

AN ANALYSIS OF ARMENIAN ISSUE AT THE CONTEXT OF HISTORICAL DEPTH AND PULPIC DIPLOMACY

Emel POYRAZ

Marmara University, Communication Fakulty Department of Public Relations

Abstract: In this article, an analysis was made on the Armenian issue from a multidisciplinary perspective, at the context of historical depth and public diplomacy. In this study; descriptive method, historical comparison and discourse analysis are used on the basis on relevant sources and documents. Some of the decisions of the European Parliament as a case study are examined on the historical and scientific facts that were reached inductively. That is to say; the Armenian issue which reached a damaging stage in terms of Turkey's foreign policy and its relations with other countries, now is much far from being a historical problem and now is politicized especially by performing public diplomacy and lobbying of Armenians and European parliaments. Genocide claims nowadays taken up by the parliaments of several countries to their agenda, and becoming enacted in states such as Greece and France, have been carried in the leadership of the European Parliament to the European Union platforms and have been connected to Turkey's accession process. Evaluating the Armenian issue in the light of the facts and documents, it can be seen that it has no historical, scientific and legal basis for Armenian genocide claims. With propaganda and public diplomacy activities at international communication and relations, this situation brings into mind that a new version of a pressure diplomacy which was put into the sheath of a variety of colors and prints from 1878 to 1914 is exhibited. In recent years, Turkey is intensively accused of Armenian genocide, and especially in April of each year, the number of these attacks increases and becomes almost offensive. It can clearly be seen who all of these policies, encourage the Armenians not to recognize the existing borders and to make demand for new land as a repetition of history. It is necessary to evaluate the so-called Armenian genocide allegations of which propaganda is made and which are announced to the world with assassinations and terrorism and then are enacted at parliaments, as a communication strategy within the frame of the 4T plan. The Armenian issue, which is re-heated with allegations of genocide, now is beyond being a historical dimension and are put to the forefront in terms of international relations, and again has become a damaging factor for relations with some countries and an obstacle in front of Turkey's foreign policy especially after the Cold War. In this context, under the cause-effect relationship and to make a historical comparison; evaluating the Armenian question in the historical process, it can be seen that this emerged as an extension of policies that were implemented in the XIX century by big states in order to break up the Ottoman Empire. During the struggle for dominance that started on the territory of the Ottoman in the XIX century and lasted until the first half of the XX century, the big states of Europe, the United States and Russia did not only create allies from different ethnic and religious groups from the Balkans, the Middle East and Anatolia within the empire but also provoked these groups against one another. Thus laid the foundations of policies and strategies to cover the XIX century and onwards period. Without know these basics, the events which will take place today and tomorrow cannot be analyzed accurately. Therefore, it is proved that Armenian genocide allegations considered in the light of the tragic facts and documents, there is no legal, historical and scientific basis. It is examined that no substantial change has been observed in the Armenian policy of Europe in the XIX century and the Armenian policy of today's Europe towards Turkey.

Keywords: European Union, Armenian Question, Relocation, 4T Plan, Public Diplomacy, Propaganda, International Communication.

INTRODUCTION

The Armenian issue, which developed in conjunction with the London-Zurich Treaties in 1959 about the 1878 Ayastefonos and Berlin and Cyprus topics, today gathered speed with the decision made by the European Parliament and was connected to the process of Turkey gaining full membership in the European Union and thus has become one of the major problems of Turkish foreign policy. With the contribution of lobbying and propaganda activities of Armenians, since the 1980s, the European Parliament show the events of 1915-1917 in accordance with the definition of genocide of the decision taken by the United Nations in December 9, 1948. European Parliament has declared this as genocide and has requested from the Turkish government to accept this issue and has declared that the fact that Turkey's rejection of this case constitutes a definite obstacle for the EU membership. In this article examining the historical dimension of the events, we do see that no substantial change has been observed in the Armenian policy of Europe in the XIX century and the Armenian policy of today's Europe towards Turkey.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study seeks to explore and discuss the debates on the Armenian issue from a historical perspective by relying on discursive and context analysis of historical sources and documents. The literature review is followed by the analysis of

case studies. Decisions pertaining to the Armenian issue that have been discussed and passed into law in some European Parliaments resolution and some member states of European Union such as France and Greece are analyzed as case studies. The historical analysis together with the case studies aims to shed light on how a historical issue has evolved into a political controversy over time.

I think that current major observation of the historical politicized events like Armenian issue just not enough to explain and analyze with only today's data. Because, the current data may not contain all the answers to all the questions. It should be participated in the examination of the development of their past time. History has duty to identify not only the events, but also looking for the cause-effect relationship between events. In other words, history is looking documents, facts and events at the correlation between them and the relationship works by calling the social issues to reach generalizations. Such an understanding of the history was given for the first time by Islamic historian and sociologist Ibn Khaldun. According to Ibn Khaldun, the meaning of which is hidden in the study of history, to think, to investigate the formation of the asset and the flow of the causes and events that you need to know in order to understand their disease. No matter which discipline and the field of science, it has a history of research topic or problem. The researcher must examine it. It should known what

studies have been conducted to date in that area. Looking at developments in the European Union and around the world in this connection, approaches which are often expressed in Turkish public opinion and decision-circles in Europe stating “we are not able to promote ourselves better”, “The Armenian Diaspora finds support” or “Let’s leave history to historians” are not the type of problem-solving. It is necessary to analyze the issue in historical depth very well so we discuss this phenomena in our study.

The results of this study is that Armenian issue is highly politicized. Armenian issue is not only limited to the European Parliament resolutions and reports, but also in general in western world. The decisions taken in relation to the genocide of the Armenians in Europe and America and practices are coordinated. The fact that in various forms and intervals, decisions have been taken against the Turks in direction of committing genocide against Armenians in 1915 and the approach shown as justification for this has become a basic policy of the West with an integrity, planned, scheduled and coordinated as proved in this study. Consensus provided on the subject shows that Turkey is not able to understand the goal it is directed to and its importance, also is an political and social deficiency.

On the other hand, it is seen that the basic aim of the European Armenian Federation which is a subsidiary of the Dashnak

Party and is Brussels-based, is to ensure that especially Turkey recognizes the genocide, and that Turkey only is accepted to the European membership after fulfilling entire demands of the entire Armenians, in other words, to ensure that these demands shall be a prerequisite for full membership of Turkey. It was converted into a political pressure fact and communication strategy for Turkey.

The proposals of this article is that the full membership in the European Union adventure of Turkey which departed from being a rational choice and turned into an untold adventure of passion. It has become a tool of the Armenian psychological operations, too. It has become a tool that adversely affects the image of the country, which have been used by some countries against Turkey concerning international communications and international law areas.

From the mentioned decisions in this article as a case study, it can be seen that the Armenian issue which has occupied Turkey’s domestic and foreign policy for many years, and more like is going to occupy it for much more time.

In recent time completely has been inflicted from its historical reality and has become a foreign policy putting forwards demands unacceptable for Turkey. Furthermore, some countries wanting to prevent Turkey’s EU membership have used the Armenian issue as a political tool and will always be able to use the Armenian

allegations. Because the European Parliament decision dated June 18, 1987 recognizing the Armenian genocide, and then the decisions taken with reference to this decision, are drawing the route of this and make it quite easier.

After all, look at the dimension of historical events Armenian politics and propaganda activities of Europe in XIX. century, it has been observed that any substantial change in Europe today on the basis of Armenian policy towards Turkey.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES OF PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES

Evaluating the Armenian question in the historical process, it can be seen that this emerged as an extension of policies that were implemented in the XIX century by big states in order to break up the Ottoman Empire (Seydi, 2003: 96-97). During the struggle for dominance that started on the territory of the Ottoman in the XIX century and lasted until the first half of the XX century, the big states of Europe, the United States and Russia did not only create allies from different ethnic and religious groups from the Balkans, the Middle East and Anatolia within the empire but also provoked these groups against one another and thus laid the foundations of policies to cover the XIX century and onwards period (İnalçık, 2007:259-260).

As it is known, the political, social and economic developments on the world in

the XVIII and XIX century have forced the Ottoman Turkey administrators to make interventions against this and together with radical changes in the structure of the society and the state, initiated the modernization of the Ottoman. In addition to expansionist and protectionist policies of great colonial European states which became strengthened as a result of Industrial Revolution especially the French Revolution and the spreading of the emerging nationalism caused the emergence of the idea of independence in the non-Muslim citizens of the Ottoman Empire. In this context *under the condition of western propaganda and public diplomacy activities; the Serbs, Greeks, Romanians and Bulgarians from the Christian Communities in the Balkans, emerging as a so-called independent state-driven countries through rebellion with the support and instigation of the great European powers, has become encouraging and a sample for the Armenians.*

Within the context of public diplomacy and propaganda of great powers, the idea of Armenian nationalism became strengthened with the support of missionaries, foreign schools and the great imperial states. Under the leadership of the church oriented propaganda towards the movement of independence has gained momentum. By the treaty signed as a result of the 1877-78 Ottoman- Russian war, the Armenian Issue gained international dimension and this became an issue which was used as a pressure tool against the Ottoman Turkey by Europe and the USA

which have had ambitions in this region and especially by Russia.

The Armenian question was one of the most challenging issues of Abdulhamid II period of the Empire when the attacks began and when Turkey was being tried to be destroyed through wars, domestic and foreign intrigue. Abdulhamid II clearly saw that under the control of propaganda activities, European missionaries put enmity between the Armenians and the Kurds which had been living together with peace and tranquility for centuries. The Sultan, did not only hold Europe but also America responsible for these actions. Because missionaries in charge of American colleges which had been opened with the allowance of Mahmud II in various parts of the country had been making suggestions harmful and destructive propaganda activities and public diplomacy to Christian subjects (Karaca,1993 : 75).

Thus, the Armenian events used as a tool for efforts of the great powers as a means of destructing the Ottoman Empire, in the last quarter of the XIX century, have been an extension of politics including at first sight to root the Ottoman Empire out of Europe, and then increasingly to take away the Turks' right to live even in Anatolia. The most important material used for this purpose had been the Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire. From the particular will of Abdulhamid II, it is possible to observe revolts carried out as a

result of propaganda activities and public diplomacy drive of the Armenians by great powers, and how these forces used the consulates as spies in order to perform each of these drives (Engin, 2005:44).

It was seen that American missionary activities carried out in collaboration with the British mission organizations and under the protection of British and American diplomats gained density after the 1840s between the Bulgarians and Armenians. Like mission organizations belonging to other states, also the activities of organizations in the American missions had developed as an element of danger and threat to the Ottoman Empire more as political rather than religious aspects and most of the time has been a decisive factor of the Ottoman-American diplomatic relations. Ottoman archival documents show that American missionaries had a preparatory, preventive and interventionist role in the Bulgarian and Armenian uprisings, and also that major task had been undertaken by them to demonstrate these uprisings to the American and European public opinion with an exaggerated and anti-Turkish-tone under the condition of propaganda activities and public diplomacy (Aydın, 2008:45) .

Due to loyalty to the Ottoman Empire, the Armenians referred as "loyal nation" have been started to be used first by Russia who wanted to take over the former Eastern Anatolia, and then began to be used by the British (Inalcık,2007:260).

The Armenians, hoping that independence would be given to them with the Treaty of Berlin occurring after the 1877-78 Ottoman-Russian War, but could not reach this aim, in the next period, adopted strategy of terrorism as a method to reach their objectives and have founded the terrorist organizations named TASNAK (Dashnak) and HINCAK (Hinchak) (Engin, 2007:205-249).

OTTOMAN REFORM PROJECT FOR ARMENIANS FAILED

While the driven Armenians continued their efforts of politicization between the years of 1878-1894 with terrorism, the Ottoman Empire, being engaged with the Anatolian Question of the reform was trying to prevent the European states in terms of interference with the internal affairs (Karaca, 1993:145). With a state to be established by The Armenians never being the majority in Anatolia, Russia would have been able to sneak into the Mediterranean and the Middle East. On the contrary, an Armenian state under the auspices of the England could prevent this. Both parties using the Armenian for their own imperial interests, together with the political process since 1878, by creating an Armed Revolutionary Committees adopted identity as an organized, planned and purposeful group, continuously espoused of armed terrorist acts. Just the same as the Kurdism cases of today, the Ottoman Empire, between 1878-1915 both with the intervention of

the European powers, as well as his own global accord, had made many administrative and political reforms in favor of the non-Muslims, especially in favor of the Armenians.

Although the 1895 Reform Project in particular, was applied in general and made under the supervision of the European States, the Armenians continued expanding their organized, planned and armed rebellions. It was seen that the parts coming from necessity and which should be applied of this project, with the political interest calculations of European states and their requests for sanctions deviated from the actual path. By 1915 it will reveal that the reform project disguised as a hidden invasion plan which used some elements of the Ottoman Empire, especially the Armenians, as a pawn.

This pressure of the European states which lasted 37 years between the years 1878-1915, will lead to the justifiable suspicion and antipathy of the Ottoman administrators, against Europe-sourced reforms, requests and projects. Until 1915 including the Unions and Progress association, it cannot be ignored that the Ottoman State administrators gave all of their efforts for a very long time to solve the Armenian issue in good faith, even if it was necessary to be in cooperation with the Armenian armed revolutionary committees (Karaca, 2001,169).

Some Armenians creating terror in Istanbul and provinces by establishing the

Hinchak and Dashnak terrorist organizations especially were supported by the British. This tradition of terror would continue in the following years, and the leaders and dignitaries of the Unions and Progress association would be killed by the Armenian terrorists (<http://www.ttk.org.tr/templates/resimler/File/tpasa-cinayeti.pdf>) Access date: 07.10.2009

It will reveal how personally Dashnak resources, hidden from the public opinion and stolen from some libraries to be destroyed, have been used by Tsarist Russia and Western imperialism against Turkey, and the justified war during the occupation of the Turkish army and the Armenian atrocities with documents.

In fact, the first prime minister of Armenians who were allegedly subjected of the genocide Ovanes Kachaznuni, assesses the event as a war and openly said that they were tools of imperialists (Kaçaznuni, 2009:11). He openly admitted that the Armenian genocide is a big lie, a slander, that it is in compliance to the relocation decision of the leading names of the Dashnak movement, Prime Minister Ovanes Katchaznuni who personally experienced the events of 1915, that means that the Ottoman did not make any massacre or genocide, that they made the Armenians who united with the Russians and stabbed the knife in the back of their homeland the Ottomans, to immigrate for the purpose of control, and that in fact the Armenians provoked by the West

has massacred the Muslim population. When we apply the testimony of history, it can be seen that as a result of Europe's propaganda machine and political plans have caused that states, including the Armenians and other Christian elements, have been confronted with their own countries and that these have been reason to experience several negative events by applying non-Muslim elements of the Ottoman Empire, under the shadow of the so-called Armenian genocide allegations against the Turks as atrocities and massacres (Saray, 2003:29-75).

Justin McCarthy, examining in detail the ethnic cleaning and executing process against the Ottoman Muslims between the years of 1821-1922, has made research in relation to how millions of Muslims in the Balkans, the Middle East and Asia have been killed and relocated and also investigated how the ethnic and religious killings which Muslims had been exposed. While the periods, when the Russian Empire's expansionist policy and emerge of new nations in the Balkans came on the stage of history, in Western literature, traditionally are tried to be explained from the point of view of the Christian nations, in the work of Justin McCarthy entitled "Death and Exile", these developments, for the first time, have been explained from the point of view of the Turks and other Muslims who had been the real victims of imperialism, nationalism and ethnic conflict. It was seen that the number of Muslim Turks being subject to death

casualties and forced immigration from the Greek uprising until 1922 appears as ultimately a total of 5.06 million deaths and 5.381 million who have been forced to immigration (McCarthy, 1998:374).

From the Christian communities in the Balkans the Serbs, Greeks, Romanians and Bulgarians took a sample by the subversive and separatist terrorist activities carried out against the Ottoman Empire and Armenians who made several riots from 1890 until 1914, saw the World War I as an opportunity for themselves and they have been in war against the Ottoman Empire, of which they were citizen once, in cooperation with especially Russia and the Other Allies (Öztuna,2006:18). The Armenian committee members, in order to hit the Ottoman armies fighting against Russia from their back and to cut their supply routes, started armed uprisings and murders (Halaçoğlu,2006:135). At the beginning of World War I, the Ottoman government, in the face of this situation, tried to prevent incidents through warnings and administrative measures. In the administrative life of the Ottoman Empire, measures like forced resettlement, immigration acts, relocation to another area, as an policy of exile, from time to time also was applied to Muslim elements, emerges as a method, which the state was forced to use in the face of these developments. The Armenians have continued their activities during the World War I and after the War of Tur-

kish Independence against the Turkish government (Rüstem, 2001,18-45).

NOT ONLY HAD THE ARMENIANS UNDERGONE EXİLE

Analysis of 600 years of Ottoman history, it will be seen that almost in every period when mass movement and riots occurred for various reasons, those involved in the events, had sentenced to “relocation” regardless of religion or ethnic origin. The deportation law issued during the World War I was not only applied to the Armenians but where necessary each ethnic group living in the Ottoman Empire were relocated as needed. For example, due to war conditions, also the Arabs and Greeks temporarily sent from Syria and Medina to Anatolia and Rumeli, were affected by the law of the relocation. In fact, the transportation and housing applied to the Arabs did not differ from those applied to the Armenians (Beyoğlu, 2004: 30-52). This situation, as with the other contemporaries, is the continuation of relocation policy and forced displacement, which was applied in the classical period of the Ottoman Empire for various reasons. As can be seen in many contemporary states, the Ottoman Turkey in this regard has continued its traditional policy and understanding.

This historical application will also be implemented in the years of National Struggle and the Republic where necessary. Even recent history is full of many similar state- applications. The subject

to be discussed here, is why the government decides immigration and relocation whether or not the officers complied with the law of the period, whether or not they have confronted the corruption and abuses in practice (Beyoğlu, 2004:49). For this reason, dispatch and relocation or deportation issues of Armenian event should be evaluated in this context. I.e., the relocation of Armenians, where Armenian citizens have been temporarily sent to safer parts of the country due to war with the relocation and transfer decision of the Ottoman Empire and showing them that at the end of World War I those who want to do so, might go back, alone is the logical extraction that there was nothing as genocide. In fact, some of those who went into exile returned to the old place. Those coming back were supported and ensured ease in any way (Bakar, 2007: 235-252).

As it can be understood by historical data, such relocation was not planned, but was a situation occurring due to war as a forced application after entering into war with the Russians, the fact that the Armenians collaborated with the enemy and started armed rebellion. This co-operation undeniably clearly reveals from the correspondence of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia (Türküzü, 1983:45-80).

As it started as a forced relocation of housing, the arguments put forwards in Armenian related issues, without knowing anything about the issue of reform, its

background and what was made before, were incomplete and misleading. As it can be understood from sources, the most important reason why the Ottoman Empire was drift to the war with Germany and why all Ottoman elements experienced great suffering and disasters, was the political attitude demonstrated and policy pursued by the European powers and especially the United Kingdom and Russia. The thesis and counter-arguments put forward in the debates today, show, that it has been based entirely on the developments in the years 1915-1922. The fact that today, Turkey is left to face the same problem, shows that here has not been much change in the politics of the Western states in this region (Karaca, 1993:170).

THE RE-HEATED ARMENIAN ALLEGATIONS

Propaganda machine have been working under the condition of some of the Western and Armenians, rather than basing their allegations on historical and scientific foundations, prefer to take as a basis the memoir type subjective artifacts/works and use history in a very selective way in compliance to their own interests. In this respect, historical events, are not evaluated in a special cause and effect relationship and are not treated as a whole with a certain consistency in itself, but the arguments in favor of the Armenians are taken and are used as an information warehouse, and history virtually is imp-

risoned in 1915. Thus, the reasons for the Armenian deportations and events of the Armenian organizations during the relocation process and the policies against the Armenians of the big states are tried to be caused to be forgotten, and the Turkish nation is blamed with a scenario, that the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire were subject to genocide in 1915 without any reason. The Humanity's most vile, vulgar imprescriptibly crimes of genocide, which is tried to be attached historically and culturally to the Turkishness as a black mark, is tried to be arrogated to the entire nation.

As stated by İlber Ortaylı, in case that genocide, which constitutes a very serious crime and blame for a society, is adopted, it will be affixed an unfair label to the future Turkish generations and their ancestors (Ortaylı, 2009:198). However, in the second half of the XIX Century and in the first quarter of the XX century, despite of numerous adverse effects experienced by the Turkish nation, or even the incompatible political attitudes of the Armenians and the armed actions, historical sources focusing on these developments and the Turkish folkloric values, show that the Turks did not develop any feelings of racial hatred against non-Muslims or any anti-Armenian feelings especially against the Armenians.

On the contrary, the presence of a deep sense of hatred and anti-Turkism is clearly visible against the Turks especially

in the Armenian clergy and intellectuals and also ordinary Armenians (Karaça,2001:170). In this context, Armenians operating against Turkey, especially towards the end of the Cold War, so to speak from the last periods of the USSR, were seen to have been directed to a target to make the Turks accept the genocide claims at international organizations whose decisions Turkey had to comply with, in order to achieve that Turkey adopts and accepts their requests and wishes.

Since the Armenians knew that the decisions taken by the National parliaments of the state will not impact too much on Turkey, they, in particular, have tended to target international organizations to take decisions (Arslan, 2005:146).

Although many Armenian sources, state that the genocide claims had been accepted by the United Nations and the Council of Europe, this is not true for the moment. However, since the decisions taken by national parliaments would be effective in the decision-making of the United Nations, it can be seen that all of these studies are a preparation and infrastructure stage to achieve that the UN recognizes the Armenian genocide claims (Ataöv,1986:3). The European Commonwealth of which Turkey wants to be a member of, with its decisions it takes, is a transnational corporation with power to impose sanctions on Turkey. The Armenians, achieving that their request, immediately after Turkey's application for

full membership in the EC in 1987, was confirmed by the European Parliament, also have the wish to attain the objectives that the United Nations also takes a similar decision.

ARMENIAN ALLEGATIONS AT THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY AXIS

Nowadays, the Armenian issue, re-entered the European political agenda after a period of 70 years. Until 1965, the Armenians exactly have not made genocide claims for 50 years. When we are seeking for an answer to the question of how it comes that something unthinkable since half a century, has emerged at once, as stated by Ali Tayyar Onder, was the fact that the Western States and especially the USA, who already in 1961 had foreseeing that the Soviet Union would be divided and that five new states would be established in Central Asia, have put into effect their new policy in order to prevent Turkey with its historical and cultural potential to become the leader of these countries and also has put this policy in effect which had foreseen to destroy and divide Turkey as it was planned in 1960, by declaring Turkey as the “new big enemy” in order to prevent Turkey to become leader of the Muslim countries with the purpose to distract the energy reserves in the hand (Önder, 2009: 62).

Considering the historical fact that the Western Countries have no habit of heading to a destination based on histori-

cal events before directing to a concrete and interest-based target and as they do not have a habit of making explanations, it will be not hard to see what meaning the explanations and decisions being converted to a systematic Western policy regarding the Armenians have (Aydoğan, 2004: 402).

Since 1965, ‘Diaspora Armenians’ have started to make black propaganda against Turkey in unity and have begun to intensively utter their claims of genocide which are not related to historical facts described above. In particular, after Turkey had increased its prestige with the London and Zurich Treaties signed in 1959 in order to achieve important rights in the Cyprus issue, in the axis of westernization policies it also had applied to the European Economic Community (EEC) for membership, and wanted to become a member in order to take its place in all institutions in the EEC as an European state (Arslan, 2008:59).

In fact, even Turkey showed such a political will as of the beginning of the relationship and requested membership just as a European state, contrary to this fact according to the preference of the EEC, it consented to be put on the Article 238 (Soysal,1991:654) which was prepared in order to expand the scope of the traditional European exploitations, allowing to make regulations for associate membership of the former colonies, and in order to

regulate the relations of Europe with the former colonies.

As stated by Prof. Dr. Ali Arslan who wrote about this remarkable issue in his book for the first time in Turkey, even this event at the very beginning of the relationship shows from what angle the European with their historical colonial mentality look at the Turks, and that they never consider the Turks to be equal with them, and that they based their relations with Turkey on a basis as explained in this sentence. It was also quite remarkable that in 1963, with the Treaty of Ankara in Turkey, right after being accepted to the associate membership of the EEC, as it was an old colony of Europe, the Armenian patriarch started a multi-dimensional war including propaganda and public diplomacy all around the word against Turkey which tried to become European.

ARMENIAN PROPAGANDA MACHINE

According to Bilal Şimşir this new war had repeated itself as follows: *“To use the Turkish nation for the Armenian ambitions of some collaborators and publishing tools emerging in Turkey in order to carry out the followings: to make systematical publications accusing with the so-called genocide, and the implementation of a relentless propaganda campaign, erection of monuments of genocide in various countries, ostensibly to cherish the memory of the victims of the genocide, but in fact, in order to whip up feelings of hatred and antagonism against the Turkish nation,*

to carry out armed and bomb attacks against the Turkish organizations and Turkish diplomats and to kill diplomats and their family members only because they represent Turkey abroad and because they are Turkish citizens, carrying the Armenian allegations to the political platform and making some local and national parliaments of various countries to take decisions of ‘ recognition of the genocide ‘, using the EU organs as an instruments of repression against Turkey “ (Şimşir, 2007:226-227).

This new Armenian propaganda war which was declared in 1964, since then has survived to the present day going through the various stages. Bilal Şimşir who closely witnessed personally the propaganda campaigns initiated systematically in 1964 upon calls of the patriarchs has issued this subject in his book named “The Armenian Question 1774-2000” within the frame of historical origins, Armenian propaganda in America, the Armenian issue during the War of Independence and the Republican period, the Turkish victims of Armenian terrorism, Turkish martyr diplomats and the Armenian issue during the EU accession process. Considering the events and developments coming from the past and covering today all together, it is seen that the arguments put forward, have been put into practice in accordance to the 4T plan, (Terör, Tanıma, Tazminat, Toprak), “Terror, Recognition, Compensation, Territory “. Introducing the Armenian genocide, to the public opinion of the world

as terrorism means to realize the 3T requests with the 4T plan.

Especially Russia, USA, France, Greece, Cyprus, Syria, Lebanon and many other European states openly or secretly supporting the Armenian terrorism are supporting the Armenians and do sympathize them. The Christian countries having an antipathy against the Ottoman Empire which had the leadership in the Islamic world for centuries, had no antipathy at all in terms of the terrorist actions perpetrated by the Armenians whom they thought that they had been hard done (Saraya, 2003:134).

Propaganda machine was working in a period where Turkey's concerns about the on the Cyprus issue with the U.S. and EU increased, Turkey made efforts to create its own policies in this regard, the fact that the Armenian Churches controlled by the West and the anti-Turkey policies of the Armenians became more powerful, directed the Turkey- EC / EU relations in another direction. ASALA (Hyland, 1991: 26) was established in Beirut in 1975 and the PKK was established the same year in Syria Bekaa and both organizations with the terrorism they applied by surprisingly getting powerful, gave serious damage to Turkey (Karakoç, 2008:52). Armed-bomb attacks against Turkish diplomats first started in the United States and then concentrated in the formerly EC and present EU countries.

This situation created the terrorist phase as the first phase of the 4T plan. The most Armenian attacks against Turkish diplomats, between the EU members were realized in France and Austria. Especially France was leading with 8 attacks, 17 dead and 71 wounded people (Şimşir, 2005:231-234). France today is the ringleader of those who oppose Turkey's EU membership, and is followed by Austria. We wonder if it a coincidence that these two countries which tolerated the Armenian killings yesterday, today strongly oppose Turkey's EU membership.

In 1985 after a period of 10 years of armed attacks and terrorism of ASALA, the Armenian arguments became politicized in accordance with the 4T Plan, and after this date almost all western countries and especially EC/EU began to take "Armenian genocide" decisions. From the EU countries, at first the Parliament of Greece, with the decision dated April 25, 1996 determined April, 24 to be of day of commemoration of the genocide of the Armenians by the Turks (http://www.eraren.org//bilgibankasi/tr/index1_2_4.htm). Access Date:20.12.2012

A striking issue was that while it was discussed at the parliaments, the decision taken by the European Parliament in relation to the Armenian Genocide in 1987, which we will be examining in detail below, was shown as reference decision.

The fact that ASALA terrorist acts of terrorism suddenly stopped, and then was

drawn to an international political ground creating a justification for terror with unfounded, baseless and arguments not in compliance with historical facts in order to convert them to legitimate politics; shows that the Armenian issue, was pre-programmed and put in the Western policies and that this would be used as a political pressure element against Turkey.

In this context, classifying the Armenian issue in the historical process, the period from after the 1877-78 Ottoman-Russian War, when imperial powers were created and from the beginning of the Armenian question directed by being converted into an ethno political identity, until the period of the establishment of the Turkish Republic after the victory of the War of Independence, will be referred to as FIRST WAVE, The Turkish hostility and victimization policy in the Republican period, the problem, which traditionally has been forgotten by the Turks, which almost was wiped from the national mind, and which was restructured with lies far from reality, and then transferred in order to increase the coefficient of hatred in every generation and in parallel was tried to be shown as the cause for anything negatively experienced in Diaspora, and thus the average perception of the Armenians about the Turks was turned into an image of any kind of evil and negativity, was used successfully by the Armenians. By again pressing the button after the Cyprus Peace Operation the process from 1974 until the 1983 Paris Orly Airport

massacre can be seen as SECOND WAVE. During this period, the beginning of the massacre of Turkish diplomats and acts of terrorism by establishing a treacherous ambush, contain the assassinations and attacks realized by the heir of the tradition of the Dashnak terrorism group, namely the ASALA and the Justice Commandos of the Armenian Genocide and this constitutes the terrorist part of the 4T plan (Özbek, 2008).

The process in which the so-called Armenian genocide allegations have been introduced to the world through terrorism and the stage of their recognition process, is the Third Wave, in which we are still living. The third wave is a stage where no bombs are thrown, no bullets are fired, embassies are not busted, and here issues are handled in political platforms and parliaments, and by claiming that the XX Century's first genocide was carried out by the Turks, it is requested that Turks accept this issue, they are alleged with. Immediately after the Armenian terror based on hatred, they were striving hard to make Turkey to accept it through political channels. In fact, the city councils, national parliaments, the European Union Parliament approved draft law stating that the Turks are responsible for the Armenian genocide, and did even put these in effect. The Armenian genocide is imposed to Turkey at the state parliaments and the European Parliament in order to achieve that the Turks accept the recognition of the Armenian Genocide and that

relevant issues are handled. The fact that the Armenian Diaspora organizations enhanced their activities, that various countries' parliaments one after another put into effect the Armenian Genocide laws and the Armenian allegations, thanks to the decisions taken by the EP, have become an element of pressure in international relations of Turkey and have even become a tool used by some countries against Turkey. Especially from the fact that those who do not want Turkey to enter the EU perform politics by means of using this topic, and against the "other" or better to say the "enemy" Turkey, both themselves and Armenians, are earning benefit (Arslan, 2005:126). With reference to the decisions of the European Parliament concerning the Turkey-EU relations, the issue to accept these allegations and to recognize the genocide is given as conditions for the acceptance of Turkey's full membership (Arslan, 2005: 146).

Thus, the Armenian allegations are connected to Turkey's EU accession process, and through the European Parliament, either directly or indirectly with various sleeves, it is requested to accept these allegations and to recognize the so-called genocide is given as conditions for the acceptance to full membership.

RESOLUTIONS OF EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT THAT RECOGNIZING THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Since the 1980s, the EP, playing a decisive role in the relations between Turkey and

the EC/EU, in particular after the formal application of Turkey for membership in the European Community, came to the agenda by taking important decisions. With institutional changes in the EU, it was seen that the powers of the European Parliament representing the will of the Europeans in the period after 1980 gradually started to be increased and that in parallel it tried to show its strength on Turkey (Poyraz, 2009:149-199).

It was observed that it was the European Parliament, which stated EU's demands to Turkey in an understandably language far from the diplomatic language, in the most obvious and quite rude way and that the decisions taken later were put into effect as decisions taken by the Council or the Commission in the later process. Therefore, in order to analyze the attitude and policies of the EU towards Turkey it should be taken advantage of decisions taken by the EP. As pointed out in this regard by Bilal Şimşir: *"We formally appealed for EU membership in 1987. Since then Europe was thinking "the more pressure we can apply on them the more will be gain profit" and as such they took out of the shelves any moldy existing files and began to put them into our faces. Particular, the European Parliament took decisions in this regard. But our newspapers ignore these decisions, whether they do ignore them or release them after trimming these. And when the news emerge they try to calm down our public by saying 'Do not worry, the decision of the EP are not important, it is the decision of the commission*

which are essential But then we have a look and what do we see, a decision adopted by the European Parliament, for example, five years later, within the EU's complex decision-making process this time turns out as a decision of the commission " (Şimşir, 2006:10).

The European Commission, never ignores the decisions of the European Parliament as it is thought in Turkey, the commission is taking these decisions into account. In the examinations it makes, reports it prepares, it always is referring to the decisions of the EP. Although in Turkey the resolutions of the EP are referred to as recommended resolutions, it is important as part of the European acquis and with reference to these decisions, similar decisions are taken by other EU institutions. On the other hand, when the European Commission adopts a decision, they are putting these in the face of candidate countries for membership saying "since you're becoming a member of the EU, then you have to accept them" (Şimşir, 2006:10). Within this frame, the decisions taken by the EP on the Armenian question, can be seen as one of the most important criteria of the EU's approach to the Armenian problem.

REFERENCE EP DECISION DATED JUNE 18, 1987

The EP's decision of recognizing the Armenian genocide was saying "the Armenian incidents in the years 1915-1917 are found to be in compliance to the definition of genocide in the decision of the Uni-

ted Nations dated December 9, 1948 and declares the decision and asks the Turkish government to accept it. It declares that it will be a final barrier for Turkey's membership of the EU if Turkey rejects this phenomenon", immediately after ASALA laid down their weapons. Since the decision dated June 18, 1987, which was taken in relation to the Armenian problem right after Turkey's application for full membership of the European Community has been accepted and was shown as reference decision for every decisions to be taken later and the reports, it can be said that this is the most comprehensive decision and the timing of taking this decision is quite remarkable (Arslan, 2008:126-149). Therefore, all of the decision will be discussed in this part of the study.

This decision made reference to relevant proposal given earlier at the EP, writing proposals and reports and contained provisions relation to the Armenian problem of biased manner, that were quite disturbing Turkey in. The decision emphasizes that the Armenian side evaluate the events of 1915 as genocide planned under the 1948 United Nations Convention, but that the Turkish Nation refuses this on grounds that the accuses are groundless charges of genocide.

According to the decision, the EP is sure that adoption of the minorities identity of Armenian people living in Turkey in terms of ethnic, linguistic and religious

elements, begins with the adoption of their own history. The member states invite the community to dedicate a day of memory to especially the massacres and crimes carried out against the Armenians and Jews in the 20th Century. In this context, the EP with the decision of 1987 declares to make an important support of an initiative to encourage talks between the Armenian and Turkish peoples.

The Turkish nation is accused with the most vulgar and ignominious crime of humanity which is genocide and which has no written or oral cultural-historical sub-structure and which legally is not being able to lapse of time. Furthermore it is illogical and non – moral to make the Turkish nation accept the genocide with an assumption without any historical, legal and scientific devoid of any foundation, stating that the Turks caused genocide of the Armenians and that the only responsible for this is the Ottoman Empire. As stated by Gunduz Aktan, since in the Ottoman Empire there was no such thing as an anti-Armenianism feeling similar to the anti-Semitism of the Nazis against Jews , e.g. there was no racist hatred against the Armenians, here relocation has not been made with the purpose to destroy the Armenians as a group. The decision to expel, was given in order to prevent the movement against the armies of the Ottoman started with the historical treaty of Armenia and Russia, with which Armenia, within the framework of friendship and cooperation, merged with the

Russian occupation army and also to prevent the Turks and Muslims who made up 84% of the population in the East at the region called ‘Vilayat-i sitte’ , being eliminated with an ethnical cleaning in genocidal proportions as it happened in the Balkans. The reason of relocation on one hand was directed to military requirements and on the other, to defend the existence of the Turkish-Muslim population, what could not have been achieved in the Balkan.

GREEK-ARMENIAN COOPERATION

Article 4 of the above examined decision about the recognition of the Armenian genocide by the European Parliament dated June 18, 1987, even the wishes of the Greek, and the political Kurdsists have been taken into account and it is said that “Genocide applied against the Armenians must be accepted by the Young Turk government; the government must be willing to apply international law rules for the differences of opinion with Greece, to hold the Turkish forces invading in Cyprus, to deny the existence of the Kurdish issue, the absence of a real parliamentary democracy, to have no respect against individual and collective freedoms, and in particular religious freedom in Turkey and similar elements, are ‘insurmountable obstacles’ to prevent Turkey to participate in the community (*European Parliament, Resolution on a Politi-*

cal Solution to the Armenian Question, Doc. A2-33/87 , 18.06.2007)

These problems identified by the EP in the process will be brought to Turkey with all its weight and depth by politicizing them. At the time this decision was discussed and strongly condemned in the Parliament of Turkey. The approach of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the period is as follows: "We do feel regret about the Decision accepted by the European Parliament, which is completely contrary to historical facts, one-sided and full with unfair accuses about our country, as the government we do not accept this decision. The resolution adopted, on the Armenian issue, is not only giving place to completely unrealistic claims, but at the same time, also includes unfounded allegations of Turkey's in hostile environments which have nothing to do at all with this issue such as the Cyprus issue and Greek-Turkish relations. In the same way, expressions to serve some of the aims of known separatist elements, are also included in the text of the decision The resulting table, reveals how hostile environments of Turkey are in a cooperation. So far, if there are any persons wondering who at least morally supports the terrorist organizations carrying out criminal activities against Turkey, it will be enough for them to read the text of the draft which was adopted. The sad thing about this issue is that those who are not willing to make settlements in issues such as the Cyprus issue through negotiati-

ons, are taking refuge in the shadow of the Armenian militant organization, and have chosen the path to express their own views ...

According to the European Union acquis, the European Parliament is not an institution judging historical events, but by taking a political decision by becoming party of an historical event with which it has nothing to do, it has become a pressure element against Turkey. Moreover, even here during the draft of the resolution, hostile environments of Turkey came together and shared attitudes showcasing a historical-political hatred.

On the other hand, another striking effect, is the historical Greek- Armenian cooperation's size rising above the common hatred against Turkey starting at the end of the XIX century. Greeks and Armenians, in the First World War, have proved their hatred of the highest level being reached by terror activities applied before and after the war by fighting together against their common enemy, the Turks. As you remember, from the moment it was founded on the territory of the Ottoman, Greece won soil against Turkey and was enlarging continuously, and this was taken as an example by the Armenians. In other words, the smaller the Turkish territory became, the more grew Greece.

Finally, by spreading from Izmir to Anatolia, it has tried to realize its megalia idea but was confronted with Turkish national

resistance led by Mustafa Kemal. One of those coming to Turkey during the years of occupation and witnessing the persecution made by the Greek army in Anatolia was Prof. Arnold Toynbee. Events he experienced, according to his own words, greatly changed the view of him against the Greeks and the Turks. This British historian who was sent in order to make propaganda and to witness rebirth of the ancient Greek civilization in Anatolia, gave a document at his return, documenting the contrary, namely the brutality of the Greek, and condemning the government's imperialist policies, promoting these atrocities. This, at least for them who had sent him there, constituted a disappointment with a scandal grade. For this reason, the smear propaganda campaign started against him continued unabated until he left the university (Toynbee, 2007:5).

Remembering that during and after the period when the Greeks were gaining independence, was taken as an example by the Armenians, during the stage of expansion of the territory, Greece benefited from the continuous support and assistance of the Western countries, it will be seen that there is nothing much changed in this respect today. Since Europe also today stands behind Greece and Armenia, and supports them, Greece wants to become dominant on Cyprus and the Aegean region and Armenia want to become dominant at Nagorno-Karabakh and Azerbaijan and thus continue to

implement historical policies (Manisalı, 2003:10).

In fact, history is full of genocides against Turks. Since the Turks do not know to lament for the dead or since this is not placed in their culture, genocides, and suffer against the Turks was never engraved in history, the suffering experienced was not transferred to future generations and were quickly forgotten.

However, history is full of events where the Turks were always confronted with genocide, after they retreat in the West from Vienna, from the Balkans and in the East from the Caucasus. In Vienna, Mora, in the Balkans, recently in Bosnia, in Azerbaijan it has always been the Turks and Muslims who were subjected to genocide. Considering the Caucasus, it can be seen that history pages of the last two centuries are full with genocides against the Turks. In the Khanate of Erevan, in Baku, Gence, it always have been the Turks who have been massacred. But today, what a contradiction it again is the Turkish Nation being exposed to these accusations of the Western public opinion. The Armenians, taking the events experienced on the Balkans as an example and realizing the first planned deportation and genocide on Azerbaijani territories between the years 1905-1907 in order to establish Great Armenia, in the years 1915-1918-20 once more forced the Turks to leave their land. They attempted to do the same thing in Anatolia, but had found the Ottoman

administration against them. Azerbaijani Turks living in Armenia during the USSR period, were subject to great migration in the years 1948-53 and approximately 150 thousand Azerbaijanis were expelled from the historic homeland Armenia and the Azerbaijani Turks were subjected to genocide for the third time. Last genocide was realized in front of the eyes of the modern world with conflicts that started in 1988. The Nagorno-Karabakh which turned into armed conflict in 1988, in short time flooded beyond the borders of Nagorno-Karabakh, and military achievements gained at the front gave the Armenian the possibility to come to the interior of the Azerbaijanis. As a result, 20 percent of Azerbaijan's territory has been occupied by the forces of Armenia (İlbay, 2009).

On the other hand, the Greeks just like the French, at the Lausanne Peace Negotiations did speak in favor of Armenians and did not hesitate to receive plenty of Armenian immigrants in their country. The Greeks, after Lausanne, dealing with their internal and external problems, in the Cyprus issue which was uncovered by the directives of the British from 1960, seeing old friends Armenians on their side, had given permission to its old allies for the establishment of the Armenian Community Committee" in Athens, Piraeus, Thessaloniki and Nicosia, and at the 50th anniversary of the events of 1915, supported the Armenians, applying to the United Nations for rights. A joyous celebration of Memorial Day ceremonies April 24 were

provided to the Armenians and the Greek Interior Minister Tsirimokos speaking at these ceremonies, accused the Turks of cruelty and slaughter against the Armenians. Greece, as in political Kurdish partisan issues, also became the most ardent advocate of the Armenian issue, (Çitlioğlu,2009:15-45)) and the April 24th memorial day, every year is memorized with the participation of the members of the Greek government, political parties, the archbishop of Athens and academics, and hostile speeches are continued to be held on this occasion. These meetings held in Greece are also joined by the Beirut Armenian Church and representatives of the Armenian and Greek communities in Cyprus (Saray,2003:135-136) Many more similar examples can be given.

In the international arena the sacred Armenian-Greek cooperation continues by being shaped on the historical Turkish hostility, and the Greek and Armenian lobbies with a great solidarity in the European Parliament, are continuing to have an influence on the decisions taken against Turkey. As can be seen in this decision, in terms of both the Armenian genocide, as well as the Cyprus issue, decisions supporting arguments of both sides were taken at the same time. Games played on Cyprus should be evaluated in this context.

POST- 1999 PERIOD

Turkey's EU candidacy, coming to the agenda once more with the 1999 Helsin-

ki Summit, gave some sections in the EP the opportunity to come up again with the issue of the Armenian genocide and this subject, usually were discussed during the examination of the reports prepared by the European Commission on Turkey at the Parliament. Moreover, the EP, putting into force the 1987 decision identifying the Armenian genocide with the Holocaust and being accepted with its various dimensions, was converted into a pressure element in EU's relations with Turkey and Turkey will always be confronted with this decision as this decision was referred to in several decisions and reports on various bases which we will define below. After the 1987 decision, the European Parliament, in relation to the so-called Armenian genocide took decisions in 2000, 2002 and 2005 with the same quality and nearly the same rhetoric. In one of these decisions the EP states, "the Turkish Government and the Grand National Assembly of Turkey is invited to accept in front of the public the genocide to which the Armenian minority was exposed to especially prior to the establishment of modern state of in order to provide a fresh support for the Armenian minority which forms an important part of Turkish society" (European Parliament, *European Parliament resolution on the 1999 Regular Report from the Commission on Turkey's progress towards accession* (COM (1999) 513-C5-0036/2000-2000/2014 (COS),15.11.2000).

It was determined that two more articles in relation to the so-called Armenian genocide had been added to this decision which was taken with the weighted votes of left-wing parties and with the subject "the steps taken by Turkey towards full membership in the EU". In this decision, the EP is claiming that the Armenians constitute an important part of Turkish society and wants the Turkish Government to officially recognize the genocide suffered by the Armenian minority. In the other article added Turkey is invited to establish normal diplomatic and trade relations with Armenia and to lift the embargo. As it can be understood from this decision, the EP supports the official thesis of Armenia in an historical event and thus becomes a political party of it and it also can be reached the conclusion that it acts one sided and biased against Turkey.

In fact, these requests, in diplomatic arrangements with different formats, will take place in the first "Turkey's Progress Report" prepared after the adaption of Turkey's EU membership application. Although, since 1998, there was not made any direct evaluation of the Armenian issue in the progress reports on Turkey's EU accession process which is published by the EU Commission each year, the 2000 Progress Report states that Turkey made some initiatives by contributing peace and stability in the Caucasus, and that the most important element of this initiatives is that the Stability Pact was not sufficient for the Caucasus, to elimi-

nate the unstable condition due to the continuance of the Karabakh issue, and it is reminded that Turkey still keeps closed its border with Armenia (.Commission of the European Communities, 2000 Regular Report on Turkey's Progress Towards Accession, 8.11.2000, http://europa.eu.int/comm/enlargement/report_11_00/pdf/en/tu_en.pdf s.67) Access Date:03.12.2009

By the 2000s, it is seen that now in Western capitals the 25th establishment anniversary celebrations of ASALA are made (Bayar, 2000), that in Europe and America one after the other Armenian genocide decisions taken almost in an epidemic way, and that Armenian propaganda is ongoing and even being spread. In fact, France will announce the year 2006 as the year of Armenia (Hürriyet 2005).

The decision of the European Union in relation to the 2011 Progress Report does not include any word about the "genocide", but relations with Armenia were evaluated in this decision. For the re-establishment of dialogue between Azerbaijan and Armenia it is requested from Turkey to take an active role in this issue, and it is also asked to lift the embargo of Armenia. In the report it is mentioned that the border between Turkey and Armenia is still closed, and they confined themselves by emphasizing that an unofficial "Turkish-Armenian Reconciliation Commission" was created in order to achieve a development in the dialogue and

mutual understanding about economy, tourism, culture, education, research, the environment and mass media tools (Commission of the European Communities, 2001 Regular Report on Turkey's Progress Towards Accession, SEC(2001) 1756, 13.11.2001) However, the "genocide" issue, will appear again when the European Parliament in 2002 examines another report about the relations with the South Caucasus countries.

In the footnote of the explanations sections of a decision taken on February 28, 2002 by the EP with the heading "South Caucasus Report" which also did contain arguments of the Armenian genocide and, contrary to the other reports also used the name of Atatürk it is said as follows: "The fact that Genocide was recognized by the EP and some European countries, that at the end of the First World War, some responsible of the Turkish Regime were sentenced with some severe penalties due to the offence of genocide may constitute a basis for a suggestion of the EU for Turkey to bring this problem to a conclusion... Kemal Atatürk in his speech at the National Assembly dated April 10, 1921, came to the conclusion that the Young Turks regime, during the First World War, conducted genocide against the Armenian people." (EU Relations with South Caucasus, P5_TA(2002)0085 A5-0028/2002).

It is remarkable that European Parliament claims that Atatürk accepted that the Turks committed Armenians genoci-

de, and brings it into an act of parliament. However, contrary to these claims, there is no record of sources, stating that Atatürk recognized the Armenian genocide, and this also is not contained in his Parliamentary speech dated April 10, 1921. That means, Atatürk did not make any speech on April 10, 1921 in the Parliament, the Assembly protocols are clearly available (Bozdağ,2009).This decision alone shows that the allegations are unfounded and do lack from sincerity, and also shows the great damaging dimensions in the relationship.

In the meantime, the European Armenian Federation continuing its lobby and propaganda activities on December 3 2002, did send an anti-Turkey call to the governments of the 15 EU member countries, and stated that Turkey increased to apply pressure in terms achieving a date of accession of Turkey before the EU peak meeting to be held on 12-13 December 2002, and asked them not to give the genocidal, denying and aggressive Turkey a date for negotiations. In this paper published by the Armenians besides of serious human rights violations, it is specified that they do not want Turkey to be given a date for negotiations due to its general insensitivity against moral values and the ideals of peace and justice generally identifying Europe (Lütem, 2003:31). In the European Parliament resolution on the 2002 Progress Report, by putting the phrase “the solution of the Cyprus problem and the normalization of relations with Armenia,

of course is included in the issues prescribing the fulfillment of the Copenhagen criteria”, it was attempted to link the “genocide” issue to the Copenhagen criteria. It is seen that this request overlaps with the call of the European Armenian Federation stating that ‘Turkey’s recognition of the Armenian genocide, is the basic condition to become a member of the EU within the framework of democracy and human rights criteria”. Since in the Copenhagen Criteria to which countries wishing to join the EU must comply with, there is nothing said about the adoption of the so-called Armenian genocide, the Armenians, try to impose that democracy and human rights criteria also covers this issue (Lütem, 2003:25-27).

After the European Parliament took a new recommendation decision in this issue on December 15, 2004. The EP General Assembly, by secret ballot, accepted the Eurlings Report which created new pressure fields against Turkey and which requested Turkey to accept the Armenian genocide (Eurlings,2004:3). It is again remarkable that this report, openly accusing Turkey of genocide, wanting Turkey to accept the genocide against the Armenians in 1915 and wanting from Turkey to open the border with Armenia, was adopted two days before the December 17, 2004 EU Summit.

In this resolution it is stated that the borders between Turkey and Armenia are still closed and that the Turkish leaders

missed a good opportunity to establish good neighborly relations with Armenia, and emphasizes that the Turkish authorities failed to comply with other aspects of the Armenian question stated in the decision of the European Parliament dated 1987. In the European Parliament decision, with the purpose that Turkey and Armenia clearly overcome the tragic experiences of the past, if possible, with the help of an independent committee of a board of assessors, it is believed to continue the process of reconciliation, and Turkey is requested to open its border with Armenia in the shortest possible time. The keep good relation to your neighbors- pressure of the EU in relation to Turkey also includes Armenia and Greece.

In the draft report issued by Dutch MEP Camiel Eurlings of the EP Foreign Affairs Committee, not only the Armenian issue but also other requests that contain a variety of topics is seen to be contrary to the national interests of Turkey. While Turkey has hard times to get used to the EU's demands on the Cyprus issue, the EP report constituting a source for the progress report is full of fantasies, so to speak, it is officially being asked from Turkey to recognize the genocide, and Turkey is seen as the reason and responsible for the death of all the people known to have lived in Anatolia. As can be seen from these examples, the decisions of the European Parliament, much more do reflect the opinions of the Armenian than the European Commission reports. It is

remarkable that the EP, at various times, although in different subjects, insists that Turkey recognizes the so-called Armenian genocide, and to open its border with Armenia.

The only thing of the decisions of the Commission on what the Armenians will not be pleased, is that it was requested that the tragic experiences of the past shall be examined by an independent, two-sided committee of experts. Since they claim that the Armenian "genocide" is sufficiently proven, they do not support this expertise.

In the 21st paragraph of the declaration, accepted after the Summit December 17, 2004; the European Council refers to the decision taken by the European Parliament two days on December 15, 2004. In fact, this issue is also included in the European Commission progress report dated October 6, 2004. In the report instead of the phrase "genocide", with diplomatic word games it is used the phrase "tragic events" which could be accepted by Turkey. In addition, after requesting the establishment of diplomatic relations between Turkey and Armenia and prompting to open the land border in the report, the events of 1915 are mentioned as another important issue. In this respect, the fact that the final summit declaration dated December 17, 2004 points to the decision of the EP, in terms of Turkey shows that as of the approach to the Armenian issue in the commission's report

dated October 6, 2004 it is being gone backwards. From legal aspects the decisions of the summit are more effective than decisions of the commission. Since the EU Summit in Brussels, accepted the decision foreseeing to grant a date for accession negotiations for Turkey to the EU, the Turkish public opinion celebrated this in a festive air (Milliyet,2005) and it was considered that Turkey had entered the EU (Hürriyet, 2005).

A few days before Turkey's accession negotiations, on September 28, 2005, the EP adopted another decision more, particularly including the recognition of Southern Cyprus, and also including claims of the Armenian genocide and demands and complaints of the EU countries in relation to Turkey. Article J of the introductory section of this decision stipulates that the Turkish authorities, not yet fulfilled the demands of the European Parliament's decision of June 18, 1987 in relation to the Armenian issues. Article 5 of the process section of this decision invites Turkey to recognize the Armenian genocide, and it was stated, that this recognition is a precondition for joining the European Union.

The EP thus has once more proved its attitude against the so-called Armenian genocide. These decisions of the EP is such an important issue with important political, strategic and economical dimensions for Turkey that cannot be passed off with a defense stating: "the decisions of the

European Parliament is not binding but only advisory and shows the trends of the Parliament. According to Article 4, 6 and 10 of the EU Negotiating Framework Document in relation to the participation, dated October 3, 2005 signed by Turkey, "being bond to the condition of accepting of all decisions, declarations, etc. taken by EU institutions..." (<http://ekutup.gov.tr/ab/muzakere/cerceve.pdf>,10,10,2005). Access Date:13.12.2007

The resolution to the Armenian Genocide taken by many European states and the European Parliament is to be accepted and will be binding for Turkey. Thus, since decisions taken by the EP are part of the EU acquis, these will be binding for Turkey more than only being of nature of an advice (Teori, 2005: 3-8). Since the "The adoption of the Armenian Genocide" is not included in the Copenhagen criteria, and although in all other documents related to Turkey's candidacy, and latest in the Negotiating Framework document the records in relation to the request from Turkey to recognize the genocide claims are given with clear and precise terms, it was focused on this issue with diplomatic word games.

However, interpreting the above mentioned articles of the Negotiation Framework documents, we see the decisions taken by the EP, and it is understood that this situation if not now then in the near future will make Turkey to be obliged to accept the decision. In addition, since the

negotiations will also be held with Member States, also the Member States will be able to put their wishes on a separate table. Indeed, France, (Chirac, 2006). Netherlands and Austria have already said that they will discuss the Armenian “genocide” during the negotiations (Cumhuriyet, 2006).

If, during the negotiations, Turkey does not want to discuss this issue or indicates that it will not recognize the genocide claims, these countries will have the right to “veto” Turkey’s EU membership. Under normal circumstances it could be considered that Turkey’s EU accession process cannot be hold only for the “genocide” issue. However, if at the FP in the future, Turkey’s negotiations could be completed successfully and a Treaty of accession could be prepared, there is the possibility that the EP does not approve the Treaty of accession as long as Turkey does not take into consideration the decision of 1987 and other decisions taken in the same subjects in the ongoing period, and does not recognize the so-called Armenian genocide, and this possibility seems to be strong (Koç, 2005:36).

On the other hand, the demands of the EU in relation to the Armenian Genocide are also a part of the plan of giving a part of Turkey to the Armenians. Enlargement commissioner Olli Rehn speaking in the EP session held in Strasbourg on September 28, 2005, officially imposed the genocide in the Parliament and several

times recalled that the AP with its decisions accepted several times the motion of Turkey’s recognition of the Armenian genocide and again in 2004, took this decision and strongly defended that the Armenian should be a prerequisite for Turkey (Rehn, 2005).

OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND CONCLUSIONS

The Armenian issue which reached a damaging stage in terms of Turkey’s foreign policy and its relations with other countries, now is much far from being a historical problem and now is politicized especially by performing public diplomacy and lobbying of Armenians and European parliaments. Genocide claims nowadays taken up by the parliaments of several countries to their agenda, and becoming enacted in states such as Greece and France, have been carried in the leadership of the EP to the EU platforms and have been connected to Turkey’s accession process.

Evaluating the Armenian issue in the light of the facts and documents, it can be seen that it has no historical, scientific and legal basis for Armenian claims. This situation brings into mind that a new version of a pressure diplomacy, which was put into the sheath of a variety of colors and prints from 1878 to 1914 is exhibited. In recent years, Turkey is intensively accused of Armenian genocide, and especially in April of each year, the number of these attacks increases and becomes almost of-

fensive. It can clearly be seen who all of these policies, encourage the Armenians not to recognize the existing borders and to make demand for new land as a repetition of history.

It is necessary to evaluate the so-called Armenian genocide allegations of which propaganda is made and which are announced to the world with assassinations and terrorism and then are enacted at parliaments, within the frame of the 4T plan. The Armenian issue, which is reheated with allegations of genocide, now is beyond being a historical dimension and are put to the forefront in terms of international relations, and again has become a damaging factor for relations with some countries and an obstacle in front of Turkey's foreign policy especially after the Cold War. Looking at developments in the EU and around the world, approaches, which are often expressed in Turkish public opinion and decision-circles in Europe stating "we are not able to promote ourselves better", "The Armenian Diaspora finds support" or "Let's leave history to historians" are not the type of problem-solving approaches. It is necessary to analyze the issue very good. The subject is not only limited to the European Parliament resolutions and reports. The decisions taken in relation to the genocide of the Armenians in Europe and America and practices are coordinated.

The fact that in various forms and intervals, decisions have been taken against

the Turks in direction of committing genocide against Armenians in 1915 and the approach shown as justification for this has become a basic policy of the West with an integrity. Consensus provided on the subject shows that Turkey is not able to understand the goal it is directed to and its importance, also is an political and social deficiency. It is seen that the basic aim of the European Armenian Federation which is a subsidiary of the Dashnak Party and is Brussels-based, is to ensure that especially Turkey recognizes the genocide, and that Turkey only is accepted to the European membership after fulfilling entire demands of the entire Armenians, in other words, to ensure that these demands shall be a perquisite for full membership of Turkey.

The full membership in the EU adventure of Turkey which departed from being a rational choice and turned into an untold adventure of passion, has become a tool of the Armenian psychological operations. It has become a tool that adversely affects the image of the country, which have been used by some countries against Turkey concerning international relations, international law areas. From the above mentioned decisions, it can be seen that the Armenian issue which has occupied Turkey's domestic and foreign policy for many years, and more like is going to occupy it for much more time, in the recent time completely has been inflicted from its historical reality and has

become a foreign policy putting forwards demands unacceptable for Turkey.

In short, some countries wanting to prevent Turkey's EU membership have used the Armenian issue as a tool and will always be able to use the Armenian allegations. Because the European Parliament decision dated June 18, 1987 recognizing the Armenian genocide, and then the decisions taken with reference to this decision, are drawing the route of this and make it quite easier.

REFERENCES

ARSLAN, A., (2005). Kutsal Ermeni Papalığı Eçmiyazın Kilisesi'nde Stratejik Savaşlar, İstanbul: Truva Yayınları.

ARSLAN, A., (2008). Efendi ve Uşak Avrupa Birliği- Türkiye İlişkileri, İstanbul: İskenderiye Yayınları.

AYDIN, M., (2008). Bulgarlar ve Ermeniler Arasında Amerikan Misyonerleri, İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi.

ACER, Y., (2003). "Terörizm Kavramı Açısından Ermeni Terörü ve Genel Nitelikleri ", Ermeni Araştırmaları, Kış 2003, cilt :2, sayı: 8, s. 114- 136

AYDOĞAN, M., (2004). Avrupa Birliği'nin Neresindeyiz Tanzimattan Gümrük Birliğine, İzmir: Umay Yayınları, 9.Baskı.

BAKAR, B., ÖZTÜRK, N., & BEYOĞLU, B., (eds), (2007). Tarihi Gerçekler

ve Bilimin Işığında Ermeni Sorunu, İstanbul: IQ Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık.

BEYOĞLU, S., (2004). "Ermeni Propandasının Gölgelediği Gerçek: Tehcir Kanunu ve I.Dünya Savaşı'nda Arap Tehciri ", Türk Kültürü İncelemeleri Dergisi, İstanbul: KOCAV Yayıncılık, sayı:11, Güz 2004, s. 30-52

BOZDAĞ, İ., (2009). Çankaya Özel Arşiv Belgelerinde Atatürk Soykırım İddialarını Reddediyor Tarihin Vicdanını Sızlatan Soykırım Yalanı, İstanbul: Truva Yayınları.

CHIRAC, J., (2006). " Chirac: Soykırım AB Şartı", Sabah, 1.10.2006.

Commission of the European Communities, 2000 Regular Report on Turkey's Progress Towards Accession, 8.11.2000 http://europa.eu.int/com/enlargement/report_11_00/pdf/en/tu_en.pdf Access Date:20.12.2000

CUMHURİYET, (2006). "Fransa 'soykırım' Tasarısını Isıtıyor", 30.09.2006.

ÇİTLİOĞLU, E., (2009). Ölümciül Tahterevallı Ermeni ve Kürt Sorunu, Ankara: Destek Yayınları, 5.baskı.

EURLINGS, C., (2004). Avrupa Parlamentosu İlke Kararı, Dış İlişkiler Komitesi Katılıma Doğru Türkiye'nin İlerlemesine Dair 2004 tarihli Avrupa Komisyonu'nun Tavsiyesi ve Düzenli Raporu Hakkında, (COM (220) 0656-C6-0148/2004-2004/2182(INI)), T.C. Adalet Bakanlığı Avrupa Birliği

- genel Müdürlüğü tarafından tercüme edilmiş versiyonu Ankara, 16 Aralık 2004.
- ENGİN, V., (2005).** *II. Abdülhamid ve Dış Politika, İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi.*
- ENGİN, V.,(2007).** *Kurtlar Sofrasındaki Osmanlı, İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi.*
- EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, (2002).** *Report on the Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on the European Union's Relations with the South Caucas, under the Partnership and Cooperation Agreements (COM(1999) 272-C5- 0116/1999 -1999/2119 (COS)), 28.02.2002. EU Relations with South Caucas, P5_TA(2002)0085 A5-0028/2002, Article 19.*
- EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, (1987).** *Resolution on a political solution to the Armenian question , Doc. A2- 33/87*
- EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, (2004).** *1999-2004 Session Final Document 19 March 2004 A5-0204/2004, Arie M. Oostlander Report on the 2003 Regular Report of the Commission on Turkey's Progress Towards Accession (COM(2003) 676 – SEC(2003) 1212 – C5-0535/2003– 2003/2204(INI)), Committee on Foreign Affairs, Human Rights Common Security and Defence Policy.*
- EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, (2000).** *resolution on the 1999 Regular Report*
- from the Commission on Turkey's progress towards accession (COM (1999) 513-C5- 0036/2000-2000/2014 (COS)),15.11.2000.*
- HALAÇOĞLU, Y., (2006).** *Sürgünden Soykırıma Ermeni İddiaları, İstanbul: Babiali Kültür Yayıncılığı.*
- HYLAND, F, P., (1991).** *Armenian Terrorism, The Past, The Present, The Prospects, Oxford: Westview Press.*
- (http://www.ttk.org.tr/templates/resimler/F_ile/tpasa-cinayeti.pdf) Access Date: 07.10.2009*
- İLBAY, B., (2009).** *Ben Daha Unutmadım, 21. Yüzyıl Türkiye Enstitüsü, Ermeniler ile Türklerin ilişkisi, Türklerin Anadolu'ya gelmesiyle, bin yıl önce başlamıştır. (<http://www.21yyte.org.tr/yazi.aspx?ID=2753&kat=31> Access Date: 28.04.2009*
- İNALCIK, H.,(2007).** *Atatürk ve Demokratik Türkiye, İstanbul: Kırmızı Yayınları, 2.Baskı.*
- KARACA, A., (2001).** *"Türkiye'de Ermeniler İçin Yapılan Reformlar (Örtülü Bir İşgale Doğru) ve Tehcir Gerçeği (1878-1915)", Uluslararası Türk-Ermeni İlişkileri Sempozyumu 24-25 Mayıs 2001, T.C. İstanbul Üniversitesi Rektörlüğü Yayınları , (Tertip komitesi Prof. Dr. Selçuk Erez ve Prof. Dr. Mehmet Saray), İstanbul: Üniversite Yayın no:4305, 2001.*

- KARACA, A.,(1993).** Anadolu Islahatı ve Ahmet Şakir Paşa (1838-1899) İstanbul: Eren Yayıncılık.
- KARAKOÇ, E., (2008).** Türk Basınında Ermeni Terörü (1973-1984), M.Ü. Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi A.B.D., Doktora Tezi, 2008.
- KAY, S.Ö., (2008).** "AB: Soykırımı Tanı Kapılarını Aç", Yeniçağ, 6.09.2008, s.7
- KARACAKAYA, R., ÖZDEMİR, H., V.D., (2007),** Osmanlı Belgelerinde Ermenilerin Sevk ve İskanı, (1878-1920), Osmanlı Arşivi Daire Başkanlığı Yayını no: 91 Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü.
- KAÇAZNUNİ, O., (2009).**Taşnak Partisi'nin Yapacağı Bir Şey Yok (1923 Parti Konferansı'na Rapor), Çev: Arif Acaloğlu, Ermeni Belgeleriyle Ermeni Soykırımı Yalanı-1, İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 22.basım.
- KASIM, K., (2006).** "Ermeni Sorunu'nun Uluslararası Boyutu... İddialar Türkiye'ye Engel ", Cumhuriyet Strateji Dergisi, Özel ek Ermeni İddiaları ve Şehit Diplomatlarımız, yıl:2, sayı:95, 24 Nisan.
- KOÇ, Y.,(2005).** "AB Türkiye'den Ne İstiyor?" Teori Aylık Dergi, Kasım, s.36
- LÜTEM,Ö.,E., (2003)** "Olaylar ve Yorumlar", Ermeni Araştırmaları üç aylık Tarih, Politika ve Uluslararası İlişkiler Dergisi, Ankara: Avrasya Bir Vakfı Avrasya Stratejik Araştırmalar Merkezi ASAM, Kış, sayı:8
- MCCARTHY, J., (1998).** Ölüm ve Sürgün, Osmanlı Müslümanlarına Karşı Yürütülen Ulus Olarak Temizleme İşlemi 1821-1922, (Çev: Bilge Umar), İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi.
- ORTAYLI, İ.,(2009).** Tarihimiz ve Biz, İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 4.baskı.
- ÖZBEK, H., (2008).** "Üçüncü Ermeni Dalgası Sınırları Zorlarken", Yeniçağ, 23.09.2008
- ÖNDER, A.T.,(2009).** Türkiye'nin Etnik Yapısı, Ankara: Kripto Yayınları, 46. Baskı.
- ÖZTUNA, Y., (2006).** Avrupa Türkiyesi'ni Kaybımız Rumeli'nin Elden Çıkışı, İstanbul: Babıali Kültür Yayıncılığı.
- POYRAZ, E., (2009).** Avrupa Birliği'nin Tarihsel Gelişimi ve Türkiye, Marmara Üniversitesi, Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi A.B.D Doktora Tezi, 2009.
- RÜSTEM BEY, A., (2001).** Cihan Harbi ve Türk Ermeni Meselesi, çev: Cengiz Aydın, İstanbul: Bilge Kültür Sanat .
- SARAY, M., (2003).** Ermenistan ve Türk Ermeni İlişkileri, İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- SEYDİS., (2003).** "Sovyetler Birliği'nin Ermeniler için Başlattıkları 'Anavata-

na Dönüş Projesi' ", Ermeni Araştırmaları, Kış 2003, ilt: 2, sayı: 8.

ŞİMŞİR, B., (2005).Ermeni Meselesi, 1774-2005, İstanbul: Bilgi Yayınevi.

ŞİMŞİR, B., (2006). " Ödünün Sonu Gelmez", Cumhuriyet Strateji Dergisi, Özel Ek Ermeni İddiaları ve Şehit Diplomatlarımız, yıl: 2, Sayı: 95, 24 Nisan.

ŞİMŞİR, B., (2000). Şehit Diplomatlarımız, 1.-2. kitap, İstanbul: Bilgi Yayınevi.

Texts adopted by Parliament opening of negotiations with Turkey, provisional edition P_6TA- PROV(2005)0350 B6- 0484,0487,0496,0498,0502 and 0505/2005.

Texts adopted by Parliament opening of negotiations with Turkey, provisional edition P_6TA- PROV(2005)0350 B6- 0484,0487,0496,0498,0502 and 0505/2005.

TEORİ, (2005).Türkiye'nin İdam Fermanı AB Müzakere Çerçeve Belgesi başlığıyla çıkan aylık dergi "AB Müzakere Belgesi", Kasım.

TOYNBEE, A.J.,(2007). Türkiye'de ve Yunanistan'da Batı Meselesi, Dr. Kadri Mustafa Orağlı (çev), İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınları.

TÜRKİYE GÜNLÜĞÜ,(2004).AB'nin 17 Aralık Kararı: "Kapıyı Açıyoruz ama, iğneli fiçidan geçeceksin!" başlığıyla çıkan üç aylık fikir ve kültür dergisi Türkiye Günlüğü, "AB'nin Brüksel (17 Aralık 2004) Zirve Bildirisi'nin Türkiye Maddeler", sayı: 79, Kış, ss.5-7

TÜRKÖZÜ,H.,K.,(1983). Osmanlı ve Sovyet Belgeleriyle Ermeni Mezalimi, Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü, Yayınları, 2. baskı.

YAŞIN, G.,K.,(2006). "İstekler 'fantezi'ye dönüşüyor Avrupa'nın sonu, boyutu ve ölçütü önceden kestirilemeyen beklentileri", Cumhuriyet Strateji Dergisi, yıl:3 sayı:116, 18 Eylül.

YENİÇAĞ, (2005). "Fransız Önergesi Sözde Ermeni Soykırımını Dayattılar", 29.09.2005.

www.mfa.gov.tr/turkce/Avrparlraporu.htm T.C. Dışişleri Bakanlığı resmi web sitesi Access Date:12.02.2008

ERMENİ MESELESİ'NİN TARİHİ DERİNLİĞİ VE KAMU DİPLOMASİSİ BAĞLAMINDA BİR ANALİZİ

Özet: Bu makalede multidisipliner bir bakış açısıyla Ermeni meselesinin; tarihi derinliği ve kamu diplomasisi bağlamında bir analizi yapılmıştır. Çalışmamızda, konu ile ilgili kaynaklara ve belgelere dayanarak betimleyici yöntem, tarihi karşılaştırma ve söylem analizi kullanılmıştır. Örnek olay çalışması olarak Avrupa Parlamentosu kararları incelenip tümevarım yöntemiyle bazı bilimsel verilere ulaşılmıştır. Şöyle ki; bugün Türkiye'nin dış politikasını ve diğer ülkeler ile olan ilişkilerini zedeleyici bir aşamaya gelmiş olan Ermeni sorunu, artık tarihi bir sorun olmanın çok ötesinde siyasallaşmış bir olgu olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Yunanistan ve Fransa'da olduğu gibi yasalaşan soykırımı iddialarının, Avrupa Parlamentosu öncülüğünde AB platformlarına taşınarak Türkiye'nin üyelik sürecine bağlandığı sorunsalını görüyoruz. Bu durum, 1878'den 1914'e kadar çeşitli renk ve kılıfa sokulan bir baskı diplomasisinin, çeşitli propaganda ve kamu diplomasisi faaliyetleriyle uluslararası iletişimde ve ilişkilerde yeni bir versiyonunun sergilendiğini göstermektedir. Bazı olayların sadece şimdiki durumda gözlenmesi yeterli değildir. Ermeni meselesinde olduğu gibi, şu andaki veriler soruların bütün cevaplarını içermeyebilir. Bu noktada tarih, sadece olayları tespit etmekle kalmayıp, olaylar arasında sebep-sonuç ilişkisi de aramaktadır. Başka bir ifade ile tarih, belgelere, olgulara ve olaylara bakarak, bunlar arasında bağlantı ve ilişki arayarak sosyal konularda genellemelere varmaya çalışır. Böyle bir anlayışın temellerini atan *İbn Haldun*'a göre, tarihin içinde saklı olan anlamı incelemek, düşünmek, araştırmak ve varlığın sebep ve illetlerini anlamak için olayların meydana gelişini ve akışını bilmek gerekir. Bu bağlamda; çalışmada tarihi sebep-sonuç ilişkisi içinde ele alıp bir karşılaştırma yapmak için bazı tarihi tespitler yapıldı. Şöyle ki, olaylar tarihsel süreç içerisinde ele alındığında Ermeni sorununun, XIX. yüzyılda büyük devletlerin Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nu parçalamak için uyguladıkları politikalarının bir uzantısı olarak ortaya çıktığı görülür. Osmanlı toprakları üzerinde XIX. yüzyılda başlayan ve XX. yüzyılın ilk yarısına kadar devam eden hâkimiyet mücadelesi boyunca, Avrupalı büyük devletler, Amerika Birleşik Devletleri ve Rusya, imparatorluk bünyesindeki Balkanlar, Ortadoğu ve Anadolu'da yaşayan birbirinden farklı etnik ve dinsel gruplardan müttefikler oluşturma stratejisi ve propaganda faaliyetleriyle döne-

mi şekillendirmişlerdi. Ayrıca, bu grupları birbirine karşı kışkırtıp örgütlemek suretiyle de XIX. yüzyıl ve sonrasını kapsayacak politikalarının temellerini attılar. Bu tarihi temeller bilinmeden bugün yaşanan ve yaşanacak olan olaylar doğru analiz edilemez. Dolayısıyla bu çalışmada tarihsel bir derinlikle Ermeni soykırımını iddialarının, yaşanan trajik gerçekler ve belgeler ışığında değerlendirildiğinde tarihi, ilmi ve hukuki hiçbir dayanağının olmadığı ve sorunun siyasallaştığı ispatlanmıştır. Türkiye son yıllarda yoğun bir şekilde Ermenilere soykırım yapmakla suçlanmakta ve özellikle her yılın Nisan ayında bu saldırılar artarak adeta saldırıya dönüşmektedir. Çalışmamızda; Ermeni suikastları ve terörle dünya kamuoyuna duyurularak propagandası yapılan, ardından parlamentolarda yasalaştırılan sözde Ermeni soykırımını iddiasının uluslararası iletişim bağlamında 4T planı çerçevesinde ilerlediğini tespit ettik. Soykırım iddialarıyla birlikte yeniden ısıtılan Ermeni sorunu, artık tarihi bir sorun olmanın çok ötesinde siyasallaşmış ve uluslararası iletişim boyutuyla ön plana çıkmış, özellikle Soğuk Savaş sonrasında yeniden Türkiye'nin dış politikasının önünde bir engel ve siyasi bir baskı unsuru olmuştur. Ayrıca, belli bazı ülkeler ile ilişkilerinde de zedeleyici bir faktör haline gelmiştir. Neticede; olayların tarihi boyutuna baktığımızda, Avrupa'nın XIX. yüzyıldaki Ermeni politikalarıyla günümüz Avrupa'sının Türkiye'ye yönelik Ermeni politikasının temelinde ve propaganda faaliyetlerinde esaslı bir değişimin olmadığı gözlenmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Avrupa Birliği, Ermeni Sorunu, Tehcir, 4T Planı, Propaganda, Kamu Diplomasisi Uluslararası İletişim