

Armenian Question and Western Public Opinion (From the Congress of Berlin to the 1890s)

Fikrettin Yavuz

Department of History, Faculty of Arts and Science, Sakarya University, Turkey,

E-mail:fyavuz@sakarya.edu.tr

Tel:+90-264-2951364

Abstract

The Congress of Berlin was a milestone for world history. It was a meeting of the leading statesmen of the European Great Powers and the Ottoman Empire and its aim was to reorganize the countries of the Balkans. But at the same time the Congress brought a new issue to the world agenda. It was the Armenian Question which would increasingly take a place in world public opinion following the Congress. In fact it turned into an international problem. Hereafter, the Armenian Question started to become more pronounced in Western Public opinion. Actually the Western public was almost bombarded with information about the Armenians. It was at this time that the great powers, Britain, Russia, France, Germany and America became increasingly involved in this question. It is indisputable that developments related to Armenians were more closely followed. So in what ways and channels did the West get information? What were the information sources on Armenians in the West? How did the anti-Turkish image grow in Europe and America because of the Armenian activities? This article is an attempt to answer all these questions. In this context, the press, particularly periodicals, missionary activities and the roles of great news agencies will be considered.

Key Words: Armenian Question, Western Public Opinion, Newspaper, Missionary activities, News Agencies.

Introduction

The term “the Armenian Question” as used in Turkey and on the Western public agenda, became commonplace in diplomatic circles and on the world stage particularly after the Congress of Berlin. It was at this time that Western public opinion, namely the Western powers, Britain, Russia, France, Germany and America became increasingly involved in this question. In fact the interest of the Western powers did not happen over night. Before the Congress, the Armenian community in the Ottoman Empire had experienced a transformation in their identity. The Armenians, or a group of them at least, had gained a nationalistic character. This led them to seek a way of gaining autonomy. An appropriate time and place was needed for the realization of this ideal and it was a great war that gave them this opportunity. That is to say, the story began with the Turco-Russian War of 1877-78ⁱ. It was at the Congress of Berlin that they found an opportunity to present themselves to the world public. The Armenian National Assembly and Patriarch Nerses II of Constantinople sent a delegation to Berlin to present their case to the Congressⁱⁱ. They understood from the Greek and Bulgarian examples that if they secured European intervention, they would achieve autonomy or independenceⁱⁱⁱ. Armenian delegates did their best at the Congress of Berlin, where the European powers were negotiating the future of the Ottoman territories. Although their requests for European protection went mostly unheeded unreciprocated in Berlin, the “Armenian Question” turned into a point of conflict in the multifaceted European diplomacy of the late nineteenth century. Thus the Armenian Question became an international problem. In short, this treaty was a milestone for the Armenians. Hereafter, the Armenian Question started to take prominence in the Western public agenda. Actually the Western public was almost bombarded with information about the Armenians. Although there had already been an Armenian image in the West, in this process undoubtedly developments related to Armenians were more closely followed. Such a level of interest was down to the attitude of the Western press. So through what ways and channels did the West get its information? What were the information sources on Armenians in the West? How was the anti-Turkish image formed in Europe and America? This article aims to answer all these questions. In this context, the press, particularly periodicals, missionary activities and the roles of great telegraph companies will be examined. Thus the role of press will be evaluated.

Increasing Interest of the Western Press in Armenians

The press, in a broad sense, the media, is the most powerful tool for the formation of public opinion in contemporary times – television, the press, radio and the internet. The role of the media in shaping public perceptions and opinions about significant political and social issues has long been the subject of much speculation and debate^{iv}. But it is clear that news and newspapers are so essential that they were the leading sources of information in the West about the Armenians, especially after the Congress of Berlin.

Historically, the attitude of the world press, particularly the European press, towards the Ottomans has been overshadowed by traditional European prejudices. Even though Turks had property and political dominance across a wide area of the European continent, they were perceived as foreigners and their presence in Europe was observed as a problem. Such recognition was reflected in press coverage about the Ottomans^v. In contrast to this perception, Western public opinion and especially the Western press were always sympathetic towards the Armenians who were to be claimed as one of the important parts of the “Eastern Question”^{vi}. From the end of the 19th century, the press played an important part in directing public opinion and political powers. Under the circumstances, politicians were not indifferent to this effect and had become open to the orientation of the press. This situation could be seen in states like Germany and England in Europe and the USA^{vii}. The British press may be a good example for such an evaluation. During the period of the Congress of Berlin in which the Armenian Question was internationalized, the orientation of the press became apparent in

England. The British press, especially *The Times* covered much news in favour of the Armenians. In fact *The Times*, one of the leading and most influential newspapers of the period, affected public opinion, politicians and governments as well as the foreign press by means of news and articles. Much of the foreign press followed *The Times*' covers and communicated them to their readers for their own publication purposes^{viii}. In this context, the Armenian Question always featured in the columns of *The Times* related to the Congress. The activities of the Armenians were also being closely followed and supported in England. The famous James Bryce in an article in *The Times* noted that it was the right time to bring the problems of the Armenians in front of the Congress and that the Armenians deserved much more attention it was felt in England that Europe should help the Armenians as it had helped other Christian citizens of the Sublime Porte^{ix}.

Along with *The Times*, the *London Standard*, *Pall Mall Gazette*, *Morning Post* and *London Daily News* were the leading newspapers giving such kinds of information to the public. For example, the *London Standard* was very interested in the Armenians during the Congress and distinctive headlines were used in its columns. Under the headline, for instance, "*British Sympathy with the Armenians*", it gave comprehensive information about the Armenians and their activities and meetings in England^x. London's *Pall Mall Gazette* lifted up the Armenians on the one hand as being one of the most promising races in Asiatic Turkey but the same gazette, on the other hand, quoting from its correspondence from Turkey on 8th January 1878 reported that fifty-five families were starving in Anatolia^{xi}. The *Morning Post*, another important British newspaper, used quite unique headlines supporting the Armenians during the Congress and gave full details day by day too. It delivered comprehensive news of a decision pertaining to the Armenians and the Armenian delegate sent by the patriarchate of Istanbul to Berlin. On 1st July 1878, the *Morning Post* stated that the Armenian delegate had officially submitted to Congress a memorandum demanding administrative autonomy^{xii}. Two days later, it stated that Lord Beaconsfield had raised the Armenian territory question^{xiii}. The *London Daily News* also followed the same way and gave the same news. On the same day, it offered comprehensive information about the Armenian delegate under the headline "*The Armenian and the Berlin Congress*". It can be seen that the activities of the Armenians in London also found echo in the newspapers. An Anglo-Armenian Committee was held in Westminster to express sympathy with the Armenians. The requests of the Armenian delegates in Berlin were given in the *London Daily News* on 17th July 1878, reporting that they had received consideration at the hands of the Berlin Congress. They are to live a Turkish guarantee of security against the Circassians and Kurds^{xiv}. As can be seen from the examples, it is clear that the British newspapers were showing an interest in news about the Armenians. Such interest of the press implicitly meant that there was a rising interest of public opinion in Armenia which brought about discussions about the Armenians in all circles.

In this way it is seen that such kinds of publications in the press also found echo in the British parliament and the matter of assisting the Armenians was brought forward. The politicians who shaped British foreign policy such as Lord Salisbury stated that the status of the Armenians should be discussed in the Congress of Berlin. Like him, Lord Carnarvon expressed the belief that there was no more remarkable community than the Armenians who deserved interest^{xv}. It is evident that the sympathetic attitude of the British press in this process encouraged the Armenians in England who held conferences for propaganda purposes in London and Manchester. In these meetings, administrative reforms were demanded in favour of Armenians in Turkey and they announced that they were thankful to the British government who were dealing with this issue in the Congress^{xvi}.

As during the Berlin Congress, in the following decades reports on the Armenians continually gained popularity in the Western press and they were shown sensitivity^{xvii}. The

British press particularly, when Gladstone became Prime Minister again, covered much news in support of the Armenians thanks to him. The themes covered in the news included: the Christians Armenians being persecuted in Anatolia, the reform decisions of the Congress of Berlin not being met and support for the Armenians being given financial assistance. The subheadings of “The Armenian Massacres 1894-1896 Media Testimony”, a recently published and popular book including articles from that period, reveal similar sentiments. The remarkable titles used in this book include: *Armenian Massacres*, *Unhappy Armenia*, *Aid for Armenia: An Appeal for Immediate Help*, *Why the Sultan is responsible for the Armenian Massacres*, *Armenia’s Impending Doom: Our Duty. Who is responsible? A Question from Armenia*xviii. The amount of this type of news increased considerably in the 1890s when the Armenian events broke out. Among the factors affecting this situation, the newspapers published by Armenians in various cities of Europe had considerable importance from mid-1880.

The Western public started to receive news directly from the Armenians through the publication of a newspaper named *Armenia* by Migirdich Portakalian Marseilles in 1885. This was followed by *Armenie* (later *Armenia*), with the first edition published on 15th November 1889 in London, managed by Minas Cheraz who was one of the members of the Armenian delegation participating in the Congress of Berlin. It can be seen that Cheraz’s *Armenie* and the *Daily News*, the mouthpiece of Gladstone and the liberals in England, had parallel publication affecting British public opinionxix. The same effect could be seen in France with Portakalian’s *Armenia*. Because of his influence, the Ottoman government was in constant contact with Marseilles asking for information about Portakalian’s activitiesxx. In terms of affecting French public opinion, the Armenian students in France also played an important role. For example, Armenian students in Paris prepared detailed news that they wanted covered in the French newspapers including their claims that the Turks and Kurds were continually carrying out massacres on Armenians. Some of their requests were picked up in various newspapersxxi.

American Press on Armenians and Rising of the Anti-Turkish Image

Like Europe, the American public and press, too, dealt with the Armenian Question. American public opinion, since the beginning of the 19th century, had already approached the struggles of minorities in the Ottoman Empire with the spirit of Christianityxxii. Actually the American people first became aware of the Armenians through the books of scholars, adventurers and missionariesxxiii. It is accepted, however, by Armenian writers that the American missionaries were the most significant group in shaping an American view of the Armeniansxxiv. The American missionaries in the Ottoman Empirexxv were under the general direction of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM), founded in 1810 with the motto of “*Go in the name of the Lord and we will help*”xxvi. The first two representatives of the ABCFM (Pliny Fisk and Levi Parsons) arrived in the 1820s and were soon followed by others. Working closely with English missionaries and enjoying the protection of the English government, they began spreading out across the Ottoman Empire in search of suitable locations for their schools, churches and collegesxxvii. As time went on, the missionary activities of America increased so much that when America came under discussion in the Ottoman Empire, only the missionaries came to mind. Fed by the writings of missionaries and their media outlets in America, in the news and articles related to Turkish-Armenian events, always exaggerated, there became embroidered the assertion of a Christian nation being oppressed by a Muslim empire. Taking advantage of this, the Armenians also stiffened the image of the “ugly Turk” in American public perceptionxxviii.

The formation of such an attitude against the Turks in Western public opinion particularly in America had a long history. It was necessary to find interesting issues to put

the press into action whereby, based on these issues, the press could release remarkable news stories for the public. The ideal theme for this was “Muslim hatred” and “massacres of the innocent Christian Armenians”. It was inconceivable that the Christian world would remain unmoved for their co-religionists if they thought that they had been killed just because of their religion. Therefore, this phenomenon was used a great deal in the newsxxxix. The formation of such a perception especially in America was because of the activities of missionaries. As mentioned above they published such kinds of news and information in their journals and books. For example, *Christian Alliance and Foreign Missionary Weekly* in New York quoted from a letter written by a priest, Allen, published under the title of “*massacres in Anatolia*” which was what he called Armenia. In the report, the events of 1894-95 in Anatolia were discussed at length and presented as Armenian massacres. The dead were presented as not Armenian but peaceful, law-abiding Christians. In the report, it was said degradingly that the last two years in Turkey had been a black page in historyxxx. Likewise, at their annual meeting, the events occurring in Anatolia were presented as Armenian massacres and reflected in a similar manner to the press stories. For instance, *The American Missionary* magazine recorded and released details of their annual meetings and the resolutions carried thus informing the public through publications.

In a resolution, it was stated that the horrible massacres of the Armenians in Turkey called for the speedy and effective intervention of the nations of Christendom; and that a special duty rested on their governments to protect the rights of American citizens who had been endangered, or violated, and that their people and their governments were under an obligation to offer asylum to those who had escaped from the massacre with their livesxxxii. When the Armenian events were at a peak in the 1890s, similarly journals, and missionary books contributed to the negative image of the Turks. Various American clergymen wrote books on the Ottomans and tried to extend the anti-Turkish image in America. Of these, Frederick Davis Greene and Edwin Munsell Bliss were at the forefront. The former wrote “*The Rule of the Turk – the Armenian Crisis*” which was published in 1896 and the latter published his work entitled “*Turkey and the Armenian Atrocities – A Reign of Terror: From Tartar Huts to Constantinople Palaces*” in 1896. Those kinds of books were filled with anti-Turkish interpretationxxxii. In short, anti-Turkish books written by missionaries were other sources of information for the public in America.

One of the methods of informing the public in America was the publication of anonymous priests’ letters from Anatolia. The Board missionaries in Anatolia reported their activities in detail to the centre in Boston. In addition they sent letters to newspapers and magazines in order to establish an agenda for financial support required from American people for the maintenance of missionary activitiesxxxiii. These letters, sent by the priests and pastors who lived in Anatolia and were portrayed as reverend, were the sources for the press of events in Anatolia. The Catholic World in 1896 issued a part of a letter sent by an anonymous priest living in Anatolia even without giving the name of the city. It was stated in the letter that almost every city in the region had been plundered, churches, schools and houses of the priests had been looted and then set on fire. It was also claimed that those who fled from the provinces had been followed and arrested and then brutally killed by “barbarian Turks” regardless of age and genderxxxiv. It was usually not clear where and by whom these letters were written. Actually it was not important for the newspapers. Usually the number of these letters increased when the Armenian revolutionary movements were at their peak and in turn the implementation of measures taken by the Ottoman Empirexxxv.

The missionaries would send such manipulative letters, always reported in the third person and exaggerating the incidents. Moreover the newspapers did not attach any importance to evaluating the accuracy and reliability of these letters before publishing. Even the editorial writers of the newspapers gave places for such letters in their own columns. Such

letters were published in various American newspapers like the *Congregationalist*, *New York Times*, *Tribune*, *Sun*, *Mail and Express*, *Evangelist World*, *Missionary Herald*, *Evening Star*, *Times*, *Boston Journal* and *Christian Herald*^{xxxvi}, always anonymously.

The reason for the publication of letters anonymously was to combat the prosecuting and diplomatic initiatives of the Ottoman government. For this reason, the Ottoman ambassador in Washington raised claims with the American government about these “hostile” publications and tried to prove that the writers of these writings were missionaries. This kind of news reflected in the newspapers continually developed anti-Turkish and anti-Islamic sentiments among the American public^{xxxvii}. In short, the theme of such letters was usually along the following lines: thousands of Armenians in the Ottoman lands were killed, maltreated, left hungry and thirsty and missionaries were always attacked by Muslims. Predominantly the explanations were in favour of the Armenians. At the end of the letters, the amount of the donation from the Americans was given and then it was stated how much of this donation was used for the missionary work and how many Christian Armenians had been rescued. Thus it tried to keep the Armenian question alive in the public opinion.

The Ottoman government had to account for contradicting the missionary- originating news and made appeals to the government. But despite all their efforts, the Ottoman government could not prevent such publications. The missionary letters were not only published in American newspapers but also in Armenian newspapers in the areas largely inhabited by Armenians. For example, *Haik*^{xxxviii}, an Armenian newspaper published in New York, created a negative impact on Americans about the Ottoman image through publishing such information^{xxxix}. On the other hand, Armenians in America also worked hard to increase anti-Turkish sentiments in the United States. They did their best to convince the American newspapers to write articles in their favour. Some of the Armenians of New York reported to the American press that 10,000 Armenians were resident in New York and they would subscribe to newspapers if they would give space to their cause^{xl}. Naturally this initiative yielded results. In a news item entitled “*Suffering Armenia*”, the *Worcester Daily Spy* dated 21st March 1894, published an interview with Nishan Garabedian, the *Hinchak* Leader, which reported that Armenians were educated, civilized and progressive people and they were currently being persecuted by Turks in Anatolia^{xli}. In short, the initiatives of the Armenians in America had an important influence on American public opinion and contributed significantly to the anti-Turkish perception by Americans^{xlii}.

Political journals in America had a similar attitude towards the Armenian Question. One of the examples was *The Outlook* published in New York. In an article, it is stated that this piece was written by an Armenian (anonymous) who was a recent graduate of a leading theological seminary. The theme in the article entitled the “*Evil of Turks*” was that Turkey wages perpetual war against her Christian subjects. Actually the main theme of the article which begins with a couple of questions is related to the following question. “*Why are the Turkish displays of barbarism allowed to go unchecked and unpunished at the close of the enlightened nineteenth century?*”^{xliii}. *Review of Reviews*, a London-based magazine, also published in New York in America, discussed political events but the attitude of the magazine was the same.

In an article entitled “*The Massacres in Turkey from October 1, 1895, to January 1, 1896*”, it is claimed that during this period Muslim fanatics carried out horrible and dreadful massacres that were sudden and spontaneous and took place according to a deliberate and preconcerted plan. According to the statements of many people, French, English, Canadian, American, Turk, Kurd and Armenian, the outbreaks were carefully directed with regard to the place, time and nationality of the victims and the perpetrators, who were prompted by a common motive, and that their true character had been systematically concealed by Turkish official reporters. The names of the people who put forward such claims could not be given,

as with the missionary example, and it was said that their names for obvious reasons could not be made public^{liv}.

As can be seen, the Armenian events were portrayed as massacres to the Western public. While doing this, missionary magazines especially discussed the events from a religious dimension. The massacre of these people just for being Christian, particularly by “fanatic Muslims” would be enough to arouse the feelings of Westerners^{lv}. Therefore, American public opinion would be stirred as the newspapers conveyed events to the public in this way and politicians would move accordingly. This was the most effective method of propaganda. Actually the propaganda of the Armenian committees in Anatolia had a great effect on both America and Europe. The system established by the Armenian committees that endeavoured to affect world public opinion by means of the press operated as follows: First of all, a forced insurrection is stirred up, this is followed by local authorities’ arrest of Armenians, the religious officials report it to patriarchate, the consul to the ambassador or the foreign minister, or the missionary reports it to his centre and the desired newspapers and embassies. From all of these it is transferred to the world press and the news cycle grows like an avalanche^{lvi}. Thus both the anti-Turkish image was consolidated and the Armenian Question remained vividly on the agenda.

The Role of News Agencies or Telegraph Companies

News agencies/telegraph companies held an important place in the formation and development of such an anti-Turkish image both in Europe and America, In order to comprehend their role, it is necessary to look into the history of these agencies. It is generally said that international news agencies were established not so much to create an informed international citizenry as to make money, their histories are characterized by struggles to secure and expand markets for their news, with markets often delineated by the territorial limits of their home countries’ empires or spheres of influence. The world’s first international news agency was Agence France-Presse (AFP). Its origins date back to 1835 when Charles-Louis Havas, a French entrepreneur, bought Correspondence Garnier – a company that translated foreign newspapers – and started converting it into a news agency^{lvii}. By 1845 there was no capital or major commercial centre in central and western Europe where a Havas reporter was not functioning^{lviii}.

In the late 1800s Havas was to encounter competition when rival international news agencies – Reuters in London and Wolff in Berlin – were set up. His rivals were the Germans Paul Julius Reuter and Bernhard Wolff, both of whom Havas had employed earlier and trained. These three agencies – Havas, Wolff and Reuters – would remain the premier news agencies of the world well into the twentieth century. But Reuters and Havas outlasted the Wolff agency in time^{lix}. Havas, Reuters and Wolff established an international news cartel between them by signing the “*Agency Alliance Treaty*” in 1869^l. From then on, the Ottoman territories were closely followed, especially by Havas and Reuter.

When the Armenian Question became international following the Congress of Berlin and events were at their peak especially in the 1890s, Havas and Reuter were informing Western public opinion. As mentioned above, these two agencies, which were initially established for the purpose of transmitting important events and information to the centre, maintained all the international news transmissions^{li}. It is commonly argued that these agencies led to a sharp swing in the stock exchange with false and biased news and that by means of publications against the state, they derived improper benefits from blackmailing^{lii}. There are clear examples that these news agencies were an obvious threat to the Ottoman government. Telegrams sent to the Havas agency confuting the news and events were rejected. The reason given for the rejection was that the Ottoman government did not subscribe to the agency. There were many archival documents about such kinds of example.

For instance the Ottoman State endeavoured to forestall the negative news from Reuters. With this aim it requested information from its embassies in London, Paris and Berlin about probable precautions^{liii}. One particular biased news item of Reuters led the Ottoman government to threaten the agency.

It had transmitted a report about Abdulhamid's sickness directly to the Times, which was claimed to be false. Upon this, the government notified Reuters that if there was such coverage again, their agency in Constantinople would be closed^{liv}. The government even thought about banning the activities of Reuters as they considered it as a centre producing false news^{lv}. However, despite all their efforts it did not bring results. Finally the Ottoman government went for the idea of making an agreement with Reuters which was recognized as the source of the political speculation^{lvi}. Furthermore the government reckoned that this agency could benefit from confuting the "slanders" that were deliberately put forward against the Ottomans^{lvii}. For this purpose, financial support for Reuters was raised^{lviii}. So the Ottoman government subscribed to these agencies in order to avert unfavourable news about the Ottomans^{lix}. In a collective note by the Grand Vizier, the Head of the Council of State (*Şura-yı Devlet Reisi*) and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, presented to Abdulhamid II in November 1895, it was stated that the most effective way to eliminate the impact of adverse publication was to pay the newspapers particularly the two news agencies, Reuters and Havas^{lx}. However, despite all these efforts, almost all the news conveyed to the Western public remained the same, namely against the Sultan and the Ottoman Empire. This reality remained unchanged when the Armenian events came to a peak in this process. Later Sultan Abdulhamid II also accepted that it had been an error to try to avert such kinds of publications with money^{lxi}. The last sultan of the Ottoman Empire, Mehmet VI, made the most appropriate evolution with the following statement:

"Your newspapers and the magazines would not publish it if we sent an article written by a Turk. If it was published, your people would not read this; if they read it they would not believe it. Even if we sent an expert, who could express the Turkish opinion in your own language to America, could this person find unbiased masses of listeners?"^{lxii}

Conclusion

Known as the "obedient millet" (community), Armenians in the Ottoman State experienced a transformation in their identity and gained a nationalistic character. Through their endeavours to establish their own independent state in the 19th century, with the effect of nationalism, Western public opinion began to take an interest in their cause. In this framework, the Armenian cause had a greater place on the agendas of the Western powers particularly after the Congress of Berlin. In this process, contemporary newspapers played a crucial role for the formation of Armenophiles in the Western states. Like the newspapers, religious and political journals, missionaries and news agencies were primary news sources informing Western public opinion. By means of their influence, those states which had interests in the Ottoman State oriented their policies.

Following the Congress of Berlin, such effects could be seen especially in England. During and after the Congress, the number of news stories related to the Armenians steadily increased in the British newspapers. The activities of Armenians living in England were also followed more closely, which caused the Armenian question to become a part of British policy. Similarly, the American interest in Armenians loomed large in the 1880s. As in Europe, the existing image of the "Barbarian Turk" also gained popularity in America. The American Board (ABCFM) had an important role in the formation of such a perception. As in England and France, the Armenian activists living in America caused this question to become a part of American policy. The most effective factor in the formation of such a perception in

Europe and America was undoubtedly the news agencies holding the world news transmission rights. While using this issue as an argument against the Ottoman State, Havas and Reuters also achieved financial interests and determined that the Armenian question would feature in the policies of Western states.

In conclusion, in the last quarter of the 19th century the Armenian Question, as an important part of the Eastern Question, took up more space on the agenda of the great powers as a result of the above-mentioned motives. The infrastructure of the propaganda of 1915 was actually prepared during this period.

Endnotes:

i For details about the Armenian efforts see Esat Uras, *Tarihte Ermeniler ve Ermeni Meselesi*, Belge Yayınları, İstanbul 1987.

ii The delegation consisted of Khrimian Hayrik, ex-patriarch and the future Catholicos of Armenians, Priest Khoren Narbeh, Minas Tcheraz and S. Papazian.

iii The famous speech delivered by Khrimian following the Congress shows that their main aim was to provide European intervention by drawing inspiration from the Bulgarian and Gharadaghian examples. For details see Kevork Bardakjian, *Reference Guide to Modern Armenian Literature, 1500-1920*. Detroit, Michigan: Wayne State University Press, 2000.

iv For the power and history of media see Jane L. Chapman, *Comparative Media History: An Introduction: 1789 to Present*, Polity Press, USA, 2005. Adam Albert, *The Power of Media*, Franklin Watts, USA, 2006. Michael Schudson, *The Power of News*, Harvard University Press, 1996.

v Memet Yetişgin, “Batı Basınından Osmanlı Devleti’ne Yaklaşımlar ve Osmanlıların Bu Yaklaşımlara Tepkileri”, Sayı: 28, *OTAM*, 2010, pp. 119-162.

vi The expression “the Eastern Question” entered diplomatic parlance at the time of the congress of Verona in 1822. The term includes the diplomatic and political problems resulting from the decay of the Ottoman Empire. It does not apply to any one particular problem of the Ottomans (Greek, Serbian, Bulgarian etc.) but instead includes a variety of issues raised during the 18th, 19th, and 20th centuries in territories ruled by the Ottoman Empire. For a detailed survey of the problem, see Matthew A. Anderson, *The Eastern Question 1774-1923: a study in international relations*, London, Macmillan, 1966. R.W. Seton-Watson, *Disraeli, Gladstone, and the Eastern Question*, Macmillan and Co., 1935. Richard Millman, *Britain and the Eastern Question, 1875-78* Oxford University Press, 1979. Malcolm MacColl, *The Eastern Question: its facts and fallacies*, London, Longmans, Green, 1877. Edouard Driault, *La Question D’orient Depuis Ses Origines Jusqu’a Nos Jours*, Ancienne Librairie Germer Bailliere et Paris, 1898.

vii Ramazan Çalık, *Alman Kaynaklarına Göre II. Abdülhamit Döneminde Ermeni Olayları*, Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, Ankara, 2000, pp. 155-156.

viii Yetişgin, “Batı Basınından Osmanlı Devleti’ne Yaklaşımlar”, p. 132.

ix The Times, 20 March 1878, p. 12.

x London Standard, 02 July 1878, p. 6.

xi Pall Mall Gazette, 27 June 1878, p. 3, 2 January 1878, p. 10.

xii Morning Post, 1 July 1878, p. 5, London Daily News, 3 July 1878, p.5. London Standard, 3 July 1878, p. 5.

xiii Morning Post, 2 July 1878, p. 5.

xiv London Daily News, 3 July 1878, p. 5, 2 July 1878, pp. 4 and 6, 17 July 1878, p. 3.

xv The Times, 7 June 1878, p. 9.

xvi The Times, 28 June 1878, p. 10.

xvii Çalık, *Alman Kaynaklarına Göre II. Abdülhamit*, p. 156.

xviii Arman J. Kirakossian, *British Diplomacy and the Armenian Question from the 1830s to 1914*, Gomitas Institute, Princeton, 2003, pp. 7-9

xix Orhan Koloğlu, *Avrupa Kışkırcısında Abdülhamid*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 1998, p. 158.

xx Prime Ministry Ottoman Archive (hereafter cited as BOA.) Hariciye Siyasi (hereafter cited as HR.SYS.) 2749-110.

xxi BOA., HR.SYS. 2749-31.

xxii Haluk Selvi, “Efsaneden Gerçeğe Ermeni Soykırımı Tarihi Yazımı”, *Tarihi Gerçekler ve Bilimin Işığında Ermeni Sorunu*, ed. Bülent Bakar, Necdet Öztürk, Süleyman Beyoğlu, IQ Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, p. 460. Actually before the 19th century Americans acquired their first knowledge about the Turks from the European

writers' and travelers' observations which helped the formation of a negative image of Turks. Çağrı Erhan, "The American Perception of the Turks: An Historical Record", *The Turkish Yearbook of International Relations (Milletlerarası Türk Yıllığı)*, Vol. 31, No:0, 2000, pp. 75-97.

xxiii For a history of Turkish-American relations, see. Çağrı Erhan, *Türk-Amerikan İlişkilerinin Tarihsel Kökleri*, İmge Kitabevi, Ankara, 2001; James Gordon Leland, *American Relations with Turkey 1830-1930, An Economic Interpretation*, University of Pennsylvania Press, London: Humphrey Milford: Oxford University Press, 1932.

xxiv Dennis R. Papazian, *The Changing American View of the Armenian Question: An Interpretation*, *Armenian Review* 39, No. 4-156 (1986), pp. 47-72.

xxv For comprehensive information about American missionaries in Anatolia see Uygur Kocabaşoğlu, *Kendi Belgeleriyle Anadolu'daki Amerika, 19. Yüzyılda Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'ndaki Misyoner Okulları*, İstanbul 1989. Jeremy Salt, "Trouble Wherever They Went: American Missionaries in Anatolia and Ottoman Syria in the Nineteenth Century", *Muslim World*, Fall 2002, Vol. 92, Issue Nos. 3&4. pp. 287-314.

xxvi Edwin Munsell Bliss, ed., *Encyclopedia of Missions, Descriptive, Historical, Biographical, Statistical*, Vol. II, Funk and Wagnalls: New York, London, Toronto, 1891, p. 26-27.

xxvii Salt, "Trouble Wherever They Went", p. 290.

xxviii Seçil Akgün, "Amerikalı Misyonerlerin Ermeni Meselesinde Rolü", *Atatürk Yolu*, Sayı: 1, Mayıs, Ankara. 1988, p. 12. Especially after the relocation, the great powers who exploited the Armenian Question for propaganda purposes excessively used the image of "cruel Turk-persecuted Armenian" Enis Şahin, "Önemli Bir Propaganda Dergisi: The Armenian Herald (1917-1919)", *Tarihi Gerçekler ve Bilimin Işığında Ermeni Sorunu*, ed. Bülent Bakar, Necdet Öztürk, Süleyman Beyoğlu, IQ Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, p. 267. Papazian states that many reports, including eyewitness accounts, appeared in contemporary newspapers and journals, including The New York Times, the Literary Digest, The Independent, the Missionary Review, the Atlantic Monthly, the New Republic, Current History, The Century, and The Nation. These articles were almost universally pro-Armenian, and they flooded America. Dennis R. Papazian, "The Changing American View of the Armenian Question: An Interpretation", *Armenian Review* 39, No. 4-156 (1986), pp. 47-72.

xxix Çalık, *Alman Kaynaklarına Göre II. Abdülhamit*, p. 156

xxx *Christian Alliance and Foreign Missionary Weekly*, (1896) Vol. XVII, No.11, pp. 225-226.

xxxi *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting*, [The American Missionary / Volume 50, Issue 12, Dec 1896], 1896, pp. 382-383

xxxii Çağrı Erhan, "The American Perception of the Turks: An Historical Record", *The Turkish Yearbook of International Relations (Milletlerarası Türk Yıllığı)*, Vol. 31, No.10, 2000, p. 94.

xxxiii Halit Ertuğrul, *Kültürümüzü Etkileyen Okullar*, Nesil Yayınları, İstanbul 2002, pp. 89-96.

xxxiv *The Catholic World*, (1896), "An Eye-Witness to the Armenian Horrors", vol. 63 (May 1896), p. 279.

xxxv Ertuğrul, *Kültürümüzü Etkileyen Okullar*, pp. 89-96.

xxxvi Erdal Açıkse, *Amerikalıların Harput'taki Misyonerlik Faaliyetleri*, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara 2003, pp. 157-160.

xxxvii For a few archival documents of the activities of the Ottoman Embassy in Washington see, BOA, HR.SYS, 65-28, 2740-27. BOA. Yıldız Tasnifi Sadaret Hususi Maruzat Evrakı (hereafter cited Y.A.HUS), 316-83, 323-113. Yıldız Tasnifi Mütenevvi Maruzat Evrakı (hereafter cited as Y.MTV), 132-76.

xxxviii Actually Haik was the first Armenian newspaper published in America by Sympad Kaprielian who was arrested by the Ottoman State and exiled to America. Robert Mirak, *Torn Between Two Lands, Armenians in America (1890 to World War I)*, Cambridge, 1983, p. 5. In fact it is understood from the Ottoman archival documents that Haik was very effective in America. In order to mitigate its effect, the Ottoman government took serious precautions. For details see. BOA., Y.A.Hus. 283-98, Yıldız Perakende Evrakı Tahriyat-ı Ecnebiye ve Mabeyn Mütercimliği (hereafter cited as Y.PRK.TKM.) 36-7, HR.SYS. 60-46, 61-19, 61-22, 2735-48, 51, 2851-29, 2736-12.

xxxix This newspaper provoked Armenians claiming that weapons and fighting were necessary to save the Armenians. It portrayed Anatolia as troubled by declaring to American Armenians that bills had been posted in various Anatolian cities announcing revolutionary notices. In addition this newspaper tried to reflect ideas that would contribute to the Armenian cause on the world agenda through the foreign press. Furthermore it aimed to publish the crime and evils as well as the violence committed against Armenians in order to discredit the Ottoman State on the international stage. Haluk Selvi, "Amerika Birleşik Devletlerin'de Ermeni Faaliyetleri", *Bilim ve Aklın Aydınlığında Eğitim*, Nisan 2003, Yıl 4, sayı 38, p. 122. Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermeniler, vol. 11, Document No: 159, İstanbul 1988.

xl Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermeniler, vol. 12, Document No: 111, İstanbul 1988.

xli BOA, Yıldız Mütenevvia (hereafter cited as Y. Mtv.), 93/41.

xlii As mentioned above, this perception took root when the Armenian events were at their peak. After the Sasson uprising that occurred in August 1894, there was a massive propaganda wave against Turkey in America. While the uprising of the Armenians was ignored, it was claimed that they were killed because they were Christians. In churches, cursing prayers were invoked against Turks, and protest meetings were organized in squares. Antagonistic press articles were written in newspapers and journals, and a lot of books and pamphlets were published. See Bilal Şimşir, "Ermeni Propagandasının Amerika Boyutu Üzerine", *Tarih Boyunca Türklerin Ermeni Toplumu İle İlişkileri* (8-12 Ekim 1984 Erzurum), Ankara 1985, p. 106.

xliii *The Outlook*, "The Evil of the Turk", vol. 52 (24 Aug. 1895), pp. 301-302.

xliv *The Review of Reviews*, Feb. 1896, pp. 197-198.

xlv Çalık, *Alman Kaynaklarına Göre II. Abdülhamit*, pp. 156-157.

xlvi Selvi, *Amerika Birleşik Devletlerin'de Ermeni Faaliyetleri*, pp. 121-122. This is actually a requirement of the Regulation of the Hinchaks. Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermeniler, vol. 11. Document No: 34, İstanbul 1988.

xlvii At the beginning Havas used carrier pigeons, but in 1845 when Samuel Morse invented the electromagnetic telegraph, he started installing Morse machines and introduced it in France. K.M. Shrivastava, *News Agencies: From Pigeon to Internet*, New Dawn Pres Group, New Delhi, 2007, p. 2.

xlviii Orhan Koloğlu, *Havas-Reuter'den Anadolu Ajansına*, Çağdaş Gazeteciler Derneği Yayınları, Ankara 1994, p. 4.

xlix Mark D. Alleyne, *News Revolution: Political and Economic Decisions About Global Information*, St. Martin's Press, New York, 1997, pp.6-7.

I Under this treaty, they delegated to each other regions of the world for exclusive coverage and service. Reuter got the entire British Empire and the Far East; Wolff covered Scandinavia, Russia, Austria and its surrounding territories; and Havas gained the rights to the French and Portuguese empire, Italy and Spain. Reuter and Havas agreed to penetrate South America jointly. The Agreement was made in an attempt to offset rising telegraph costs. It was the first of a series of contracts between the three agencies that would last well into the 1930s. Alleyne, *News Revolution*, p. 7.

İi Ersan İlal, *İletişim, Yıgınsal İletişim Araçları ve Toplum*, İstanbul, 1989, p. 69

İii Orhan Koloğlu, "II. Abdülhamid'in Basın Karşısındaki Açmazı", *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyete Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Cilt I. İletişim Yay., 1985, p. 84.

İiii BOA., Y.A.Hus. 260/6, 259/94.

İiv BOA., Y.A.Hus. 260/59.

İv BOA., İrade-i Hariciye (hereafter cited as İ.HR.) 436/53.

İvi BOA., Yıldız Perakende Evrakı Posta Telgraf Nezaret Evrakı (hereafter cited as Y.PRK.PT.) 9/14.

İvii BOA., Y.A.Hus. 317/117.

İviii BOA., Yıldız Perakende Evrakı Başkitabet Dairesi Maruzatı (hereafter cited as Y.PRK.BŞK.) 39/61.

İix BOA., Y.MTV. 85/10; İ.HR.1310-Za-12

İx Koloğlu, "II. Abdülhamid'in Basın Karşısındaki Açmazı", pp. 273-274

İxi Vahdettin Engin, *II. Abdülhamid ve Dış Politika*, Yeditepe Yayınevi: İstanbul, 2005, p. 69.

İxii Edward Alexander Powell, *The Struggle for Power in Muslim Asia*, New York, 1923, p. 32.

References:

Açıkses, Erdal, (2003). *Amerikalıların Harput'taki Misyonerlik Faaliyetleri*, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara.

Akgün, Seçil, (1988). "Amerikalı Misyonerlerin Ermeni Meselesinde Rolü", *Atatürk Yolu*, Sayı: 1, Mayıs, Ankara.

Albert Adam, (2006). *The Power of Media*, Franklin Watts, USA.

Alleyne, Mark D., (1997). *News Revolution: Political and Economic Decisions About Global Information*, St. Martin's Press, New York.

- Anderson, Matthew A., (1966). *The Eastern Question 1774-1923: a study in international relations*, London: Macmillan.
- Bardakjian, Kevork, (2000). *Reference Guide to Modern Armenian Literature, 1500-1920*, Detroit, Michigan: Wayne State University Press.
- BOA, (Prime Ministry Ottoman Archive), HR.SYS, 65-28, 2740-27, 2749-110, 2749-31, 60-46, 61-19, 61-22, 2735-48, 51, 2851-29, 2736-12.
- BOA, Y. Mtv., 93-41, 85-10, 132-76.
- BOA., İ.HR. 436-53, 1310-Za-12.
- BOA., Y.A.Hus. 260-59, 260-6, 259-94, 283-98, 317-117, 316-83, 323-113.
- BOA., Y.PRK.BŞK. 39/61.
- BOA., Y.PRK.PT. 9/14.
- BOA., Y.PRK.TKM. 36-7.
- Bliss, Edwin Munsell, (1891). *Encyclopedia of Missions, Descriptive, Historical, Biographical, Statistical*, Vol. II, Funk and Wagnalls: New York, London, Toronto.
- Çalık, Ramazan, (2000). *Alman Kaynaklarına Göre II. Abdülhamit Döneminde Ermeni Olayları*, Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, Ankara.
- Chapman, Jane L. (2005). *Comperative Media History: An Introduction: 1789 to Present*, Polity Press, USA.
- Christian Alliance and Foreign Missionary Weekly*, (1896) Vol. XVII, No.11, pp. 225-226.
- Driault, Edouard, (1898). *La Question D'orient Depuis Ses Origines Jusqu'a Nos Jours*, Ancienne Librairie Germer Bailliere et. Paris.
- Engin, Vahdettin, (2005). *II. Abdülhamid ve Dış Politika*, Yeditepe Yayınevi: İstanbul.
- Erhan, Çağrı, "The American Perception of the Turks: An Historical Record", *The Turkish Yearbook of International Relations (Milletlerarası Türk Yıllığı)*, Vol. 31, No:0, 2000, pp. 75-97.
- Erhan, Çağrı, (2001). *Türk-Amerikan İlişkilerinin Tarihsel Kökleri*, İmge Kitabevi, Ankara.
- Ertuğrul, Halit, (2002). *Kültürümüzü Etkileyen Okullar*, Nesil Yayınları, İstanbul.

-
- Gordon Leland, James, (1932). *American Relations with Turkey 1830-1930, An Economic Interpretation*, University of Pennsylvania Press, London: Humphrey Milford: Oxford University Press.
- İlal, Ersan, (1989). *İletişim, Yıgınsal İletişim Araçları ve Toplum*, İstanbul.
- Kirakossian, Arman J., (2003). *British Diplomacy and Armenian Question from 1830's to 1914*, Gomitas Institute, Princeton.
- Kocabaşođlu, Uygur, (1989). *Kendi Belgeleriyle Anadolu'daki Amerika, 19. Yüzyılda Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'ndaki Misyoner Okulları*, İstanbul.
- Kolođlu, Orhan, (1985). "II. Abdülhamid'in Basın Karşısındaki Açmazı", *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyete Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Cilt I. İletişim Yay., p. 84.
- Kolođlu, Orhan, (1998). *Avrupa Kıskaçında Abdülhamid*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Kolođlu, Orhan, (1994). *Havas-Reuter'den Anadolu Ajansına, Çağdaş Gazeteciler Derneđi Yayınları*, Ankara.
- London Daily News, 3 July 1878, p. 5., 2 July 1878, p. 4, 6, 17 July 1878, p. 3.
- London Standard, 3 July 1878, p. 5, 02, July 1878, p. 6.
- MacColl, Malcolm, (1877). *The Eastern Question: its facts and fallacies*, London Longmans, Green.
- Millman, Richard, (1979). *Britain and the Eastern Question, 1875-78* Oxford University Press.
- Mirak, Robert, (1983). *Torn Between Two Lands, Armenians in America (1890 to World War I)*, Cambridge.
- Morning Post, 1 July 1878, p. 5, 2 July 1878, p. 5.
- Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermeniler*, vol. 11, Document No: 34, İstanbul 1988.
- Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermeniler*, vol. 11, Document No: 159, İstanbul 1988.
- Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermeniler*, vol. 12, Document No: 111, İstanbul 1988.
- Pall Mall Gazette, 27 June 1878, p. 3, .2 January 1878, p. 10.
- Papazian, Dennis R., (1986). *The Changing American View of the Armenian Question: An Interpretation*, *Armenian Review* 39, No. 4-156, pp. 47-72.
- Powell, Edward Alexander, (1923). *The Struggle for Power in Muslim Asia*, New York.
- Proceedings of the Annual Meeting*, (1896). [The American missionary / Volume 50, Issue 12, Dec]. pp. 382-383.

The Review of Reviews, (1896). Feb., pp. 197-198.

Şahin, Enis, (2007). “Önemli Bir Propaganda Dergisi: The Armenian Herald (1917-1919)”, *Tarihi Gerçekler ve Bilimin Işığında Ermeni Sorunu*, ed. Bülent Bakar, Necdet Öztürk, Süleyman Beyoğlu, IQ Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, pp. 267-301

Salt, Jeremy, (2002). Trouble Wherever They Went: American Missionaries in Anatolia and Ottoman Syria in the Nineteenth Century, *Muslim World*, Fall, Vol. 92, Issue Nos. 3&4. pp. 287-314.

Schudson, Michael, (1996). *The Power of News*, Harvard University Press.

Selvi, Haluk, (2007). “Efsaneden Gerçeğe Ermeni Soykırımını Tarihi Yazımı”, *Tarihi Gerçekler ve Bilimin Işığında Ermeni Sorunu*, ed. Bülent Bakar, Necdet Öztürk, Süleyman Beyoğlu, IQ Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, pp.

Selvi, Haluk, (2003). “Amerika Birleşik Devletleri’de Ermeni Faaliyetleri”, *Bilim ve Aklın Aydınlığında Eğitim*, Nisan, Year. 4, No. 38. p. 122.

Seton-Watson, R.W. (1935). *Disraeli, Gladstone, and the Eastern Question*, Macmillan and Co.

Shrivastava, K.M., (2007). *News Agencies: From Pigeon to Internet*, New Dawn Press Group, New Delhi.

Şimşir, Bilal, (1985). “Ermeni Propagandasının Amerika Boyutu Üzerine”, *Tarih Boyunca Türklerin Ermeni Toplumuna İle İlişkileri* (8-12 Ekim 1984 Erzurum), Ankara, pp. 106.

The Catholic World, (1896), “An Eye-Witness to the Armenian Horrors”, vol. 63 (May 1896), p. 279.

The Outlook, (1895). “The Evil of the Turk”, vol. 52 (24 Aug. 1895), p. 301-302.

The Times, 20 March, 1878, p. 12, Jun 07, 1878, p. 9, Jun 28, 1878, p. 9.

Uras, Esat, (1987). *Tarihte Ermeniler ve Ermeni Meselesi*, Belge Yayınları, İstanbul.

Yetişgin, Memet, (2010). “Batı Basımından Osmanlı Devleti’ne Yaklaşımlar ve Osmanlıların Bu Yaklaşımlara Tepkileri”, Sayı: 28, *OTAM*, pp: 119-162.

Fikrettin YAVUZ is an assistant professor of history in the department of history at Sakarya University, Turkey. He received his Ph.D. in history from Institute of Social Science at Sakarya University. His research interests include history of Armenian question, late Ottoman era and early republican Turkey. He gives lectures about Contemporary World history, terrorism, Turkey, Europe and America.