

ARMENIAN MASSACRES.

The Kaiser Held to be in Part Responsible for Them.

To the Editor of The New York Times:

Public opinion in all countries has held Abdul Hamid responsible for the Armenian massacres. The scheme of the atrocities of 1894-98 emanated from the Yildiz Palace, and the recent massacre in Cilicia, though not traceable to any definite action of the Central Government, is the necessary outcome of a situation he has created himself. All this is true, yet it is not generally known that Hamid could not have gone to the extreme of butchering his people but for the personal and political friendship of the German Emperor.

The Kaiser's foreign policy is free from the suspicion of humanitarian sentiments. He represents sheer force. He has declared that the whole Eastern question is not worth the bones of a Pomeranian grenadier. In other words, he would sooner see a portion of the map wiped off than imperil the health of one German soldier. Again and again he has given public demonstration of his sympathy with the Sultan in the crusade against the subject races. At a time when the moral sentiment of England and America got red hot over the wholesale slaughters in Turkey, he was the willing guest in the palace of Hamid. Even his visit to the Holy Land bore a political significance. He told the Mohammedans of Damascus that their sovereign and the world of Islam might rest assured in the friendship of the German Emperor. All the subjects of the Sultan, the Believer, and the "Galour," the old as well as the young Turk, have been fearfully aware of this fact, which they consider the real cause of the massacres.

A coalition of this sort covenanted between an Oriental tyrant and an Occidental monarch, besides being a singular phenomenon, is one of the characteristic features of Hamidian statesmanship. The last thirty years have witnessed a gradual, and systematic strengthening of German influence in Constantinople. The Kaiser successfully lodged himself in the Sultan's heart. Indeed, it was a self-seeking sort of agreement. The Kaiser had his eye upon the industrial resources of Turkey, whereas the Sultan's ambition was to render himself supreme in the world of Islam. Yet, somehow, both parties were satisfied, and what did they care that the innocent people of Armenia and Cilicia had to pay the price in coins of blood and tears? The Kaiser was accorded the first choice in industrial and commercial enterprises throughout Turkey, and the Sultan was allowed the privilege of handling the Christian subjects in the Hamidian fashion. Backed by the mightiest military King in Europe, Hamid could do anything he chose with them, and he chose to kill them. In defiance of all treaty obligations and all humanitarian considerations, he made a system of slaughtering the very people whose welfare had been the subject of solemn agreements between Europe and himself. The Great Assassin did his work thoroughly, while the august friend planted the power of Germany against any foreign intervention of punitive purpose.

What I have stated above applies particularly to the fate of the Armenians, but it is no less true regarding the question of Crete, the late war with Greece, the troubles in Macedonia, and the struggles of the Young Turk Party. We cannot wonder that last July, when the Young Turks got their first grip upon the Sultan, they burst into violent enthusiasm over the fall of German politics in Constantinople.

When we think of the Armenian massacres let us learn to divide the responsibility justly. The German people are as good as any people on earth, but their Emperor is not a little responsible for the notorious Hamidian policy which has ruined a land and which finally ruined Hamid himself.

M. G. PAPA ZIAN.

New York, May 8, 1909.

The New York Times

Published: May 10, 1909

Copyright © The New York Times