

FROM YEGHERN TO GENOCIDE ARMENIAN NEWSPAPERS, RAPHAEL LEMKIN, AND THE ROAD TO THE UN GENOCIDE CONVENTION¹

KHATCHIG MOURADIAN
Khatchigm@hotmail.com

2008 marks the 60th anniversary of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, adopted by the U.N. General Assembly on Dec. 9, 1948, chiefly due to the efforts of jurist Raphael Lemkin, who coined the term “genocide” and struggled to make it a crime punishable by International Law.

Over the past three decades, “genocide” has been the word Armenians wanted to see but which the Turks wanted to avoid at all costs when discussing the massacres and deportations of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire in 1915-16. It matters little to most ordinary Armenians how graphically historians and politicians describe what befell their ancestors in 1915 and what they consider the number of victims to be. If they do not use the term “genocide,” it means they are siding with the Turkish state and that they are genocide deniers. In contrast, the average Turkish person cheers regardless of what terms are used and what the number of victims is estimated to be when referring to 1915, as long as the G-word is not uttered.²

A typical example is the U.S. presidential statements issued on every April 24 since 1994. In 1994-95, Clinton spoke of “the victims of the 1915 massacres” and “those who died in the violence of 1915.” From 1996-99, his statements became more powerful; he spoke of “one of this century’s darkest moments” and “the senseless deportations and massacres of one and a half million Armenians that took place from 1915-23 in the Ottoman Empire.” In 2000 Clinton also extended “sympathy to the survivors and their descendents.” Bush picked up where Clinton left off and continued on the same note. In 2005 he mentioned how Armenians “have come to call [1915] the Great Calamity [probably an English translation of *Medz Yeghern*].” In 2006 he stressed how “we and the world must never forget” the “tragedy.” In 2007 the president told us that Armenians were “forced from their ancestral home.”³

The fact that Armenians found little solace in these words, and Turks found little to be angry about, attests to the importance of the one and only word both sides look for when reading the statement year after year:

genocide. Regardless of everything that was said, Armenians and Turks read one thing from the text: "It was not genocide." In 2005 a few days before Bush issued the April 24 statement, the Turkish daily News ran a story titled, appropriately, "Armenians, Turkey waiting to hear Bush's Sunday statement." After the statement was issued, one prominent Armenian commentator wrote, "Pres. Bush issued another one of his infamous "Armenian Remembrance Day" statements... even though every year we ask him not to say anything at all, if he cannot say Genocide."⁴

This paper does not look at the archival record and survivor accounts in an attempt to answer questions like why the term "genocide" applies to 1915 or why—and to what extent—the term is important. However, this paper might contribute to the discussion around the aforementioned, while attempting to answer the following questions:

What terminology have Armenian newspapers employed to describe the greatest tragedy in the millennial Armenian history?

When and how was the term *Tseghasbanutyun* (Genocide) incorporated into this discourse?

What role, if any, did the Armenian newspapers play during the birth pangs of the UN Genocide Convention and the years leading up to its ratification by countries where vibrant Armenian communities existed?

In this paper, which is part of a broader study on the Armenian media and the Armenian genocide, I will try to answer the above questions by looking at news items, interviews, editorials and commentaries that were published in Armenian-and English-language dailies and weeklies on three continents: *Aztag* (Factor), *Zartok* (Awakening), and *Ararad* in Lebanon; *The Hairenik* (Fatherland) *Weekly* and *The Hairenik Daily* on the U.S. East Coast; and *Haratch* (Forward) in France⁵. These newspapers express the views of the three Armenian political parties that survived in Diasporan conditions: the Armenian Revolutionary Federation (ARF) or the Tashnags, the Social Democratic Hunchagian Party, and the Democratic Liberal Party or the Ramgavars. The paper will focus especially on editorials published on or around April 24 lying on the occasion of Armenian martyr's commemoration day on or around April 24⁶.

TERMINOLOGY

The survivors of the Armenian genocide have employed a number of terms to refer to the destruction of their people in the Ottoman Empire. In the newspapers under study, the term most commonly and consistently used from the 1920s to the present is *Yeghern* (or variants like *Medz Yeghern*—Great Crime/Catastrophe, *Abrilian Yeghern*—the April Crime/Catastrophe). Other terms that are employed are *Hayasbanutyun*

(Armenocide), *Medz Voghperkutyun* (Great Tragedy), *Medz Vogchagez* (Great Holocaust), *Medz Nahadagutyun* (Great Martyrdom), *Aghed* (Catastrophe), *Medz Nakhjir and Medz Sbant* (both, Great Massacre), *Medz Potorig* (Great Storm), *Sev Vojir* (Black Crime) and, after 1948, *Tseghasbanutyun* (or variants like *Haygagan Tseghasbanutyun*, *Hayots Tseghasbanutyun*- both, Armenian Genocide).

Yeghern was the word most frequently used when referring to the destruction of the Armenians before the term "Genocide" was coined. Even after that, *Yeghern* maintained its prominence for a number of decades. It is only in the late 1980s and early 1990s that the expression *Haygagan Tseghasbanutyun* started appearing more frequently than the term *Yeghern*⁷ in the newspapers under study⁸.

Hayasbanutyun was used after the Lebanese jurist Moussa Prince published his book *Un génocide impuni: L'Arménocide* in 1967⁹. In the next few years, more than one translation of this book into Armenian appeared, both as a book and as a serial in *Ararad*¹⁰. From 1978 to 1982, the term *Hayasbanutyun* was employed at least once in every April 24 editorial in *Aztag*. However, it rarely appeared in the editorials of other newspapers under study.

ARMENIAN NEWSPAPERS AND THE STRUGGLE FOR RATIFICATION OF THE CONVENTION BY PARLIAMENTS OF MEMBER COUNTRIES

In October 1945 the third count of the Nuremberg Indictment stated that defendants had "conducted deliberate and systematic genocide."¹¹ Two months later, on Dec. 9, 1945, *Haratch*, an Armenian newspaper in France already had an editorial about the term.

The editorial, titled "Génocide," provides the readers with some background on the term "Génocide" using information from the French newspaper *Le Monde*¹². "A new word was used in the Nuremberg trials, which means *Tseghasbanutyun*," editor Shavarsh Misakian writes. He then cites how Lemkin wants those responsible for genocide to be punished and similar crime to be averted in the future. He underlines,

"We read these lines, we follow the Nuremberg trials, and our mind instinctively wanders to a far away world, where 'war crimes' took place 30 years ago... Where were the jurists and judges back then? Had they not discovered the word, or was the blood-thirsty monster so powerful or unreachable that they could not punish it?"

On December 11, 1946, after months of lobbying by Lemkin, the U.N. General Assembly unanimously passed a resolution condemning genocide.

On January 30, 1947 the *Hairenik Weekly* reprinted on its front-page a *New York Times* January 5, 1947 article titled "United Nations Outlaws Murder of Entire Groups as International Crime." The *Hairenik Weekly* highlighted the following sentence in the original article: "If the members of the United Nations pass appropriate legislation such incidents as the pogroms of Tsarist Russia and the massacres of Armenians and Greeks by Turkey would be punishable as genocide."

The same issue of the *Hairenik Weekly* (page 2) had an editorial titled "Genocide." The concluding paragraph reads as follows:

"Outlawing wholesale slaughter of peoples is welcome news to the Armenians, the Greeks, the Syrians, the Arabs, and the Balkan peoples who used to be systematically decimated under the rule of the barbarous Turk, but ironically enough it comes after the mischief has been done. It is small comfort to tell already exterminated peoples that they shall no longer be subject to the horrors of wanton destruction. To those peoples who have been fortunate enough to be immune from such mass tragedies, the security for the future is a precious and reassuring comfort. But all this still does not solve the Armenian dilemma. The Armenians were robbed of their historic provinces, they sacrificed a cool million and a half human lives, and another million were made expatriates. In compensation for this colossal wrong the United Nations offers them a 'Genocide.' The Genocide is hardly the cure for Armenian wounds."

On April 25, 1948, several months before the UN General Assembly approved the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, *Aztag* ran an editorial titled "*Tseghasbanutyun*." Signed by Sharvarsh Misakian, the editorial starts by posing the following question in reference to the Jewish Holocaust¹³:

"Was another earth-shaking storm necessary, so that men would learn the word "*tseghasbanutyun*" (Génocide)?"

It states:

...the attempt to exterminate the Armenians *en masse*—genocide—only served the purpose of filling the pages of books and providing matter for brilliant speeches, while the other [attempt of extermination] immediately resulted in a logical ending: trials and hanging." (*Aztag*, 1948)

Armenian communities and their newspapers in the U.S. and France not only followed the developments around the word "genocide," but also played an active role in demanding the U.N. General Assembly and then parliaments of countries to ratify the Genocide Convention. Lemkin himself attests to this role. In an article he wrote in the *Hairenik Weekly* in 1959, he says,

The sufferings of the Armenian men, women, and children thrown into the Euphrates River or massacred on the way to Der-el-Zor have prepared the way for the adoption of the Genocide Convention by the United Nations and have morally compelled Turkey to ratify it.

He asserts,

The Armenians of the entire world were specifically interested in the Genocide Convention. They filled the galleries of the drafting committee at the third General Assembly of the United Nations in Paris when the Genocide Convention was discussed. An Armenian, Levon Keshishian, the well-known U.N. correspondent for Arab newspapers, helped considerably through his writings in obtaining the ratifications of many Near Eastern and North African countries.¹⁴

In Armenian newspapers, examples of this interest in the Convention abound. On May 5, 1949 the *Hairenik Weekly* ran a front-page story titled "Author of 'Auction of Souls' Speaker at Genocide Forum," in which we read the text of a speech delivered by Mrs. Aurora Mardiganian-Hovnanian. In the introduction to the speech, we are informed that she was "one of the panel speakers on genocide, broadcast on Friday, April 22nd, from station WEVD of New York. Dr. Priestly, the initiator of the genocide hour, was moderator... Dr. Priestly made frequent references to the Turkish deportations of 1915 as the precursor of modern genocide condemning the act as a crime against humanity which should be outlawed by civilized nations."

In the speech, Mardiganian says,

"... [A]s one who has seen genocide in operation, has lived it and has survived, I find it very difficult to express myself on the subject."

"How do I feel about this convention in the United Nations on genocide? There is only one feeling that I have, and that everybody should have, and that is to have that treaty ratified

by the parliaments of the signatory nations as fast as possible, before it may be too late again.”

“... Had there been a similar pact signed between the nations, as an aftermath of the Armenian massacres during the first World War, genocide perhaps would not have been practiced as it was in Hitler’s Germany during the second World War.¹⁵”

In the same issue of the *Hairenik Weekly*, there is a news story titled “29 Organizations for Genocide Convention” reprinted from the April 10 issue of the *New York Times*. On April 26, 1951 *Hairenik Weekly* runs yet another news story by its correspondent Levon Keshishian¹⁶ titled “International Court Mulls Genocide Problem.”

On March 13, 1952 the *Hairenik Weekly* reported on its front page that Lemkin was nominated for the Nobel Prize¹⁷. In the same issue, Levon Keshishian wrote a front-page article titled “Honduras is 35th Nation to Ratify Genocide, but Life of Convention is Menaced.” In the article, under the subheading “How did Lemkin get the idea,” the author describes how Lemkin read the news item on the assassination of Talaat Pasha in Berlin by Soghomon Tehlirian. “He [Lemkin] devoted the rest of his life to working for a measure to stop such mass destruction of peoples and create an international instrument to punish the persons responsible for such crimes.” The article also notes how Lemkin attests to the fact that the *Hairenik Weekly* is a profound supporter of the convention. In the article, Keshishian quotes from his interview with Lemkin who said, “You are an Armenian. You will therefore understand how important this Convention is.”

In June 10, 1952 the *Hairenik Weekly* runs a front-page story about a Canadian M.P., David Croll, reading a list of modern genocides. In the article, titled “Canadian M.P. in Call to Ratify Genocide Law,” we read, “Mr. Croll observed that in ratifying the genocide convention, Canada was giving leadership to its usual partners, the United Kingdom and the United States, neither of which has done so yet.” On June 17, the *Hairenik Weekly* publishes an article titled “Canadian M.P. Crestohl in Plea for Genocide Treaty,” which includes the text of an address by M.P. Leon Crestohl on the genocide treaty. Both articles have references to the Armenian genocide.

Despite the wholehearted support for the Genocide Convention, the bitterness and the tone of condemnation *vis-à-vis* the disregard of the West to the decimation of the Armenians¹⁸ continues to be evident in April 24 editorials:

“A second World War was needed so that the peoples of the West would feel on their own flesh what it means to plot a crime against a nation and would condemn it by employing the term genocide” (*Aztag*, 1950).

The same year, an April 24 editorial in *Aztag* states: “The condemnation of the crime of genocide in speeches and on paper is not enough” (*Aztag*, 1952). In this editorial, the term *tseghasban*¹⁹ (perpetrator of genocide) is also employed in reference to the Turks.

By this time, the term “genocide” was finding its way into editorials of most Armenian newspapers, but its use was scarce at best. *Zartonk* first employed the term *Tseghasbanutyun* in its April 24 editorial in 1954, and it continued to use it in subsequent years:²⁰ “The Armenian fatherland was depopulated as a result of the horrible crime of Genocide that was unleashed on the 24th of April” (*Zartonk*, 1954); no one listened to the few great humanists who were “condemning barbarity and genocide” (*Zartonk*, 1955); “The German-Austrian whore-like politics turned a blind eye to this ghastly Genocide” (*Zartonk*, 1956); “Forty-five years after the *Medz Yeghern* started, today, while we deeply mourn the martyrdom of our fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, we also state with endless joy that the genocidal Turk has failed in his plan... We should vow to do everything to crown our SACRED CAUSE [Emphasis by *Zartonk*] with success, so that no [other] Talaat²¹ will ever even contemplate solving “the Armenian issue” through violent genocide” (*Zartonk*, 1960); “The Ittihadist leaders or the Ottoman ministers had already prepared the ground for the unprecedented genocide” (*Zartonk*, 1964), etc.

Starting from the mid-fifties, the issue of the Genocide Convention received less coverage in the *Hairenik Weekly*. However, the term “genocide” continued to appear, albeit rarely. In an April 21, 1955 editorial titled “Our Million Martyrs,” for example, we read, “... A genocide of such proportions which had never been equaled in the annals of history.”

THE POST-50TH ANNIVERSARY PERIOD

After 1965 the term *Tseghasbanutyun* was gradually incorporated into the standard lexicon of the newspapers under study and was used interchangeably with other terms when referring to the events of 1915-16.

In 1965, stressing the importance of the 50th anniversary commemorations of the genocide²², the ARF Central Committee in Lebanon signed a declaration in *Aztag* titled “Our Word,” which appeared in lieu of an editorial. In this declaration, the term *Yeghern* was employed 5 times, while *Tseghasbanutyun* was used only twice.²³ In 1966, atypical for the period before the 1990s, in an editorial fittingly titled

"*Tseghasbanutyun*", the term *Tseghasbanutyun* was repeated 7 times (3 of them in reference to the UN Genocide Convention), in addition to *tseghasban Turk* (the genocide-perpetrating Turk), which appeared once, while *Yeghern* was absent.

Ararad first used the term *tseghasbanutyun* in an April 24 editorial in 1966. Thereafter, the term appeared with some regularity in the newspaper's April 24 editorials: "The Diaspora Armenians have an immensely important role to play in acquiring condemnation for the genocide of the Turk" (*Ararad*, 1966); "Even the wildest imagination would not be able to portray the genocide committed against us" (*Ararad*, 1967); "The genocide committed against our people is also a crime against humanity" (*Ararad*, 1968); "56 years have passed since the genocide and the pillaging of western Armenia" (*Ararad*, 1971), etc.

As it becomes evident from these examples, the expression *Haygagan Tseghasbanutyun* was not used at this juncture. Typically, when referring to the events of 1915-16, the expressions used were "the genocide of 1915", "The Turkish genocide", and "the genocide committed against the Armenians."

CONCLUSION

Turkish historians following the state-supported line and many journalists in Turkey assert that only recently—in the past few decades—did Armenians discover and then cling to the term "genocide," seeking comparability with the Holocaust and advancing their agenda in the international arena. Although it is true that over the last few decades, the term "genocide" has been used almost extensively when referring to 1915 in Armenian circles, it is also true that the Armenian community and newspapers on both sides of the Atlantic were active participants in the discussions around the term "genocide" almost from the first day when the word was introduced into academic and juridical discourse. By demonstrating that Raphael Lemkin and others writing in the international media asserted very early on that the Armenian case fits into the definition of modern genocide, this paper hints at the possibility that it is not the Armenians who sought the term "genocide," rather, from the mid-40s, the term sought the Armenians from the mid-40s.

In the words of Lemkin, "One million Armenians died, but a law against the murder of peoples was written with the ink of their blood and the spirit of their sufferings."²⁴ Moreover, as this paper demonstrates, the first generation of the post-genocide era played an active role in the struggle for the ratification of that law

ENDNOTES

- ¹ This paper is a summary of two papers presented by this author at the fifth and sixth Workshops on Turkish-Armenian Scholarship, held in New York (2006) and Geneva (2008) respectively. All translations from Armenian are the author's.
- ² Prof. Halil Berktaş, among other historians, has talked about this issue on several occasions. In an interview with Khatchig Mouradian published in *Aztag* on November 12, 2005, Berktaş says, "It is very unfortunate that what happened in 1915-16 and the fate of the Ottoman Armenians during the demise of the Empire boils down to "Was it genocide or not?" This is an extreme case of reductionism. If you have a mixed audience of Turks and Armenians (this is what happened when I was speaking at Mulheim in Germany in March 2001), if you say, "Yes, it was genocide", the Armenians cheer you and the Turks boo you, and everybody stops listening, because they heard what they came to hear. And if you say, "No, it was not genocide", exactly the reverse happens: the Armenians boo the Turks cheer and again, everybody stops listening. The question of readdressing the historicity of what happened in 1915-1916 is: how do we break away from the bind of these two mutually exclusive antagonistic nationalist attitudes and how do we liberate the historical discussion and try to attempt a fresh interpretation?"
- ³ It must be noted that in none of these statements did the presidents even hint at the possibility of 1915 being the result of a civil war, neither did they find the deportations justifiable in any way—arguments that are commonly used by Turkish state historians when denying the genocide.
- ⁴ Harut Sassounian, "Pres. Bush's April 24 Statement...From Bad to Worse," *The California Courier*, April 28, 2005.
- ⁵ The *Tashnag Aztag* was published twice a week until 1930, and then, three times a week until 1932, when it became a daily publication. The newspaper was initially the private property of Haig Balian, but it expressed the views of the ARF until June 1965, when it also became formally the official organ of the ARF Central Committee of Lebanon. The *Hunchagian Ararad* became a weekly in June 2001. The *Hairenik Daily* is the oldest Armenian-language newspaper (founded in 1899). The *Hairenik Weekly*, an English-language publication, appeared in 1934 and was later renamed *The Armenian Weekly*. *Haratch* was founded in 1925 by Shavarsh Misakian. It was an ARF organ until the death of Misakian in 1957, when his daughter, Arpi, made it an independent newspaper. This author is currently examining other newspapers in the U.S. and the Middle East in an effort to paint a more complete picture of the incorporation of the term "genocide" into the Armenian media and the role it played in the ratification of the Genocide Convention.
- ⁶ Typically, the editorials appeared on the front page or the second page of the newspapers on April 24. However, the editorial was sometimes published on the 23rd, 25th, or 26th of April, generally when the newspaper did not appear on the 24th in the event of a holiday. On the occasion of April 24, special issues were also published with a format different from that of regular newspaper issues, especially from the 1980s onwards. Some of the editorials quoted in this study have appeared in those special issues.
- ⁷ In the 1990 editorial, *Yeghern* appeared only once in *Aztag*, while *Tseghasbanutyun* was employed three times. In the 1997 editorial, for example, *Zartonk* employed the term *tseghasban* 10 times; *tseghasbanagan* (genocidal), twice; and *tseghasbanutyun*, three times. *Yeghern* was not employed. In the 2005 editorial, the term *Tseghasbanutyun* appeared 11 times in *Aztag*. It should be noted that even in the 1980s and 1990s, one does encounter editorials where the term *Tseghasbanutyun* was not the word of choice when referring to 1915 (see, for example, *Aztag*, 1991).
- ⁸ It is interesting to note here that the first ever book with the word genocide (as applied to the Armenians) in the title was published in 1948. It was Josef Guttman's 19-page

booklet, *The Beginnings of Genocide: A Brief Account of the Armenian Massacres in World War I* (New York: Armenian National Council of America, 1948). This was the English translation of an article originally published in Yiddish in *Yivo bleter*, the Journal of the Yiddish Scientific Institute, v. 28, no. 2, under the title 'Di shhite oyf Armener hit draysik yor tsurik'. Thereafter, we have to wait until 1965 for Father Jean Mécérian's *Le génocide du peuple arménien: le sort de la population arménienne de l'Empire ottoman, de la Constitution ottomane au Traité de Lausanne, 1908-1923* (Beirut: Impr. Catholique, 1965). There was one Armenian title published in Beirut with the word *tseghaspanutyun* in 1959, *Tseghasbanutyune khorhrtayin mioutenen ners: usumnasirutyun zankvadzayin shanutyants'* (Genocide in the Soviet Union: A Study on the [Committed] Mass Murders) but that was about the USSR, the translation of a book produced by Institut zur Erforschung der UdSSR in 1958. (This research was carried out through WorldCat.)

⁹ The term "Armenocide" is also used in the title of *The Genocide of the Armenians by Turks, the Turkish Armenocide. Documentary series, v. 1: The Memoirs of Naim Bey: Turkish Official Documents Relating to the Deportations and Massacres of Armenians* ([Newton Square, Pa.]: Armenian Historical Research Association, 1964).

¹⁰ One of the translators is Dikran Vosgouny, an editor of *Aztag* in that period.

¹¹ Samantha Power, "A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide," (Basic Books, 2002), p. 50.

¹² It was only in 1953, after approval from the *Academie Francaise*, that Larousse incorporated the term into its encyclopedia.

¹³ The Holocaust and other genocides are seldom mentioned in April 24 editorials. The Rwandan Genocide, for instance, is mentioned in *Aztag* in 2004, in the context of the 10th anniversary commemoration of that genocide.

¹⁴ "Dr. Lemkin, Father of Genocide Convention, Reviews Work Relating to Turkish Massacres," *The Hairenik Weekly*, January 1, 1959.

¹⁵ This is the earliest reference this researcher has come across to the argument that had the Armenian Genocide been properly addressed, the Holocaust would have been averted.

¹⁶ Levon Keshishian played a key role in both the U.N. and the Armenian media for decades. His commentaries, interviews and news stories on the Genocide Convention appear in the *Hairenik Daily* and *Hairenik Weekly* for three decades. On April 28, 1965, the *Hairenik Daily* published an article by Keshishian titled, "The Armenians are Ignored in the Genocide Convention," in which Keshishian recounts how he listened to the tapes and discs of 45 hours of recordings of the proceedings of U.N. sessions on the genocide convention and not even once was the Armenian Genocide mentioned.

¹⁷ In the news item, the *Hairenik Weekly* cites Associated Press as the source of the report.

¹⁸ In the editorials, western powers are frequently blamed for the suffering of the Armenians. Germany is considered an accomplice to what befell the Armenians. Britain, France, and the USA are blamed for being bystanders and, prior to that, doing little to fulfill their promises to the Armenians suffering under Ottoman rule.

¹⁹ As this paper demonstrates, *tseghasban* has remained an adjective inseparable from "the Turk" in the Armenian newspapers for decades. It is worth noting, that Haygazn Ghazarian's book on the Armenian Genocide, published in Beirut in 1968, is titled "*Tseghasban Turke*."

²⁰ It should be noted here that the editor of *Zartonk*, Kersam Aharonian, had an instrumental role in making the Armenian genocide a central cause in Lebanon in the 1960s. The 1116-page book, *Hushamadyan Medz Yegherni*, which he edited in 1965, was regarded as arguably the most comprehensive Armenian-language book on the topic of *Yeghern* published until then.

- ²¹ Minister of the Interior Talaat Pasha, the leading figure of the triumvirate that came to power in 1913 in the Ottoman Empire and a prime architect of the Armenian genocide, is regarded by the editorials throughout the entire period under study as the personification of genocidal evil. His name is often cited together with the name of Soghomon Tehlirian, who assassinated Talaat on March 14, 1921.
- ²² The Armenian refugees, who flocked into Lebanon after the Genocide and the exodus from Cilicia in late 1921, organized annual commemorations of the Yeghern on April 24 from the very first years of their arrival in the country. During the 1920s and 1930s, typically, requiem services were held for the souls of the victims in wooden churches erected in the refugee camps. At this juncture, April 24 was a day of mourning, weeping, and remembering relatives who perished during the Yeghern. Starting in the 1940s, the commemorations became more organized, and events were also held in schools and in other non-religious settings. Armenian periodicals in Beirut regularly published announcements on upcoming commemoration events. However, the politicization of the commemoration events, as well as the marches and large gatherings with the participation of all Armenian political parties and religious denominations would start only in the 1960s.
- ²³ In the resolution adopted by the 18th ARF General Meeting in 1963, the term *tseghasbanutyun* was employed for the first time in the line of successive General Meeting resolutions.
- ²⁴ Raphael Lemkin, "Dr. Lemkin, Father of genocide..."

**ԵՂԵՌՆԷՆ ՑԵՂԱՍՊԱՆՈՒԹԻՒՆ.
ՀԱՅԿԱԿԱՆ ԹԵՐԹԵՐԸ, ՌԱՅԱՑԷԼ ԼԵՄԲԻՆ ԵՒ
ՄԱԿԻ ՑԵՂԱՍՊԱՆՈՒԹԵԱՆ ՈՒՆՏԻ ՃԱՆԱՊԱՐՀԸ
(Ամփոփում)**

ԽԱԶՐԻԿ ՄՈՒՐԱՏԵԱՆ

Ուսումնասիրությունը կ'անդրադառնայ հայկական մամուլին կողմէ օգտագործուած եզրերուն՝ երբ անոնք կը գրէին հայոց պատմութեան մեծագոյն ողբերգութեան մասին, եւ թէ ե՛րբ ու ինչպէ՛ս «ցեղասպանութիւն» եզրը ընդգրկուեցաւ նման նիւթերու: Ուսումնասիրությունը կ'անդրադառնայ նաեւ հայ մամուլի արձագանգներուն՝ երբ ՄԱԿի Ցեղասպանութեան Ուխտը ծնունդ կ'առնէր 1948ին, ապա եւ յաջորդող տարիներուն ան կը փաւերացուէր այնպիսի երկիրներու կողմէ ուր աշխոյժ հայկական համայնքներ գոյութիւն ունէին:

Հեղինակը կը փորձէ պարզարանել, ապա եւ կատարել հետեւութիւններ վերոյիշեալ հարցերուն մասին, ժամանակագրական կտրուածքով բաղդատելով Պէյրութի, Փարիզի ու Պոստոնի հայկական մամուլին մէջ 1920ականներէն մինչեւ մեր օրերը լոյս տեսած հայերէն ու անգլերէն յօդուածները:

Ուսումնասիրությունը ցոյց կու տայ թէ հայկական համայնքներն ու մամուլը՝ Ատլանտեանի երկու կողմերուն ալ, այդ եզրին ստեղծումի ու ակադեմական եւ դատարարական կալուած մուտքի գրեթէ առաջին իսկ օրէն աշխոյժ մասնակիցներ էին Ցեղասպանութեան Ուխտին եւ այդ եզրին շուրջ ծաւալած քննարկումներուն:

