively simple. That was before the country was closed by renewed warfare. We traveled on the train at that time from Constantinople to Aleppo without seeing more than a corporal's guard of Turkish soldiers. Turkey was simply waiting for the powers to announce what its sentence should be. But instead of acting the powers have debated as to what provision should be made for the future of Turkey and the defeated forces of Turkey have begun to regain strength. It would to-day be impossible for anybody to travel through the areas that I traveled with perfect ease and safety during the summer immediately following the armistice.

At that time nobody could wish for better protection than an American citizenship. I would rather have traveled through Central Anatolia with the protection of American-citizenship papers than to travel with a bodyguard of a regiment of soldiers for any other country. I was in Armenia at that time; and when I speak of Armenia I mean the Russian part of Armenia, because the Turkish section of Armenia was devastated after the 1916 massacres and deportations and has remained desolate since, and conditions have gone from bad to worse since the summer of 1919. I was over there during the summers of 1920 and 1921. I traveled to some extent through the same areas but not as far into the interior as in 1919 because sections that were wide open in 1919 to every traveler were closed by renewed military operations, and, as you know, the war has gone on. There has not been a month since 1914 when war has not been waged in Turkey, and there has not been a time since 1915 that any Armenian dared go back to his ancestral home where he perhaps once had property and some rights of citizenship. The question has been asked two or three times as to what influence the soviet government has had upon the Russian section of Armenia. I was there in August, 1921, as I had been in August, 1920. In August, 1920, there was an Armenian Republic recognized by the United States as an independent government. In 1921 that republic had been overthrown by force by the soviet troops. So far as the general government is concerned, I could not see any marked difference. The influence of the Moscow soviet authorities, by the time it got down to Armenia, was pretty well attenuated.

The change of officers and change of government was without any essential difference in its frontiers and its attitude toward the common people, but the whole country has been indescribably impoverished. Many of them are refugees, driven from their homes in 1915, who have not dared to return to

their homes. Any attempt to return means certain death. During all the years since 1915, one year after another has added to the poverty and demoralization of the people. Naturally, in 1921, you had soviet control over a woefully impoverished people.

That is not the most serious thing. I think that in many ways the refugees in Russian Armenia are of the more fortunate of the Armenians. More serious, probably, just now is the plight of those Armenians who had been driven in 1915 to Cilicia and Palestine and were encouraged by the French to join the army and fight shoulder to shoulder with the French in getting back to their homes in Cilicia. They came back to their homes in Cilicia to find, after they had fought with the French and incurred fresh enmity on the part of the Turks, that they are again deserted by the European powers, left to the tender mercies of the Turks and again obliged to beat a retreat. The whole thing is one of the most flagrant cases that I know of anywhere in history, of civilization failing to stand by the rights of a people. The whole world has gone on record time and time again. There is scarcely a nation in Europe that, during the late war, did not officially pledge to Armenia justice and independence. We have here in our own political platforms last year statements from the Republican Party as follows:

"We deeply sympathize with the people of Armenia and stand ready to help them in all proper ways, but the Republican Party opposes now and hereafter the acceptance of a mandate for any country in Europe and Asia."

Mr. FISH. Where is that statement from?

Mr. VICKREY. It is from the platform of the Republican Party at its last convention.

Mr. FISH. That is, the last national platform?

Mr. VICKREY. Yes. I would also read from another platform, that of the Democratic Party, which expresses its position as follows:

"We express our deep and earnest sympathy for the unfortunate people of Armenia, and we believe that our Government, consistent with its Constitution and principles, should render every possible and proper aid to them in their efforts to establish and maintain a government of their own."

Other smaller parties adopted similar statements in their platforms.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Which one is that?

Mr. VICKREY. The Democratic, and the previous one I quoted was the Republican platform.

Every nation in the world in time of stress and when the military support of nations was involved, have gone on record on the side of humanity and right on this question, but when they come to the pinch they all leave it to the other nations.

I have this feeling about the thing. I am not in favor of any armed intervention. I do not think armed intervention is necessary. I said in 1919 a person could have traveled anywhere in Turkey with no other or better protection than American citizenship, but I believe that if to-day the so-called great powers, the civilized powers, including America, would agree on what is right and say these are rights approved by international law, and we propose to stand by the principles of international law, that without the firing of a gun or the loss of a drop of blood this whole thing could be righted by moral force, economic forces, commercial forces, and diplomatic procedure. It requires somebody who will stand for what is right.

Mr. LINEBERGER. What would happen if they did not do that?

Mr. VICKREY. We could bring them to time very quickly by the use of economic forces.

Mr. COCKRAN. What do you mean by "we"?

Mr. VICKREY. The Allies, including the United States.

Mr. COCKRAN. But the Allies have their own forces of dissension growing out of the disposition of the present territory of Cilicia and Turkish territory. Do you think they are liable to sacrifice these pretensions on your theory for the sake of Armenia?

Mr. VICKREY. I am very fearful that they will not do it promptly, but I think that the United States, the credit Nation of the world, has a pretty good-sized club on a number of them by the fact that it is a creditor Nation.

Mr. COCKRAN. I have not much faith in a combination of nations, but I have faith in the instincts of love of justice of the American people. How could the American people do it economically? Let us see how the United States, by the exercise of economic pressure, could effect the results you are seeking?

Mr. BEGG. He said the United States and other powers.

Mr. COCKRAN. I think he said the United States alone.

Mr. VICKREY. I think I did say this, that the United States as the creditor nation of the world could have a great deal of influence with other powers.

Mr. COCKRAN. That is it.

Mr. COOPER. That case does not look as hopeless to accomplish the result by public opinion of the world as it is now and in this country, as public sentiment did in the case of the Shantung controversy, following President Harding in that.

Mr. VICKREY. The longer there is delay in the situation the harder it is going to be. The easiest time to settle this was in the summer of 1919. At this time, now, it is vastly more difficult than in 1919, and it will be almost infinitely worse if you allow this sore to fester and poison until 1924, or 1925, or 1926. If you want to stop future warfare the time to act is now while the Allies still have some control over the situation.

Mr. FISH. When you discuss this whole Armenian situation, do you divide it into Turkish Armenia or Russian Armenia, or combine them both.

Mr. VICKREY. We aim to keep ourselves to the resolution under discussion to-day, which does not necessarily ask for any delimitation of special areas, but it is asking for some provision to be made for the Armenians to establish a suitable government.

Mr. LINEBERGER. You do not state that. You state as a separate nation. Are you in favor of the passage of this resolution as it is?

Mr. VICKREY. I am not opposing the details of this resolution.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Are you in favor of the principle of it?

Mr. VICKREY. Yes.

Mr. FISH. Do you mean this country, which does not recognize Soviet Russia to-day, could interfere with the Russian part of Armenia?

Mr. VICKREY. None of the difficulties, as I understand it, center around the soviet side of Armenia. The difficulty centers right here at Angora, Kemal Pasha attempting to defy the Allies in the Great War, who presumably defeated Germany. This spot [indicating on map] over here is almost negligible. I traveled through there this summer, and I did not know whether it was under soviet authority or some other authority. There practically is no government there at the present time because Moscow does not get down here with any great force. Moscow has problems of its own and they have all they can do to hold themselves together without worrying about conditions down here.

Mr. FISH. You would ignore that question almost because we can not do anything else unless we recognize the Soviet Government; can not even deal with them.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Is not that whole section a sore festering with intrigue, jealousy, and cross-purposes, a very intricate and involved political and economic situation? Is it not a mess?

Mr. VICKREY. Yes; but the common people desire nothing so much as a stable government.

Mr. VICKREY. I will not take more of your time, but I hold in my hand a number of cablegrams received from responsible American citizens in the Near East and a number of letters, some of them confidential, but I am perfectly willing to give to the chairman of the committee the names of the writers, showing that the conditions in the interior of Turkey to-day, especially as regards the subject races, are worse than any time since the armistice.

Mr. MOORE. You stated awhile ago that this Government had recognized the Republic of Armenia. Is that accurate?

Mr. VICKREY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. When and how?

Mr. VICKREY. April, 1920.

Mr. MOORE. In what way—a formal recognition?

Mr. VICKREY. I have in my file an exact copy of a letter of Secretary Colby which he sent, regarded as recognition, and the State Department so regards it.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Have we withdrawn that recognition?

Mr. VICKREY. No.

Mr. MOORE. The nations of Europe, the allied powers, recognize the Republic of Armenia?

Mr. VICKREY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Those rights are expressed in the Treaty of Paris and they have formally recognized the Republic of Armenia, and it has been recognized by our Government?

Mr. MOORES. They sent a minister here. Has that minister been returned?

Mr. VICKREY. He is still here.

Mr. MOORE. But we are without representation in Armenia.

Mr. VICKREY. No official representative. I do wish to say as to the sources of our information that we have in the Ottoman Empire at the present time about 300 American citizens, some of the finest persons in the world, giving their lives to the cause of humanity there. America has put into that area more than \$100,000,000.

Mr. FISH. Does that 300 include those in Constantinople?

Mr. VICKREY. Yes, sir. That 100 millions includes colleges, educational institutions, and hospitals in the Near East. America for the most part has gone over there with a helping hand, to give and not to get. For this reason America is a name to conjure with in the Near East. The consideration of what America does or does not desire goes a long way in the councils of Europe and professedly even further among the peoples of the Near East, who know that America is a Nation that is not grabbing land and that by her acts has poured millions of dollars of money into that section to relieve suffering, without any intent of political aggrandizement. Therefore America has the right of way so far as influence is concerned in the Near East, and that influence can be exerted along moral lines without military threats to achieve ends.

The CHAIRMAN. That is also true in the Orient?

Mr. VICKREY. Yes.

Mr. FISH. I asked the previous speaker how many representatives of relief organizations were from Armenia. Can you answer that question? How many representatives of American relief organizations are in Armenia proper to-day?

Mr. VICKREY. Of course, Armenia proper, according to the Wilson boundary, is divided into two definite sections. One is the Russian side where we have 50 American citizens.

Mr. FISH. That is Russian Armenia?

Mr. VICKREY. Yes; on the Turkish side that country has been made a wilderness and a desert and the Armenians have been driven out. We have a very few workers on that side, a few in Trebizond, 15 in Harpoot, and others conducting operations at other centers in the Near East, working among the Armenians, Greeks, and subject races of the Turks. We treat all alike when it comes to starving men and women.

Mr. FISH. What organizations are working there now, doing relief work?

Mr. VICKREY. Near East Relief entirely.

Mr. FISH. That is the only one?

Mr. VICKREY. The only one. There are American citizens at every yellow spot on that map [indicating] administering relief in the name of the citizens of America.

Mr. FISH. Where is the greatest part of your relief going, to Turkish Armenia? You have 60 representatives in Russian Armenia. Most of your relief goes there, then?

Mr. VICKREY. No; not more than one-fourth of it goes there. There is a large amount of it in Constantinople—14,000 orphans in Constantinople alone. At present there are several thousand refugees in Constantinople who, when the Turks withdrew, fled from Cilicia. Any sensible man would have trekked down to Syria. Some of them took flight by boats. Others got to Constantinople, and some of them are at Constantinople to-day. They dare not leave for their ancestral homes.

Mr. FISH. What I am trying to find out is, Are you doing a great deal of relief work in Turkish Armenia?

Mr. VICKREY. No.

Mr. FISH. Will they let your representatives go in there?

Mr. VICKREY. No; but there are few Armenians now in that section of the country because they were driven out in 1915 and have not been able to return.

Mr. FISH. The Turkish Government will not let your representatives go in?

Mr. VICKREY. Probably not; we make no attempt.

Mr. FISH. It is too dangerous?

Mr. VICKREY. There are no Armenians there to help. This point on the map is Van. There were 70,000 in the Province and the town of Van before the war. There were more Armenians than Turks. To-day I do not suppose you will find more than a few hundred decrepit Armenians remaining in Van; all others having been driven out. The people who once resided in Van are now refugees at Erivan in Russian Armenia. They are destitute people, driven from where they once lived.

Mr. FISH. There are no Armenians left there at all, from what you say.

Mr. VICKREY. Practically none.

Mr. ACKERMAN. You are spending \$250,000 of relief funds in that portion of Armenia.

Mr. VICKREY. In this portion here [indicating on map] \$200,000, and in other portions, \$400,000 a month.

Mr. ACKERMAN. That \$400,000 a month means you are spending a good many million dollars.

Mr. VICKREY. No. The statement was made that it was \$1,000,000 a month average, but now our resources are depleted as a private charity organization. We are getting at the present time 40 per cent less in voluntary gifts than a year or two ago, a perfectly natural decrease which registers itself in increased suffering overseas.

Mr. FISH. Do you know of James Lavery, in the Near East? He is in the New York State headquarters at Troy.

Mr. VICKREY. In this country. I do not know him personally. I think I know who you mean. I think he was one of the field men.

Mr. FISH. Can you state the amount of your funds that are used for overhead expenses?

Mr. VICKREY. Yes. You will find that in the report tendered to Congress last year. At that time it was less than 5 per cent. There will be another report offered to Congress within a few weeks which will bring the figures down to December 31, and it will not be materially different from the one a year ago. Keep in mind that a considerable part of our expenses is provided by those who contribute money especially for expenses. They say, "We give you this for overhead expenses," and that has been previously contributed to the expense funds, is included in the report to Congress which will be sent to Congress again within a few weeks, giving it for the calendar year December 31.

The CHAIRMAN. Your workers are paid salaries?

Mr. VICKREY. Stipends. There is only one over there with a salary of \$5,000, possibly two. For the most part, the workers go on a mere living wage, the standard being \$50 per month and maintenance. For doctors and those with families sometimes it is more than \$50 per month and maintenance, but all our workers are called upon to make a sacrifice, and some of them a very great sacrifice.

The CHAIRMAN. Are the Quakers represented in Armenia?

Mr. VICKREY. We would be very glad to welcome them, but they are not. We are in there by a mutual agreement with the Red Cross, which during the war could not send workers to the Turkish Empire. We had a great many in connection with various institutions in Turkey when the war broke. We have people doing work which the Red Cross could not do. They agreed it would be more economical than they could do it, and the field has been divided between the Red Cross and the Near East Relief, the Near East Relief being assigned to the near eastern section of the world.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Do you think that the economic and political situation over there is sufficiently involved to justify passing a resolution with the political clause in it, such as this contains?

Mr. VICKREY. I do. And one thing apropos of what Mr. Smith said, that in my judgment a single twelvemonth of stable government and peace would forever remove from America any appeals for Armenian assistance.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Do you know what the attitude of General Harbord is on this resolution? Have you discussed this matter with him?

Mr. VICKREY. Not this resolution; no.

Mr. LINEBERGER. You would express the opinion that any view General Harbord might have in the matter might be worth considering, would you not?

Mr. VICKREY. Yes; on the basis of information of two years ago. Of course, General Harbord is the best authority on the conditions two years ago.

Mr. LINEBERGER. He is familiar with the general political and economic status involved in the Near Eastern situation?

Mr. VICKREY. Yes.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Particularly in Armenia?

Mr. VICKREY. Yes. He is a member of our Board of Trustees of Near East Relief.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I think at a later date we should have General Harbord here before the committee.

Mr. VICKREY. I notice that Mr. Emhardt is here.

The CHAIRMAN. The Harbord report dealt with it from the standpoint of a mandate.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I understand that, but the political element is more or less the same in a mandate or any attempt on the part of this country as one member of the League of Nations.

Mr. COOPER. General Harbord is a Regular Army officer.

Mr. LINEBERGER. There was an effort then to establish this as a nation, to create such an opportunity under certain military and economic instructions that were issued.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a radical distinction between the Harbor report and this resolution. The Harbord report took it up with the idea of using physical force. This resolution proposes to use moral force.

Mr. LINEBERGER. It does not so state. It says, "may be given an opportunity." This in my opinion will be necessary to create an opportunity on the part of Armenia.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

#### **STATEMENT OF REV. W. C. EMHARDT, REPRESENTING THE PRE-SIDING BISHOP AND COUNCIL OF EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES.**

Mr. EMHARDT. I represent the official board of the Episcopal Church of America. I have no right to take your time with a detailed discussion of the matter, but I assure you we have taken up the whole question of the Near East territory relief and the conditions there very recently. We did it in a desire to see whether we could indorse the policy of the Near East relief administration. Our conviction was not merely being called upon to indorse, but to give it our most enthusiastic support. The decision came upon us at a time when we were pressed by a great many things; so pressing, indeed, that we have sent out to the bishops of our church with a request to estimate a support to the extent of 10,000 orphans as a Lenten obligation to the people who are suffering at the hands of the cruel Turks. This means that we are creating throughout the world a sponsorship on the part of an influential body of American citizens for 10,000 children for whom we, as your fellow citizens, assume protection. We feel, therefore, that not only do we indorse the proposed action of the committee but earnestly plead to you that you try to-day to bring aid to us in this American sponsorship that we now assume on behalf of a Christian body for a people at this time in dire need. We as the Episcopal Church have never tried to do missionary work in Armenia. We considered Armenians brothers in the faith. They have appealed to us for work and we are glad to give our aid in that respect. Because we have this near kin to them in faith we want to impress upon the Christian world that the Episcopal Church moves cheerfully to carry its plea to you to do that, and we beg your earnest consideration.

#### **STATEMENT OF MR. M. VARTAN MALCOM.**

Mr. SMITH. The last speaker on the list is Mr. M. Vartan Malcom, of New York City.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

Mr. MALCOM. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it is rather late and I will not exhaust your patience by a lengthy statement. I will confine myself to the discussion of only one or two phases of the Armenian question. A great deal has been said to-day by the various speakers about the Near East. The Near East is an indefinite, vast section of the world, composed of many countries in which the Armenians are not interested. What the Armenians are interested in is Armenia. Before the late war this country of Armenia was divided into four parts, known as Turkish Armenia, Russian Armenia, Persian Armenia, and Cilicia. These divisions have been pointed out to you on the map by one or two other speakers. I would like to say something more on that particular subject but I feel that there is no time. At the conclusion of the late war the Armenians made a demand for the whole of these four sections stretching from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean [indicating on the map].

Mr. Cockran asked a number of very pertinent questions of the previous speakers which have remained unanswered. He desired to know what the United States can do to help the Armenians realize their aspirations. I wish to answer that.

Mr. COCKRAN. That's what I want.

Mr. MALCOM. It is perfectly apparent that the Armenians can not expect to have a Government like the United States assume sponsorship for them because of sympathy, pity, and kinship of religion. These may furnish sentimental motives for action, but there must be a legal basis to defend the rights of the Armenians and to see to it that they regain the control of their native land. What is that legal basis upon which the case of the Armenian rests?

For the purpose of discussing this particular point I will eliminate Russian Armenia and Persian Armenia, as well as Cilicia, here on the border of the Mediterranean [indicating on the map]. I shall confine myself strictly to the six Provinces over here [indicating on the map] known as Turkish Armenia. Aside from historical and ethnological reasons this territory known as Turkish Armenia has been recognized as the home of the Armenians by international treaties. First, there is the treaty of San Stefano, signed at the conclusion of the Russo-Turkish War, on the 3d day of March, 1878. Second, there is the treaty of Berlin, signed in the summer of 1878 between the great powers and Turkey, under which Turkey admits that these six Provinces constitute the home, the country, of the Armenians. Third, there is the Cyprus convention, signed in June, 1878, between Great Britain and Turkey, which likewise acknowledges that these territories belong to the Armenians. Fourth, there is what is known as the ambassadors' memorandum of 1895, the purpose of which was to enforce upon Turkey her promises to the Armenians under the various treaties I have just mentioned. Fifth, in 1914 an agreement was drawn between Germany and Turkey on one side and Russia on the other, representing the European powers and the Armenians, under which an autonomous Armenia was created within these six Provinces. But when the Great War broke out, the execution of this agreement was abandoned. Sixth, the armistice terms signed by the Allies and Turkey on October 31, 1918, provides among other things, "Any cause of disorder in the six Armenian Vilayets (Vilayets means provinces) the Allies reserve to themselves the right to occupy any part of them." Here again these Provinces are admitted as the Provinces of Armenia. Seventh, we finally get down to the treaty of Sevres, signed between the Allies and Turkey. I have here an official copy of that treaty and I would like to read those paragraphs which refer to Armenia.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that a matter of official record?

Mr. MALCOM. Yes. Of course this treaty was not signed by the United States because this country was not at war with Turkey. I would like to read just a portion of it which refers to the establishment of an independent Armenia.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Just read that particular paragraph.

Mr. MALCOM. Section 6, article 88, reads as follows: "Turkey, in accordance with the action already taken by the allied powers, hereby recognizes Armenia as a free and independent state." Article 89: "Turkey and Armenia, as well as the other high contracting parties, agree to submit to the arbitration of the President of the United States of America the question of the frontier to be fixed between Turkey and Armenia in the villayets of Erzerum, Trebizond, Van, and Bitlis, and to accept his decision thereon, as well as any stipulations he may prescribe as to access for Armenia to the sea, and as to the demilitarization of any portion of Turkish territory adjacent to the said frontier."

The CHAIRMAN. What is the date of that treaty?

Mr. MALCOM. August 10, 1920.

The CHAIRMAN. The treaty agreed to an independent state?

Mr. MALCOM. Yes.

Mr. FISH. That treaty was on broader lines?

Mr. MALCOM. Yes.

Mr. FISH. They did that?

Mr. MALCOM. Yes.

Mr. FISH. We have all the information available.

Mr. MALCOM. Yes; I presume the State Department has all the information on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The point I want to bring out is this: Turkey in violation of that treaty has established a de facto government at Angora. Is that correct?

Mr. MALCOM. No, Mr. Porter, that is not quite correct.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I would like to hear you on that.

Mr. MALCOM. I will endeavor to explain the matter. When the Sultan's Government signed the armistice Kemal Pasha and a few other Turkish leaders fled into Anatolia, gathered together some soldiers and declared that they would not accept the terms imposed by the Allies on Turkey. The Sultan's Government



secretly helped Kemel Pasha and his followers so as to prevent the carrying out of the treaty of Sevres. The Kemalists succeeded in organizing themselves first in Erzerum. Subsequently, they were compelled by the Armenian and Russian armies to move their headquarters to Sivas, and again they moved further west to Konla. As a result of the Greco-Turkish war here in Smyrna, these rebels moved back to Angora. Kemal and his followers call themselves Nationalists, and their object is to prevent the execution of the treaty of Sevres. There are, therefore, at the present time two so-called Turkish governments in the Ottoman Empire; namely, the Government of the Sultan at Constantinople and Kemal Pasha and his followers at Angora. The Sultan's Government, which is the rightful government of the Ottoman Empire, signed the treaty of Sevres, but it claims that it can not put it into execution because Kemal and his followers in Angora will not permit it. The Allies, however, are carrying out certain provisions of the treaty in advance of the final execution of the entire treaty. For example, the treaty provides that Constantinople and the Dardanelles shall be cut off from the late Ottoman Empire and placed under a commission. England, France, Italy, and Greece now occupy Constantinople by virtue of these provisions in the Sevres treaty. There are also certain very important economic and financial arrangements under this treaty which the Allies are carrying out.

Mr. FISH. Which has not been ratified?

Mr. MALCOM. The Sultan's Government has ratified it, but it claims that it can not execute it because of the Kemalists.

Mr. FISH. The Constantinople government has not ratified it?

Mr. MALCOM. No.

Mr. FISH. The Constantinople Government has ratified it.

Mr. MALCOM. Yes; as I understand it. The Allies are, as I have said before, executing certain parts of it. For instance, they are sitting tight in Constantinople. They have created a financial commission as provided in the treaty. They have taken away Syria, Arabia, and Mesopotamia. The only important provision that has not been carried out is that of Armenia. Mr. Lloyd George and other statesmen now think that the rest of this treaty can not be enforced and therefore it must be modified. That is why one of my friends here said to you that, according to this morning's newspapers, European powers were going to take up again the question of the Near East.

Mr. Chairman, something was said about Cilicia and a treaty which France has made with the Kemalists. I have here an official copy of that so-called treaty. It really is not a treaty because it is signed by Kemal Pasha, representing the Angora government, which has not been recognized as a *de facto* and as a *de jure* government, and Franklin Boullion, representing France. This agreement was signed some months ago, but I notice that neither ex-Premier Briand nor the present French Premier has submitted it to the French Parliament. If this were a treaty such as a treaty is understood to be under international law, the ratification by Parliament would be absolutely necessary. I have also with me official copies of letters or correspondence between the British foreign office and the French foreign office on the subject of Cilicia and this agreement, which I will be pleased to submit to the committee.

Something has been said about Turkish bondholders. The Armenian question has little to do with that. We are now concerned to realize the provisions of the Sevres treaty in which these three Provinces in Turkish Armenia, together with a strip of land in the Province of Trebizond have been assigned to the Armenians.

Mr. FISH. You are satisfied with the loss of the other three Provinces?

Mr. MALCOM. No; the Armenians are not at all pleased with their loss. They are not satisfied, but there seems to be no other way, Mr. Fish.

Mr. FISH. I understand that when they made a boundary line for Armenia they went from sea to sea.

Mr. MALCOM. No. That is not correct. The Armenians demanded an outlet to both seas; that is one port on the Black Sea and another on the Mediterranean over here [indicating on map]. But all they got under the Treaty of Sevres is a strip of land along the coast of the Black Sea. The territories they originally wanted went down to the Mediterranean. The Allies have to-day taken away from us Cilicia here [indicating on the map] on the coast of the Mediterranean, the richest portion of Armenia, and also three of the Turkish Provinces of Armenia here in the north.

Mr. FISH. What you want is to have these restored. That is what your original claim was.

Mr. MALCOM. The original claim was from sea to sea [indicating on map], but under the Treaty of Sevres it has been limited to this comparatively small portion of the original claim within the Provinces of Erzerum, Van, Bitlis, and Trebizond.

Mr. FISH. Satisfied with that?

Mr. MALCOM. Not satisfied, Mr. Fish, but forced to submit.

The CHAIRMAN. Your concern is more with the people than any territory?

Mr. MALCOM. Exactly, at the present time. We want to establish a country, a home, for the Armenians so that those who have been driven away and are now scattered through Asia Minor and the Near East may be gathered together.

Something has been said about the intense animosity between the Turks, who are Mohammedans and the Armenians who are Christians. The conflict between the Armenians and the Turks is not due entirely to religion. Religion is used by the Turkish leaders to arouse the passions and fanaticism of the ignorant Turks and Kurds to murder. The real motive, however, is to wipe out the Armenian race so that there will be no Armenians to demand Armenia back. If you look on the map you will find that 100 years ago Turkey as it then existed was composed of a number of countries such as Roumania, Bulgaria, Servia, Greece, Syria, Arabia, Armenia, etc. Turkey has lost most of these countries. It is in order to prevent the Armenians from regaining their independence and their country that the Turks have set out to annihilate the race. Now, as to Russian Armenia, I think we can leave that out of discussion to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. At this time?

Mr. MALCOM. At this time. What we are now concerned is with Turkish Armenia.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not concerned with Russian Armenia because they are not killing them over there?

Mr. MALCOM. No. Russian Armenia is in the hands of the Armenians. They have established a government there with its capitol at Erivan. When the entire Russian situation is cleared up it is hoped and expected that Russian Armenia and these provinces of Turkish Armenia, allotted to the Armenians under the Treaty of Sevres, will form a federation or a united Armenia.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the treaty of August 10, 1920, three provinces were assigned to Armenia?

Mr. MALCOM. Yes; three provinces and an outlet to the sea, which necessitated a portion of a fourth province, that of Trabizond.

The CHAIRMAN. Are those three provinces where you find the defacto government, with headquarters at Angora?

Mr. MALCOM. No. The government at Angora is 300 miles away from these three provinces.

The CHAIRMAN. That is just the point I want. Does it exercise any jurisdiction?

Mr. MALCOM. It is difficult to answer that question. We do not know whether or not the Angora government has any troops that could be spared to use for the purpose of controlling this territory which is quite some distance away from Angora. I hardly think the Angora government exercises jurisdiction in the real sense of the word.

The CHAIRMAN. This de facto government at Angora is functioning under the treaty of August 10?

Mr. MALCOM. No; the government of Angora is not functioning under the Treaty of Sevres. It is functioning directly against the Treaty of Sevres. It is a rebel government.

The CHAIRMAN. The government of Constantinople is functioning under the treaty?

Mr. MALCOM. Yes; but it claims it has no power to carry out the terms of the treaty.

Mr. COCKRAN. Your object is to get these three provinces in Turkish Armenia into your actual control for the Armenians?

Mr. MALCOM. Yes; Mr. Cockran.

Mr. COCKRAN. What is your suggestion about this resolution, or have you any suggestion?

Mr. MALCOM. I approve the spirit and the essential provisions of it because it only requests that the President of the United States may use his good offices to bring about a proper settlement of the Armenian question. It provides, in my judgment, one of the best means to solve the Armenian problem.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Will this not only settle a part of the problem? This par-

ticular resolution will settle that portion of your program which you feel should be settled now. It will not settle the whole matter.

Mr. MALCOM. It will settle the Armenian problem to a point where Armenia will have a country in which to concentrate their people, particularly the refugees. It will not give them all the territories they originally claimed, but it will furnish the nucleus for protection and independence. The resolution before this committee simply provides that the United States Government shall take an interest in the Armenians as a friend in court. Mr. Cockran and you other gentlemen who are lawyers will appreciate the point I am endeavoring to make. The United States, by using its good offices on behalf of the Armenians, will not be compelled or in any way obliged to spend one penny or to use its Navy or its Army to help the Armenians in this manner. The employment of "good offices" by one government on behalf of another is a common international method. It will not involve the United States in any European entanglements, and it will not place upon the United States any financial or military undertaking.

Mr. FISH. Are we not simply bound to do as much as that, inasmuch as there is precedent to take such action?

Mr. MALCOM. I agree with you, Mr. Fish. I can refer you to a number of precedents. My principal argument is that if the United States Government should offer its good offices on behalf of the Armenians, it will have a legal basis upon which to discuss and settle the Armenian question.

The CHAIRMAN. Coming back to that question, how many Armenian provinces were there before the treaty of Sevres?

Mr. MALCOM. Before the treaty of Sevres?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; between Turkey and Russia.

Mr. MALCOM. In Russia there were three Armenian provinces, in Turkey there were six Armenian provinces and Cilicia.

The CHAIRMAN. Seven.

Mr. MALCOM. Seven.

The CHAIRMAN. The treaty ceded to Turkey three of the provinces and Cilicia and left the Russian question open, and vested the title in the remaining three provinces to Armenia?

Mr. MALCOM. That's about it. The Cilician situation requires a separate explanation which I fear I will not have time to give now.

The CHAIRMAN. Is Angora, the seat of the de facto government, in one of the ceded provinces?

Mr. MALCOM. Angora is not situated in one of the provinces ceded to the Armenians.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Is Angora in Armenia or in Turkey?

Mr. COCKRAN. Is Angora in one of the six provinces of original Armenia?

Mr. MALCOM. Angora is not within the three provinces ceded to Armenia, and it is not in one of the six provinces of original Armenia. It is in Anatolia.

Mr. KENNEDY. Where is Angora on the map?

Mr. MALCOM. Here it is [indicating on the map].

It might interest this committee to know the origin of the map which I am holding in my hand. On August 10, 1920, the treaty of Sevres was signed between the Allies and Turkey. France, England, and Italy signed on the same day what is known as the tripartite agreement and divided among themselves Turkey in Asia Minor; or rather into zones of interest [indicating on the map]. You will note on this map how these spheres or zones were divided. Here is that [indicating on the map] of France; here is that of Italy. Great Britain is a signatory to this agreement but you will note that nothing is marked on the map as to what belongs to her. There are reasons for that but I can not go into it at this time. My object in showing you this map is to point out that Armenia over here [indicating on the map] is left out of these special zones of interest. In other words when the question of settling the Armenian question comes up it will not conflict with the special interests of Great Britain, France, and Italy in the Ottoman Empire.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you call these? Zones of influence?

Mr. MALCOM. Zones of interest or spheres of special interest.

Mr. LINEBERGER. At the making or creating of Armenia they began to carve it up and eat it.

Mr. MALCOLM. Yes and no. They carved up Turkey, and in doing it they took a good slice from the Armenians. I wish I had the time to go into that discussion and to explain to you the background of this tripartite agreement and about the creation of a Kurdistan, south of Lake Van, out of Armenian ter-

ritories because one of the Allies in the last moment had overlooked some important oil fields in that section.

The CHAIRMAN. And thereby add to the white man's burden.

Mr. MALCOM. The Armenians do not wish to be a burden on any one, Mr. Porter.

The CHAIRMAN. Does this de facto government at Angora attempt to exercise any control over the provinces that remain to Armenia?

Mr. MALCOM. As I have said before, I do not know. It claims that it exercises control. But what is the extent of that control I can not say.

Mr. KENNEDY. Has it actual physical control of the territory?

Mr. MALCOM. No one knows just how much actual physical control it has.

Mr. FISH. It is the only government that exists.

Mr. MALCOLM. Yes. Our object is to have the United States, by the use of its good offices, get the Allies together and get the Sultan's Government in Constantinople and the Kemalist Government in Angora, have them sit around a table and reach an amicable agreement on this question.

Mr. LINEBERGER. You mean get the acquiescence of the Kemalist Turks, because the others have already signed?

Mr. MALCOM. That is exactly it, Mr. Lineberger.

Mr. LINEBERGER. You are restrained from carrying out the provisions under the treaty of Sevres because of this independent government at Angora?

Mr. MALCOM. Yes.

Mr. FISH. You have not any outlet to the sea.

Mr. MALCOM. There is an outlet on the Black Sea but none on the Mediterranean.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the fact that the de facto government at Angora is attempting at least to exercise jurisdiction over the three remaining Armenian Provinces, will it be well for us to recognize that control in this resolution where we say:

"Resolved, That the President be requested to express to the de facto government at Angora the moral protest of the United States against the persecution of the Armenians and other Christian peoples."

Would it not be an implied recognition of their authority over Armenia?

Mr. MALCOM. Speaking very frankly, I am not in favor of the particular wording of the resolution you have just read. I think we should eliminate the term "de facto government," and "other Christian" races. We are interested in Armenia and the Armenians and not in other Christian races in the Ottoman Empire.

Mr. SMITH. You are mistaken. The Near East is for Christian peoples and for Turkish peoples.

Mr. MALCOM. So I understand from Mr. Vickery's statement. But the Armenians are not interested in the Turkish people and other Christian races. Let me explain to you why: In the first place, it is not necessary for me to say why the Armenians are not interested in the Turks; that is self-evident. As to the other objection, I think we should eliminate the expression "other Christian races," because this term broadens the responsibility. It places upon the United States Government a heavier task than the Government would care to assume, and thus instead of helping the Armenians it would restrain the Government from offering any assistance. That is my opinion and that has been the experience of the Armenians in the past. Some people insisted that the United States should take a mandate for the whole of the Near East—the Ottoman Empire—and I believe that this ambitious program confused the simple Armenian question and prevented the Armenians from securing any assistance from the United States.

Mr. KENNEDY. What you want is embodied in the second resolve here.

Mr. COOPER. Leaving out the word Christian entirely.

Mr. MALCOM. Yes; I think that will do. I understand, of course, that the United States Government has the right to be interested in any foreign people that it chooses, but from the Armenian point of view it would be preferable for the proper and immediate solution of the Armenian question to leave out other considerations.

Mr. KENNEDY. What do you think of the second resolution?

Mr. MALCOM. I think that is satisfactory. It is couched in carefully chosen language, but in simplified terms it means that the President be requested to offer his good offices to call a conference of the Allies and other interested parties to settle the Armenian question. It will place no obligation or responsibility on the Government of the United States, except to do a humane act for

the Armenian people in assisting to establish for them an independent State where the remainder of their race would be secure from annihilation.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you think of the first resolve?

Would that, in your judgment, amount to an implied ratification of this unlawful seizure by the Turks of the three remaining Armenian Provinces?

Mr. MALCOLM. I do not wish to seem expressing a divergent view from the distinguished speakers who preceded me. I appreciate their deep interest in the Armenians. But I most respectfully submit to them and to you the suggestion that the words "other Christians" and the words "de facto government of Angora" should be removed from this resolution. I have already explained that there is no such a thing as a de facto government in Angora. Even England and France have not recognized Kemal Pasha's government as a de facto government. It would be disastrous at this time to pass a resolution in the Congress of the United States which impliedly, at least, recognizes the present so-called government at Angora as being a de facto government. No; I can not consent to that. I believe also that the term "other Christians" should be eliminated, because it is indefinite. We know what is meant by Armenians, but we do not know what is meant by other Christians in the Near East. Such an expression widens the task which we are asking the President to assume, and I fear he will not consent to it. Let us limit the resolution to the Armenian question only.

Mr. SMITH. I think that is so, Mr. Chairman. Just as General Harbord and his commission visited Kemal Pasha and reasoned with him and got information from him, so I think that the United States can warn anybody who exercises de facto power. It can bring moral pressure without going into the question of its actual legality. This question and all these questions we have before us arise from the fact that I endeavored to explain in my opening remarks the fact that there are two governments in the late Turkish Empire—what is left of it. One is the simulacrum of the Imperial Government. It has the Sultan, who is nothing but a figurehead, surrounded in Constantinople by French, Italian, and British troops. Then there is a virile power, not within the lines of foreign soldiery as there, but legatee of the Young Turks party. It is that of the man. He no doubt is a sincere man, who has the fanaticisms of the Moslem religion at his back. He has the eastern powers closely behind him, because he appeals to the Moslem world. The fact that France has 800,000 men under arms and did not send troops to Cilicia to save her own honor; the fact that Italy has been helping him privily; the fact that Great Britain has done nothing positively, but negatively she withdrew her troops from the line of railway, leaving 800,000 Armenians to a starvation that would have been inevitable had it not been for the diplomatic tact of Colonel Haskell, representing Secretary Hoover and the Near East Relief; all these show where the real political power now rests.

Mr. COOPER. How would this resolution meet your purpose in view:

*'Resolved, \* \* \** That the President be requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to take up with Great Britain, France, and Italy the question of calling a conference for the purpose of considering methods by which the Armenians may be given an opportunity to establish themselves as a nation; and to express to the Governments of Great Britain, France, and Italy and the Government of Turkey the moral protest of the United States against the persecution by the so-called de facto government of Turkey of the Armenians."

Mr. SMITH. I think that would be an admirable suggestion.

Mr. COOPER. That covers it all.

Mr. SMITH. The Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, before whom many of us appeared in 1919, modified resolutions submitted to them. We know you are sympathetic, and we ask you to take this resolution, we do not care if you decide not to pass it in *ipsissimis verbis*. Do for us what in your judgment and conscience under the circumstances and in the line of the testimony and in the light of what you are receiving from the State Department, if you ask for it, what you think you can conscientiously recommend Congress to do.

Mr. COOPER. Let me ask you this specific question, in line with the suggestion I have just made. Ought not we to make our protest to the Governments of Great Britain and France and Italy and Turkey against the persecutions by the de facto government?

Mr. MALCOLM. Yes, sir.

Mr. COOPER. That brings up the fact that we need a resolution to make our protest to the Governments.

Mr. SMITH. It is rather a late moment just before we are about to adjourn to suggest to you a point that escaped my mind and has not been dwelt upon by other speakers. A member of the committee thinks it is a mess. Naturally, it is a mess. He thinks, and members of the committee may think, why should we put our finger into this mess? Why should we bother ourselves about this matter at all as statesmen? As individuals we may do anything we can.

We are concerned with everything that happens in the world, and our State Department has given a very stern admonition to the European powers that we are not bound by any settlement they may make where we are not party to it. There are vast economic interests in that country—oil wells in Baku. There are to certain extent American commercial interests there. Those powers hear nothing at all. They settle the Turkish question and we appeal to them, and we turn to them and say we are not satisfied with your settlement. Among individuals that would not be considered a reasonable doctrine. Why do we not apply to our dealings in this matter the new experience that is coming over international affairs in the world and say to them, we want to know what you are going to do. We are not going to be bound in any way. We will protect American interests. There are American interests out there. This must stop. Mr. Chairman, take this resolution, if you will; I am sure it has already received consideration beyond my best hopes. The committee has shown an interest and keenness and intelligence in regard to it that I could hardly have hoped for for this reason. There is so much misery in the world, so much suffering, so much of famine and starvation that we could not go on with our ordinary duties if we allowed ourselves to be influenced by it.

Those of us who have been on the spot and have seen the conditions are interested. You will take this matter up. You have taken it up. We have had our day in court and we can not complain of the courtesy and patience of this committee. If you do something and find that these lines are not just the lines that commend themselves to you, do what you can and what the situation suggests as presented by us in one way and another, and I think when you come to examine the record, although some discrepancies are in it, it will be fully presented.

I am going to ask permission to put in the record a letter from the Right Rev. William T. Manning, of the Episcopal Church; a letter from Mr. A. T. Loring, of Boston, Mass.; a letter from Mr. Albert Bushnell Hart, professor of government in Harvard University; a letter from Rabbi H. Levi; a letter from Mrs. William Harman Van Allen, of Boston; and a letter from Mrs. Alice Stone Blackwell. I also ask, Mr. Chairman, to give us an opportunity to correct our remarks, which were made for the most part without verbal preparation.

The CHAIRMAN. This report will be printed, and I do not like to limit the time too much, but if you can make these corrections within five days, do so. In this connection, I thank you, Mr. Smith, for the concise way in which you have presented this matter to the committee.

Mr. SMITH. There have been representatives of different religious denominations and organizations here and there may be perhaps others likewise.

The CHAIRMAN. If you desire to prepare a list of those present you may leave it with the stenographer and it will be made a part of the record.

(The following list of names was left with the stenographer:)

Rev. John J. Burke, representing the National Catholic Welfare Council; Dr. Anne Nicholson, representing the National Catholic Welfare Council.

(The letters referred to are as follows:)

DIocese of New York, SYNOD HOUSE.

February 28, 1922.

HON. STEPHEN G. PORTER,

*Chairman Committee on Foreign Affairs.*

*House of Representatives.*

DEAR SIR: I write to express my strong sympathy with H. Res. 244, relating to the Armenians and other Christian peoples of Turkey, which was introduced by Mr. Rogers, of Massachusetts, and referred to your committee.

I sincerely hope that this resolution may be favorably acted upon and that its purpose may be carried into effect.

Very truly, yours,

WILLIAM T. MANNING.

BOSTON, MASS., *March 1, 1922.*

HON. STEPHEN H. PORTER,

*Chairman of the House Foreign Relations Committee,**Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SIR: I have the honor to be the chairman from Massachusetts of the Near East Relief, which maintains many workers, hospitals, clinics, and orphanages in Armenia and other parts of Asia Minor. Although America declined the mandate for Armenia, yet the American people have adopted the helpless children who have no other protectors, as their parents and friends have been massacred.

During the last five years the Near East Relief has sent \$63,000,000 to Asia Minor, and until a stable government is established so that the Armenian people will be secure in their persons and property, this voluntary guardianship, with its great drain on the charitably disposed Americans, must continue. The reports of our workers are backed up by the late Lord Bryce's statement that the Armenians are the Anglo Saxons of the Near East, are thrifty, industrious, and progressive people, have been educated in American schools and colleges, and among them are not only all sorts of skilled artisans and mechanics, but also doctors, lawyers, and statesmen, many of whom have become famous in other lands.

I am writing now in favor of H. Res. 244, introduced by Mr. Rogers, of Massachusetts, on December 12, 1921, which has been referred to your committee. Surely this short step in the right direction should be taken to make effective the aid which has been so lavishly extended by the American people to Armenia.

The contribution of \$13,000,000, which was raised last year in America, represents a great number of contributors and people who are backing their wishes by their money. It is in their name that I beg you to do all that you can to forward this most worthy measure.

Yours truly,

AUG. P. LORING.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *March 4, 1922.*

MY DEAR SIR: For many years I have been interested in the Armenians in this country and also in Turkey, a country which I visited in 1913. The treatment which members of that race have received at the hands of the Turks before, during, and after the World War, must arouse every friend of humanity. Here is an ancient and highly capable race—the first Asiatic Christian Nation—which has maintained culture and industry, and has furnished a great number of business men and administrators to the Turkish Empire. It is an indictment of the Christian nations of 500 years ago that they should ever have allowed the Turks to overrun Armenia, and still more to enter Europe. That they should have remained for ages masters of a Christian population—Greeks, Armenians, Syrians, and other races superior to their masters in intelligence, culture, virtue, and capacity for affairs, is an affront to modern civilization. The old Sultan, a butcher by nature, long before the war began a deliberate policy of rooting out a Christian population first, in Constantinople, and, then, in other parts of the empire, bringing the process down in the war to the most horrible destruction of men, women, and children in the annals of our time. There has been no mercy and no respect. The deliberate purpose was to grind to powder the race which most resented Turkish rule.

That process is being renewed since the war by the rump government which has maintained an army in western Asia Minor. People who live among the Turks, missionaries, and others are very fond of praising the virtues of the individual Turk. The trouble is that these high-minded and cultured Turks, when you get a few hundred together, set up a government of iniquity, which plunders the Turkish and Christian subjects alike, but massacres only the Christians.

For Christian nations like Great Britain, France, and Italy to stand by and see people of their religion and their aspirations and civilization exterminated ought to make every humane man and woman furious. The recent deal between the French and the Turks in Cilicia is the culmination of the policy of blood and thunder. The French have abandoned a population, estimated at 200,000, to the fury of its worst enemies in order to secure the control of Syria. It is a bargain in which the goods transferred are living bodies of men, women, and children.

There are doubtless many difficulties in the way of even a protest by the Government of the United States. It has been our policy ever since 1914 to keep out of agreements or promises which we might be obliged to follow up by troops. I do not favor any action by the United States which would require the dispatch of soldiers or would obligate us to assume control of Armenian territory. There are, however, precedents for a solemn appeal to nations in the disturbed area of southeastern Europe and western Asia. President Roosevelt, in his annual message of 1904, expressed a very unfavorable opinion of massacres of Jews in Russia. In 1902 Secretary Hay sent out a circular expressing the dissatisfaction of the United States with the status of Jews in Rumania. President Taft denounced a commercial treaty with Russia, which had lasted nearly 80 years, because of the determination of the Russian Government to discriminate between American citizens on religious grounds.

President Harding has shown such a statesmanlike interest in the maintenance of peace, and such a desire for the prosperity of the peoples of the Pacific, that perhaps it might seem to him suitable to make clear to other nations the iniquity of the attempted annihilation of the Armenian race. It comes home to us through the numerous industrious and patriotic American Armenians within our own gates. Without accepting the full text of the resolution pending before your committee, I earnestly ask that it consider the possibility of some announcement that will correspond with the American detestation of what seems to be accepted by the Turks as their state policy. When the Armenians are disposed of the Greeks in Asia Minor will follow the same dreadful road, unless somewhere among western nations there is some method of calling a halt.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT BUSHNELL HART.

HON. STEPHEN G. PORTER,

*Chairman House Committee on Foreign Affairs,  
Washington, D. C.*

BROOKLINE, MASS., March 3, 1922.

HON. STEPHEN G. PORTER,

*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I am writing to express my unqualified approval of H. Res. 244, introduced by Mr. Rogers, of Massachusetts. I do hope that it will be favorably reported and passed. I believe that all men and women familiar with the tale of the Armenians, more especially with the chapters written during these last few years, must share the feeling. I can not conceive that America, with the opportunity for rare human service that here offers itself, can fail to move; and it is we alone who here can serve. If the suggested conference is called, I believe the desired result can be attained. Will you not do all in your power to achieve this end?

Sincerely yours,

HARRY LEVI.

BOSTON, MASS., March 3, 1922.

HON. S. G. PORTER,

*Chairman Foreign Relations Committee,  
House of Representatives.*

SIR: I earnestly hope that your committee will report favorably H. Res. 244, introduced by Congressman Rogers, with regard to the Armenian situation. I have been for years a student of oriental affairs and a friend of the Armenian Church and the Armenian people, and I can imagine no more urgent need than the preservation of the Armenian remnant under the protection of Christendom. The story of their sufferings is unparalleled, and the shame of the powers will be indelible if action is delayed too long. Free from any accusation of self-interest, America can speak the authoritative word. For God's sake, let it be heard.

Yours respectfully,

WILLIAM HARMAN VAN ALLEN.

97705—22—4



BOSTON, MASS., March 2, 1922.

HON. JOHN JACOB ROGERS,

*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: Let me thank you for having introduced H. Res. 244, on the Armenian question, which I hope will be passed.

The abandonment of the Armenians to the cruelty of the Turks is an international scandal. It would be to the credit of the United States to take the lead in an effort to put an end to it; and this would be all the more appropriate in view of the large number of Armenians who are now living in this country and have become naturalized citizens.

If a conference with Great Britain, France, and Italy could be called, upon President Harding's initiative, it would be welcomed with great joy, not only by the Armenians but by the friends of justice and righteousness of all nationalities.

Yours sincerely,

ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the point mentioned a while ago, as to which two or three of us made a few remarks, I think it is proper, in fairness to Mr. Kennedy, to state exactly what occurred relative to the Geneva resolution, which was championed by Mr. Webster. That was a House resolution, and in the book I have here the preface to Mr. Webster's speech says this:

"On the assembling of Congress in December, 1823. President Monroe made the resolution on Greece the subject of a paragraph in his annual message, and on the 8th of December Mr. Webster moved the following resolution in the House of Representatives:

"*Resolved*, That provision ought to be made by law for defraying the expense incident to the appointment of an agent or commissioner to Congress whenever the President shall deem it expedient to make such appointment."

And upon that resolution Mr. Webster spoke, making the first great speech that he ever delivered after coming to Congress.

Mr. COOPER. Did not Henry Clay introduce a resolution on Greece?

Mr. KENNEDY. Clay introduced the first resolution and the Webster resolution was in response to a paragraph in President Monroe's message.

Mr. COOPER. What did President Monroe recommend?

Mr. KENNEDY. He did not recommend anything but simply based the proposition on going into the history of Greece and a great deal of interest was aroused in 1822 and 1823 on the question of Grecian independence in this country.

Mr. COOPER. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York, who has made an interesting speech, how would this resolution drawn in this form meet your views:

"*Resolved*, That the President be requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to express to the Governments of Great Britain, France, and Italy, and Turkey the moral protest of the United States against persecutions by the de facto Government, so-called, of Turkey toward the Armenians and other Christian people"—

And then have it further resolve, etc.

Mr. MALCOM. That is in respect to the first part of the resolution.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. MALCOM. The second part will remain as it is. That is all right. The only objection to that is this, that no government has recognized the government of Kemal Pasha in Angora as a de facto government.

Mr. COOPER. I said "the so-called de facto government."

Mr. MALCOM. Is speaking of it as a so-called de facto government equivalent to recognizing it as a de facto government?

Mr. COOPER. Then, using this language, simply protest against the government of Kemal Pasha, or whatever you call him. Make your protest to the governments of Great Britain, Italy, and France against these persecutions.

Mr. MALCOM. In a recent correspondence between the foreign secretary of Great Britain and the foreign secretary of France, the question was brought up as to whether or not France, by making an agreement with Kemal Pasha, recognized the Kemal Pasha government as a de facto government. France said it was not so; that they did not recognize the Kemal Pasha government as a de jure or de facto government.

Mr. COOPER. Will it meet your views to say, "the so-called Anatolian revolutionary government?"

Mr. MALCOM. Exactly.

Mr. KALAJDJIAN. May I just cite a paragraph if it is in order? The Allies are responsible for the present situation in Anatolia. In the articles of the armistice the Allies had the present conditions in mind in the case of these six Armenian Provinces and the Allies reserved to themselves the right to occupy any part of them. They reserved the right to occupy the territory. The Allies have not kept such promises to take advantage of their reservation and the Turks naturally think that they can do as they please. That is in article 7. That clause is in the armistice terms which still hold good. I shall be pleased to file with this committee copies of the armistice articles just referred to. They are very short; and also any portion of the Sevres treaty which applies to Armenia.

The CHAIRMAN. We would like to have them.

Mr. MALCOM. I would like also to file the treaty made by France and Cilicia recently and correspondence between France and England published, which is rather interesting reading and might clear up some of these points, although part of it has relation to this particular matter.

Mr. COOPER. You just read from the articles?

Mr. MALCOM. From the articles of the armistice.

Mr. KALAJDJIAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. COOPER. What is that particular clause?

Mr. KALAJDJIAN. It is inserted in the Sevres treaty.

Mr. COOPER. Was it in any way superseded by the Versailles treaty?

Mr. KALAJDJIAN. No; the armistice came before that treaty. That was the armistice between Turkey and the Allies. The treaty of Sevres came in August, 1920.

The CHAIRMAN. Probably they were published after that.

Mr. COOPER. That is in force yet.

Mr. MALCOM. The point is if this Government should simply take the step as a friend of the Armenians to use their good offices and say, "Let us come in and settle this thing," a fair settlement could be made. That is what we want. I assure you we would get something then, and it is our last chance. If we do not get something in the next conference which is coming on within a few months, the Armenian question will never be settled.

Mr. COOPER. You mean Armenia will be exterminated?

Mr. MALCOM. I do not say that. Armenia will never be an independent country.

Mr. SMITH. Armenia in Turkey will likely be exterminated.

Mr. LINEBERGER. We were not parties to that armistice.

Mr. MALCOM. We were not. We are in the position of going in and acting as friends of Armenia on the part of this country. There are other things in question—finance and things of that sort.

The CHAIRMAN. Would our proposition have any connection in respect to the action of the League of Nations in asking the United States to accept a mandate over Armenia which was refused by the American Congress?

Mr. MALCOM. Under the present circumstances, for the Armenian cause, it would be even better.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I do not agree with the gentleman there.

Mr. MALCOM. We feel that if some great power like the United States will take at this time enough interest in us we will be able to get approximately what was given to us under the treaty of Sevres.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it the wish of the committee to hear General Harbord and Mr. Haskell, of the State Department? I am not informed as to just when General Harbord intends to return.

(Thereupon, after informal discussion, the committee adjourned, to meet again at the call of the chairman.)















