

# ARMENIANS NOT TO BLAME

By the Editor of the New York Times.

Perhaps it was with the same consideration that the author of the article above mentioned the year before the present massacre of the Armenians preferred a position against the Turkoman who had massacred the Armenians and the Tatars, and that the Turkish Government attributed the massacre to the Armenians and the Tatars. This was done, however, considerably before the Armenian Foreign Minister, Mr. Vahan, who has been the spokesman of the Armenian people, came to the United States. The story of the Tatars-Turks crime may be summarized from the reports of Lord Rivers and other impartial observers as follows:

When the Young Turks entered the city in the latter part of October, 1908, the Dashnaktsoutchian Party—the Armenian Revolutionary party in the Ottoman Empire—proposed to the Young Turks their annual party convention at Erzurum. The Young Turks sent commissioners to lay proposals before this assembly. They proposed that the Armenians, as a nation, should make contact with the Ottoman Government in order to end the war. They suggested that the Dashnaktsoutchian leaders should take steps to join in the coming invasion of the Caucasus, and, as a reward, they sketched a project for handing over large zones of Russian territory to an Armenian national state under their suzerainty. The most notable of these protectorates was the Armenian one, and the Young Turks were even willing to incorporate it partly, if not wholly, into the Province of Erzurum, on condition that the Armenians agree with them about the war. These ambitious projects were not for the Dashnaktsoutchians alone; Armenia affirms their intention of doing their duty as Ottomans and of declining the proposal that they should do more.

A certain number of Armenians who fought on the side of the Russians in the Caucasian war, but who came to the Armenian population of Transcaucasia and America. It may be that these few Armenians crossed the frontiers in order to fight alongside the Russian troops in Transcaucasia or Russia, but, at any rate, the valiant corps that rendered such services to the Russian Army in the Caucasian part of the war was composed entirely of Armenian living in the Caucasus. Wherever the Armenians, wholly unarmed, have fought,

in Van, they have fought in defense against "the cruelty of the men who constitute what is called Turkish Government."

The Armenians were discredited, not trust the Turks no one will, but it was not without reason, for the sake of ingratitude, Europeans and Americans agreed in favor of the Armenians, which cannot be accounted of pride. What I quote below is from the *Humanity Journal*, R. F. Underwood, and it was written at the time of the Balkan war, when the brought some amelioration of opinion:

"not consider the Armenian question light. We have observed the following facts recently and now. The Armenians would never do this were beyond the human, and at no time could they be a condition related to the our country, at we had not

done. What did the late policy Armenia? The club, the and fire. The Arabians prove eloquently that the Constitutional Government has not changed the old conditions. We are told that the Armenians provoked the attack. Very well. Let us concede it. But how many persons were killed, and how many were punished? And now that these people are seeking relief we are shocked. Think of it! The Armenians demand security of life, honor, and property, and we are astonished. It would be better for us to place ourselves in the position of the Armenian—feel their, and view the whole situation as he does. Then we would find that the Armenian in his attitude is nearer the right than we are."

ASHAG MAHIDESLAN.  
New York, Oct. 30, 1916.