NAASR Celebrates Fifty Years On September 30

In celebration of its historic 50th anniversary, NAASR will hold a gala banquet and scholarly symposium on Saturday, September 30, 2006, at the Royal Sonesta Hotel in Cambridge, MA.

The events of September 30 will be the culmination of a year of observances of NAASR’s half century of pioneering programs in Armenian studies, research, and publication. Other activities have included the first NAASR Armenian Heritage Trip to Historic Armenia in more than a quarter century. The trip took place in June and was led by Prof. George Bournoutian of Iona College.

The NAASR celebratory events of September 30 will commence with a morning symposium on “Armenian-Turkish Dialogue and the Direction of Armenian Studies.” The symposium will take place at the Royal Sonesta Hotel from 9:00 a.m. until 1:00 p.m. (See box at left.)

The NAASR Celebrates 50! Gala Banquet will take place in the evening at the Royal Sonesta, beginning with a 5:30 reception. Following dinner will be a program that will include a keynote address by Dr. Gregory H. Adamian, a retrospective video, special guests and surprise announcements, and music and dancing. The Banquet is open to NAASR members and non-members alike. Interested parties should contact NAASR as soon as possible for information on reservations.

Symposium: Armenian-Turkish Dialogue and the Direction of Armenian Studies

Panelists:
Dr. Tane Akçam, Visiting Associate Professor of History, University of Minnesota; Rachel Goshgarian, Ph.D. candidate, Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University; Dr. Richard G. Hovannisian, Armenian Educational Foundation Professor of Modern Armenian History, University of California, Los Angeles; Dr. Gerard J. Libaridian, Alex Manoogian Professor of Modern Armenian History, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; Dr. Christina Maranci, Associate Professor of Art History, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee; Dr. Kevork Bardakjian, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor—Panel Respondent

Moderator:
Marc A. Mamigonian, Director of Programs and Publications, NAASR.

The Symposium is free and open to the public. Discussion follows the panelists’ remarks.

$2 Million Campaign Under Way

In order to insure its continued success in developing and implementing its educational and research initiatives to promote knowledge and scholarship on Armenian history, culture, and language, NAASR has launched a $2 million campaign to establish an endowment fund. The response has been extremely positive, and the campaign’s success will allow NAASR to expand its initiatives and embark on new ones as it enters its next half century.

For fifty years NAASR’s members and friends have generously supported our pioneering efforts in establishing Armenian Studies at the university level and supporting and disseminating research and scholarly activity on Armenian subjects through lectures, conferences, and publications.

Please give generously as NAASR reaches its milestone fiftieth year and looks ahead to even greater achievements.
NAASR Sponsors Facing History and Ourselves Workshop on Armenian Genocide

Under a major grant from NAASR, Brookline-based Facing History and Ourselves held a special full-day professional development workshop for Massachusetts teachers on July 26 using its most recent resource book, Crimes Against Humanity and Civilization: The Genocide of the Armenians. Attended by more than 35 Massachusetts high school and middle school teachers, the workshop provided a lucid, engaging, and highly informative framework for teachers to implement lessons on the Armenian Genocide, the teaching of which is mandated by the Commonwealth.

NAASR and Facing History have a history of association and collaboration that extends back over a quarter of a century. NAASR Chairman Emeritus Manoog S. Young has served on the Facing History Board of Directors since the 1970s, and as Facing History President Margot Stern Strom notes in her Introduction to Crimes Against Humanity and Civilization, it was Young who provided the original impetus for the creation of such a book. Around 1980, NAASR raised some $30,000 for Facing History’s Armenian Genocide Curriculum Project, then under the direction of William S. Parsons, now of the United States Holocaust Museum in Washington, D.C.

A Turning Point in Human Rights and International Law

Beginning at 9:00 a.m. and running until 4:00 p.m., the workshop began with an overview by Facing History’s Director of Research and Development Adam Strom, who stressed that the purpose of the workshop is to see how the resource book can work in the classroom setting. Strom described the Armenian Genocide as “a turning point in human rights and international law,” and recalled that the crucial phrase “crime against humanity” originated in an Allied declaration against the killings in 1915.

He described some of the key issues raised by the Armenian Genocide, such as how do you bring change to a traditional society where oppressed minorities seek equal rights?; the formation of the modern Middle East out of the ruins of the Ottoman Empire; the substantial connections between the Armenian Genocide and Raphael Lemkin, who created the term “genocide”; and the unresolved nature of the Armenian Genocide due to denial.

Four Sessions Explore Diverse Themes

The workshop progressed through four major sessions: “Identity and History,” “We and They: Armenians in the Ottoman Empire,” “Choices in the Face of Genocide,” and “Legacies of History.” During each of these sessions the group broke up into smaller sections working under the guidance of Strom and the other workshop facilitators, Adrienne Billingham of Lexington High School and Jimmie Jones, Senior Program Associate with Facing History.

Engaging a group of educators with widely varying backgrounds in the subject matter of the Armenian Genocide, the workshop provided a forum for discussion and exploration both of the history and sociology of the Armenian Genocide and of effective means to incorporate this complex material into Social Studies curricula.

NAASR Donates Books To Lincoln and Sudbury Libraries and High School

In Spring 2006, as part of its ongoing efforts to increase knowledge of the Armenian Genocide through the dissemination of scholarship, NAASR donated some twenty fundamental works on the subject to the Lincoln and Sudbury public libraries. In addition, NAASR sent one basic text to each of the members of the Lincoln-Sudbury Regional High School department of history, as well as the school committee and the school principal and superintendent.

Lincoln-Sudbury has been a hotbed of controversy in 2006 due to the lawsuit brought by a teacher in the Lincoln-Sudbury history department and a student (in addition to a Cambridge Rindge and Latin School teacher and the Assembly of Turkish American Associations). NAASR stands firm in the conviction that the best means of combating denial of the Armenian Genocide in any form is scholarship.
Prof. James Russell Launches New NAASR-Harvard Joint Publication

On May 4 NAASR hosted the launch of the newest publication of its Armenian Heritage Press, Bosphorus Nights: The Complete Lyric Poems of Bedros Tourian, translated with commentary by Prof. James R. Russell. The book, which offers Tourian’s complete poetic output for the first time in English, is a joint undertaking of NAASR’s Armenian Heritage Press and Harvard’s Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations (NELC) and is distributed by Harvard University Press and NAASR.

At the book launch, spoke on some of the background of the book’s creation, offered an overview of Tourian’s life and works, read several poems from his translation, and engaged in a spirited discussion with the audience. Some excerpts from his talk follow. (The complete text is online at www.commercemarketplace.com/home/naasr/Russell-TourianLecture.htm) We thank Prof. Russell for allowing us to reproduce it here.

The book is a translation—the first into English—of the complete poetic works of the Western Armenian Romantic poet Bedros Tourian, with the Armenian texts, a commentary accompanying each poem, and an Introduction, with an appendix consisting of a critical essay by Paruyr Sevak and of texts and reminiscences relating to Tourian’s life and work. Though Alice Blackwell, Minas Tcheraz, and Valerii Bryusov rendered a substantial proportion of the poems into English, French, and Russian, Tourian has received little critical attention in the West in nearly a century. The documentary and editorial labors of Chobanian, Sharuryan, Sevak, and others writing in Armenian have prepared the groundwork for such an exploration; and I hope future students of Armenian literature and scholars investigating the poet’s work will benefit from my modest efforts.

Tourian began an autobiographical novel he entitled Vosp’oryan kish-erner, “Bosphorus Nights.” His articles and letters show he was as original a writer of prose as of poetry; and the novel would have been his only major work in prose. Those who read it thought it showed great promise; but even the unfinished manuscript is lost. I have called my book after it for several reasons. The loss of the novel in a way foreshadows the larger and more tragic disappearance of the cosmopolitan culture of Constantinople and the obliteration of Armenian life in Anotia in the Genocide. The vanished manuscript of Bruno Schulz’s only novel, The Shawl, has come similarly to be seen as emblematic of the destruction of the civilization of the Jews of Europe in the Holocaust. In The Master and Margarita, Mikhail Bulgakov’s Mephistopheles plucks a novel from the fireplace, restored from the ashes, and intones Rukopisi ne goryat! “Manuscripts do not burn!” Sometimes, though, they do; and Heinrich Heine warned that those who start by burning books will end up burning men.

By naming the book after Tourian’s lost novel, one memorializes his lost world, one in which a ticket for the Bosphorus ferry was printed in Armenian, French, Greek, and Turkish. One endeavors also to render unto his delicate shade the glory he insisted was his due, albeit in the reflected sky of a different language, on the shores of a new world. And finally and simply, the vista of the waters of the Bosphorus, its new steam-powered ferries, and the twinkling lights of its far, European shore are the leitmotif of Tourian’s short life, its longings and exhilarations and reveries.

In the two decades of Tourian’s brief, meteoric life (he was born in 1851, contracted tuberculosis, and died early in 1872), a Bosphorus steam ferry company was founded and its fleet multiplied geometrically. His prose poem appeared in one of many Armenian newspapers recently founded in the city, whose Armenian population briefly exceeded that of the other main non-Muslim population—the Greeks. The speed of development in Ottoman Constantinople was so explosive that when Gustave Flaubert visited the city in 1850, he predicted in a letter that in a century’s time it would be the capital of the world. This was the time when the vernacular, askharhabar, decisively displaced Classical Armenian, grabar; and secular literature and science superseded theology.

Bedros Tourian’s life is frozen in the amber of his adolescence; this youthful feature of Romanticism, in his case determined by the tragic brevity of his
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In June, as part of the celebration of its 50th Anniversary, NAASR sponsored its first Armenian Heritage Tour to Historic Armenia in over a quarter of a century. (NAASR’s initial Armenian Heritage Tour in 1967 was the first of its kind in the United States.) Taking in the Armenian Republic and Karabagh, portions of Georgia, and much of today’s Eastern Turkey, the 2006 tour was led by the noted historian Prof. George Bournoutian of Iona College in New York.

Over twenty people accompanied Bournoutian on the tour, many of them visiting places they had never been before or from which their parents or grandparents had come nearly a century ago. Stops on the tour outside of the Armenian Republic included Stepanakert, Shushi, and Gandzasar in Karabagh, Tblisi and Batumi in Georgia, and Ani, Van, Erzurum, Mush, Bitlis, Kharpert, Hussenig, Diyarbakir, and many others in Eastern Turkey.

On September 12, NAASR will present an evening of discussion with a number of the tour participants. In this issue of the Newsletter we feature the impressions of one of the travelers, Sarah Ignatius of Somerville, MA.

* * * * *

Kharpert

On a steep hillside below the remains of a crumbling fortress and a broad rock face stood the Armenian quarter of Kharpert in 1914. The old photos show rows of flat-roofed houses, terraced into the hillside. All of the houses are completely gone, and the hillside has reverted to nature. The hillside is even steeper than it looks in the photos. A paved road winds along the edge of it. I walked on the grass by the side of the road, feeling I was walking where Grampa had walked. I put my hand on the oldest looking tree, wondering if over 100 years ago Grampa might have walked by it or even climbed it as a boy. I picked up some little pieces of rock to take home to my brother David and sister Amy.

I climbed down the rocky hillside to the remnants of a church, its stone walls in ruins in the rough grass. I walked under an arch and into the roofless center of the church and faced the altar. I crossed myself, standing in the sun, feeling the breeze, looking at the altar and the blue sky beyond. I heard in my head a rumbling, guttural sound, like Grampa used to make when getting ready to growl in exasperation, “Mehr ahdi ahsdzvadz”—a deep resonating sound. That was it. No words, no other messages coming to me from him, and now my, homeland. I reminded myself that you cannot ask too much of the dead. The dead have given all they had and now it is up to us to give back to them.

I hiked up the hillside back to the road, feeling happy to be in Grampa’s home town, a place to which he was never able to return. I breathed in deeply looking from on high down onto the plain below that stretched to the Euphrates River, now dammed to form a long blue lake. This expansive view, this clear air, these evergreen trees, this dry grass, this steep rocky hillside were all part of Grampa’s world and now part of mine.

I went back to the bus to get the picture I had brought of him as a young man taken about a year after he came to the United States, thus looking about the age he was when he left Kharpert. I also got from the bus the picture of Grampa and Granna taken at Pop’s grandparents’ home in Glendale (the house on Rossmyoyn where Uncle Nick lived). I also took out the coin from Uncle Nick I had brought along. I put the coin in my pocket and walked on the grass by the road, showing the pictures to the hillside as if they could take in the view themselves. I felt the breeze blow across them, which seemed soothing, maybe to them and definitely to me. I hoped no one would notice what I was doing, feeling embarrassed that I wanted a picture of my grandparents to see Grampa’s home town again and the town where Granna’s father went to college. If my grandparents could have seen their surroundings, they would not have recognized much. All that was left were the ruins of a church, the semicircular stone wall of another church farther down and the rectangular stone foundation of a tannery at the bottom of the hill where at times a stream probably ran. Where I was standing now was perhaps a path Grampa had walked on as a kid, or perhaps a house he had been in or walked by 1,000 times. It felt strange not to know, and sacrilegious to be walking on someone’s house, like walking on the graves of your ancestors.

I kept thinking I should be feeling sad, but I felt exhilarated to be in a place I never thought I would see, a place that until this year I did not even know how to spell or locate on a map, a place Grampa must have explored as a kid and longed to have given a different future to as an adult.

I put the pictures in one hand and continued walking, feeling connected to my own past, excited and tranquil at the same time. A member of our tour group came over and asked what I had in my hand. I showed her the pictures and started to explain who they were. Tears welled up in my eyes and rolled down my face. I hadn’t realized how close the tears were to the surface. I felt so sad for my grandparents and the thousands of other Armenians who had lived there.
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Spring Lectures and Events Cover Many Topics

Dr. Henry Theriault: From Dehumanization to Imperial Dominance: Rethinking Genocidal Violence

On February 23, Professor Henry Theriault of Worcester State College delivered a fascinating lecture to a full house at the NAASR headquarters. Dr. Theriault’s talk, entitled “From Dehumanization to Imperial Dominance: Rethinking Genocidal Violence,” addressed prevailing notions about violence in the context of genocide, challenging that popular models for understanding these ideas are sometimes too forgiving of the perpetrator.

Such is the case, Theriault argues, in the Armenian Genocide. He explained that the prevailing literature on genocidal violence assumes that the actual violence takes place because perpetrators come to think of their victims as less than human. Some analysts suggest that perpetrators are not terribly concerned with their specific actions, because they have dehumanized, or “thingified,” their victims. For Theriault, however, this paradigm supports neither the degree of brutality, nor the level of inefficiency commonly occurring as a result of genocide, and is not confirmed by eyewitness testimony to this violence.

For Theriault, the attraction of the dehumanization paradigm is an issue of ethics. There is an ethical reason why we are attracted to the dehumanization model, so much so that there is no longer debate over whether it is a legitimate position. This framework suggests that there is a lack of understanding or knowledge of what one is doing—which is an optimistic attitude. Wrongdoers are simply victims themselves of propaganda. “This has implications on how we think about why genocide happens and also what can be done after genocide,” he asserted, as far as reconciliation work goes.

Theriault posited that the planners of genocide maximized cruelty against Armenians. “It wasn’t just about killing Armenians,” he pointed out, “it was about killing them in the most brutal ways possible, such that the brutality was almost more important than the killing. There was a point where the cruelty was the central focus in a lot of ways,” and not the efficiency.

This methodology of such seemingly inefficient cruelty has sometimes been explained as designed to save bullets during the war—though, clearly, it actually required heightened manpower. Marches argued designed to separate citizens from their immovable property (i.e., homes, property) were actually extremely elaborate, lengthy marches with hired guardsmen and gendarmes. If Armenians had been so dehumanized, why, Theriault asks, was there so much attention paid to designing complicated “festivals of torture”? There was an added layer of psychological torture to the killings, precisely because the victims were viewed as human—if Armenians were really thought of as animals, torture made no sense. Inflicting psychological torture was part of the desired effects of the killings.

Theriault discussed some of Nietzsche’s philosophies regarding violence and cruelty, namely that desire for cruelty is natural, and that humans willingly enjoy suffering of others and causing the suffering of others. This idea he tied to 1915, suggesting that genocide is perhaps an excuse for mass cruelty. He noted, however, that Nietzsche’s views are complex and not necessarily to be tied to genocidal violence.

Broadening his lecture to cover other areas he has focused on in his research, Theriault also discussed the issue of mass violence against women. He compared violent acts committed during the Armenian Genocide to those in the Bosnian and Rwandan genocides, noting that while it is an under-studied aspect of genocide, it is perhaps one of the most important because the violence speaks to the intent of the perpetrator to not only kill, but to “wipe out society and social structures,” as mass rapes transcend generations and affects recovery in various ways.

Theriault discussed Armenian political history prior to the genocide, elucidating logical fallacies pertaining to arguments that the Armenians were trying to separate from the Ottoman Empire. On the contrary, he noted, the Armenians had recently acquired new rights that would preclude any desire to separate. These rights, gained after the 1908 revolution by the Young Turks, some members of which were Armenian, elevated Armenians from their second-class status under the millet, closer to equals with Turks and other Muslims. This Reconstruction-like period drew to a dramatic and tragic conclusion for the Armenians in 1915, as their newly-found status as human equals was used as a vehicle to

— continued on next page
target and animate violence.

Theriault, a graduate of Princeton and University of Massachusetts, Amherst, is currently Associate Professor of Philosophy at Worcester State College, where he also works in the College’s Center for the Study of Human Rights.

Dr. Simon Payaslian: U.S. Foreign Policy and the Armenian Question: An Historiographical Analysis

Dr. Simon Payaslian of Clark University gave a lecture entitled “U.S. Foreign Policy and the Armenian Question: An Historiographical Analysis,” on March 9 at the NAASR Center. Payaslian is author of the recently–published study United States Policy Toward the Armenian Question and the Armenian Genocide.

In his NAASR lecture, Payaslian presented an overview and assessment of some of the important historiographical works as representative samples of the dominant models that have shaped the scholarship on U.S. policy toward the Armenian Question. In so doing, he provided a sense of the “intellectual/historical context of his own study, giving an idea of “where does it fit in the overall scheme of things” in terms of the historiography of the Armenian Question and the Armenian Genocide.

Payaslian provided five “contending paradigms of international relations and United States foreign policy”: 1) Power/Realist, 2) Humanitarian/Moralpolitik, 3) Economic, 4) Systemic, and 5) Decision-Making Theories. In Payaslian’s opinion, “up to this point whatever has been written on the subject” of U.S. foreign policy and the Armenian Question “has been written simply within the context of the Armenian Question and the Armenian Genocide.” However, his approach, which he believes to be the book’s major contribution, is to “shift your focus” and “talk about the Armenian Question and the Armenian Genocide within the context of U.S. policy.”

As a result of this shift in perspective, the “historical background of U.S. foreign policy” is essential to understanding how the U.S. responded to the Armenian Genocide—and for the most part Payaslian finds that this historical background is lacking in previous studies of the subject.

It is perhaps this lack of historical background that has led most scholars to focus on the “Moralpolitik” component of U.S. policy. “So far, nearly everything written on the subject” falls into this category, said Payaslian, including Peter Balakian’s The Burning Tigris and Merrill Peterson’s “Starving Armenians.” The major problem with such an approach, Payaslian stated, is that it “implies the primary purpose of U.S. foreign policy is humanitarian,” a notion he finds “ridiculous” and “unrealistic.” Woodrow Wilson and other American leaders, Payaslian claimed, were interested in the Armenian Question only insofar as it coincided with American interests—interests that were primarily economically and militarily driven.

American missionaries in the Ottoman Empire, he noted, may have had humanitarian interests; but it is important to remember that while the missionaries were influential they did not formulate American foreign policy. "First and foremost" for the U.S. were “geopolitical and economic [concerns],” whereas the humanitarian was a “third or fourth level consideration,” Payaslian said. In effect, such concerns were at best “a luxury,” and even as such humanitarianism had to be in American interests.

Payaslian’s provocative presentation led to a lengthy discussion with the audience which continued well into the evening.

Dr. Ina McCabe: Armenians As a Global Diaspora Entrepreneurial Network

Dr. Ina Baghdiantz McCabe, Darakjian-Jafarian Professor of Modern Armenian History at Tufts University, delivered an interesting and informative talk on March 23 entitled “Armenians As a Global Diaspora Entrepreneurial Network.” McCabe is the co-editor of the recent book Diaspora Entrepreneurial Networks: Four Centuries of History and the author of one of the volume’s chapters dealing with the Armenians and the Eurasian Silk Trade.

She began with a definitional introduction of trade networks, challenging the prevailing understanding that “traders were specialists in a single kind of economic enterprise [wholly unconnected to the host country], whereas the host society was a whole society with many occupations, class stratifications, political divisions between the rulers and the ruled.” McCabe argued that this is a false dichotomy and that trade populations are in fact a critical aspect of the host’s political and cultural orders. Citing Armenians in Iran as a paradigm-breaking example, McCabe explained that, in fact, these Armenians, one of the three classic trade diasporas (the Jews and the Greeks being the others), held political offices under at least three shahs.

According to McCabe, these trade groups are not at all divorced from their parent countries. On the contrary, they exist in a unique symbiosis which benefits both parties. She believes that diaspora trade groups not only flourished financially and politically but also maintained a degree of control over the modes of production so much that they, to a degree, dictated their own success.

McCabe explained that the classic — continued on next page
European trading in the Ottoman Empire was carried out mostly by non-Moslem communities—primarily the Armenians, Greeks, and Jews. In the late 1700s, for example, the Dutch government granted these groups special privileges previously granted only to Dutch nationals. This and other treatment allowed the Greeks, for example, to become some of the leading bankers in the Ottoman state, belonging even to the Ottoman bourgeoisie.

McCabe maintained that unique political atmospheres were crucial determinants as to whether these enterprises survived, flourished, or failed. “Host societies have to have policies that are beneficial to that trade. The hub of the trade has to be politically protected. If it isn’t, people will not prosper,” she observed. Moreover, Armenians, as well as Greeks, Jews, and other diasporan trade networks, must have had tremendous negotiating and communication skills; they must have been adaptable to shifting political and economic climates, and they would had to have been clearly and concretely organized to maintain control of their trades through the generations.

**Andrew Goldberg: Preview of The Armenian Genocide**

The PBS film *The Armenian Genocide,* (which aired in Boston on April 18 on WGBH-Channel 2) received a tantalizing preview complete with a discussion and question-and-answer period with its producer and director, Andrew Goldberg.

The event, co-sponsored by NAASR, the Armenian Library and Museum of America (ALMA), and the Brookline-based Facing History and Ourselves, took place at ALMA on Sunday, April 9, and was attended by a standing-room-only crowd of nearly 250 people. There were brief introductory remarks by Mariam Stepanyan, office manager of ALMA, Marc Mamigonian, Director of Programs and Publications at NAASR, and Adam Strom from Facing History and Ourselves.

Goldberg, who has produced several films on Armenian subjects, noted in opening remarks that Facing History and Ourselves, a non-profit organization that designs curriculum, would be preparing materials for teachers who could use the film as a teaching tool in the classroom. Four segments of this material are already on Facing History and Ourselves’ website. Said Goldberg, “We want to empower kids and raise questions such as, is it possible to prevent genocide?”

Goldberg said he became interested in the Armenian Genocide as a result of his Jewish background and his knowledge of “the destruction of the Jewish way of life. I’ve come back to the Genocide out of the realization that it has been so poorly covered in the press and in public discussions. Armenians tell other Armenians about it, but it has not become part of the mainstream. I believe this film, which will be seen by millions of people, will make the subject mainstream.”

He added, “I understand the notion of not being listened to, not affirmed, not heard. This sort of response can have devastating consequences and create a sense of powerlessness.”

Goldberg related some of the process of his research for the film, which included visiting the Turkish Embassy website, visiting the Turkish Embassy in Washington and trying to speak, when in Brussels, with either the Turkish ambassador to Belgium or the Turkish ambassador to the European Union.

---

**Dr. Ina Baghdiantz McCabe.**

by some as a lesser form of organization, when the reality is just the reverse. Recently, Harvard researchers concluded that many forms of legitimate business practices exist in the myriad management styles between family-run businesses and corporations with shareholders. “Structures exist that are perfectly rational, efficient, and a sign of creative adaptation to particular conditions,” McCabe stressed.

McCabe proceeded into a lengthy discussion of Armenian, Greek, and Jewish commercial influence within empires from Europe to Asia, noting that it is common knowledge that the successes of these empires were made possible in part precisely due to the commercial activities of their diasporan trade networks. In fact, the relationships between Armenian, Greek, and Jewish diasporan trade groups to their host countries were crucial. According to McCabe, “These groups were responsible for successful financial and trading networks that stretched from Venice, Vienna, and Amsterdam, to Shanghai.”

**Andrew Goldberg.**
On the website he found page after page of material that contends that “the Armenians are lying.” Specifically, Goldberg referred to passages from a book titled *The Armenians* by C.F. Dixon Johnson, which referred to Armenians in demigrating terms and suggested that Armenians were, in fact, one of the lost tribes of Israel.

After repeatedly calling the Turkish ambassador in Washington and receiving no response, Goldberg managed to reach him at home, but was basically stonewalled. He then showed a film clip that drew laughter, of his attempts to reach the two ambassadors in Brussels by calling from outside the embassy on his cell phone. The Deputy Director for Enlargement for the EU spoke to Goldberg but did not use the word “genocide” and allowed that at this point, it would not be “on the table for discussion” at the next meeting regarding Turkey’s possible entry into the EU.

The clips from *The Armenian Genocide* shown by Goldberg included a number of interviews with Turkish citizens, one of whom admitted that his grandfather had “put Armenians in a barn and burned them,” also saying he had “heard their voices for decades afterwards.” The footage also included statements by Peter Balakian, Vahakn Dadrian, and Samantha Powers. Most interesting was hitherto undisclosed film footage of Enver Pasha and interview footage with Raphael Lemkin, who coined the word “genocide,” discussing the Armenians in a 1940s television interview.

Goldberg vigorously rejected the notion that he had received funding from Turkish sources or that PBS had tampered in any way with the film. He said the film had been 90 percent funded by Armenian sources and 10 percent by Jewish groups and individuals. He also stated that he had had no involvement with the post-program discussion panel, which included two Turkish commentators, and which did not air in Boston.

“People who gave money did not influence the film. PBS did not change the show. There was no Turkish money in the funding,” he declared.

Goldberg concluded his remarks with an appeal to the audience. “I could give more time to human rights. You could give more time and money. When in doubt, do it—give. Something should be done about Darfur, but no one does anything.”

Looking to future projects, Goldberg said he doubted he would do another film on the Genocide. “It’s time for me to move on to other subjects and projects,” he said, adding, perhaps jokingly, that his next film would deal with dogs and cats.

The DVD of the film is available and can be purchased through NAASR’s Armenian Book Clearing House. (By Daphne Abeel; reprinted courtesy of the *Armenian Mirror-Spectator*).

**NAASR, ALMA Present Our Boys: Armenian World War II Veterans**

The new video documentary *Our Boys: Armenian World War II Veterans* was presented at a special program on May 25 at the Armenian Library and Museum of America (ALMA) in Watertown, MA. The program took place through the joint sponsorship of ALMA and NAASR.

In 2005, the 60th anniversary of the end of World War II, Tom Spera, the son of a veteran of the war, was determined to find a way to honor Armenian-American soldiers who had served their country so nobly. He collaborated with filmmaker Roger Hagopian to produce the moving *Our Boys* video, featuring oral histories interspersed with personal and historical photographs from the wartime period.

The film’s interviewees attend the Armenian Memorial Church in Watertown and the First Armenian Church of Belmont. These men—some barely out of high school at the time—reflected upon the bombing of Pearl Harbor, their induction into the service, their harrowing journeys aboard troop transport ships through rough seas, correspondence with their families back home, poignant and humorous moments, and near-death experiences during combat.

Life on the home front was recalled by the wives and relatives of the veterans. They worked for the armed services and in factories, served as air raid wardens and plane spotters, comforted the wounded in hospitals, and, in groups, attended USO dances, meeting soldiers who, at a moment’s notice, could be shipped out to war.

Filmmakers Hagopian and Spera were on hand to answer questions and discuss the making of *Our Boys*. In addition, a number of the interviewees were in the audience and offered additional anecdotes and insights into their remarkable experiences.

In addition to *Our Boys*, Roger Hagopian has also made the documentaries *Memories of Marash* and *The Journey of an Armenian Family: The Struggle of a Nation*, which have earlier been shown at NAASR, as well as other films on non-Armenian subjects.

**Helping To Create a NAASR Video Archive**

Since the beginning of 2006, Hagopian has been a fixture at NAASR lectures, serving as a videographer and helping to create a video archive of NAASR lectures and events that are accessible to researchers and other interested parties.

NAASR is enormously grateful to Hagopian for performing this valuable service. Both NAASR and the entire Boston-area Armenian community are most fortunate to have someone as talented and dedicated as Roger Hagopian in our midst.
NAASR Celebrates Completion of Library Cataloguing

NAASR announced at its June 22 Open House that the Edward and Helen Mardigian Armenian Reference and Research Library is fully computer catalogued and soon to be accessible online. Over the past two years, Ruby Chorbajian has catalogued the Library’s books, pamphlets, periodicals, recorded music, videos, personal papers, and manuscripts. The cataloguing has made NAASR’s huge library more accessible to scholars and interested individuals than at any previous time.

The evening featured several speakers offering brief comments, including Library Project Manager Ruby Chorbajian who oversaw and carried out the cataloguing process. Ruby spoke excitedly to a group of friends and interested NAASR members about her early months volunteering at NAASR, as well as the last two years she spent on this project.

NAASR’s Director of Programs and Publications Marc A. Mamigonian discussed witnessing the evolution of the library and its transformation from unopened boxes of books to a fully catalogued, accessible research center. Shushan Teager, NAASR Board member and library volunteer, and someone long involved with the NAASR Library, spoke about her specific interests in the library and her work on a weekly basis with Ruby Chorbajian.

The audience then moved upstairs for a tour through the Edward and Helen Mardigian Reference and Research Library and archives. Ruby Chorbajian explained the organization (according to the Library of Congress system) of the main collection, noting that Armenian and English language materials were now side by side according to subject and no longer separated by language. In the main room visitors browsed issues of Geghuni, a rare Armenian-language periodical from the early 1900s published by the Mekhitarist Fathers of Venice, while Ruby answered questions pertaining to the cataloguing process and the collections in general.

Next, the group proceeded to the John Roy Carlson (Avedis Derounian) archives, where several individuals were interested in on-the-spot research, while several others were preoccupied with beautiful preserved book advertisements and other artistic materials. Before heading back to the ground floor, the group proceeded to the rear of the building to view the periodicals collection where individuals browsed and scanned the shelves holding over 20,000 items.

The evening concluded for some in the bookstore and in the lecture hall for others, where a number of visitors thanked Ruby for her time at NAASR and wished their best as she embarks on a graduate degree in Ireland this fall.

About the NAASR Library

The Edward and Helen Mardigian Armenian Reference and Research Library at NAASR is composed of more than 20,000 books, pamphlets, periodicals, and documents, primarily in Armenian and English, dating as far back as the late eighteenth century. The collection encompasses a broad range of topics including history, literature, art and architecture, linguistics, as well as law, anthropology, genocide studies, psychology, sociology, and sports. The library has become a center for scholars, undergraduates, high school students, and the general public, who have benefited from NAASR’s unique holdings.

Through the years, numerous important and valuable collections have been donated or willed to NAASR and form the heart of the Armenian language collection, and NAASR continues to accept donations. The library also contains several important collections of personal papers, including those of the late Avedis Derounian (aka John Roy Carlson), which represent a substantial source of information for future researchers.

Highlights of the library include a large number of histories of now-destroyed Armenian villages and towns, many types of Armenian dictionaries, virtually all titles published in English on Armenian subjects over the past fifty years, and an enormous trove of newspapers and periodicals, including scholarly journals.

If you or someone you know has books in Armenian, English, or other languages on Armenian or related subjects that you are thinking of discarding, please donate them to NAASR’s Armenian Reference and Research Library.

The core of the library’s collection has come from donors like you who have helped make it one of the finest and largest of its kind in America.

No collection is too big or too small – contact NAASR if you have any questions. All gifts to NAASR are tax deductible. Keep the Armenian heritage alive – give to NAASR.
Launch of New Russell Publication (from p. 3)

earthly career, is easily translatable, at least, to this culture. For we tend to regard more the morning of life than its dusk. But in Tourian’s time death was more visible than now: people died mostly in early middle age, and at home: the sight and smell of death were normal to them but would be terrifying to us. Much else might seem strange: the rugged optimism of the mid-19th-century Ottoman Armenians who believed so firmly in the power of enlightenment and the certainty of progress. Visitors to Constantinople believed it to be the city of the future. One should not scoff at their misplaced hopes: what illusions about the future do we cherish today? What seems sure now but will entirely deceive us, or our descendants? Tourian thought the Sultan would protect the Armenians against the depredations of the Kurds, that the only dangerous opponent of human freedom in Europe was the Vatican. He wrote of the imprisonment and death of the Russian-Armenian poet and activist Mikayel Nalbandian, who was working for a Revolution that, progressives believed, was to signal the end of history and inaugurate an unbroken rational paradise of human bliss. Every hope proved deception; every cause, betrayal.

What makes nearly bearable the peril and tragedy of human existence is perhaps the continuity of life itself, the people who labor on. Bedros’ younger brother, Mihran, went on to become Yeghishe, Abbot of the Monastery of Armath, Archbishop, then Patriarch of Jerusalem, a public servant, a scholar of literature, a great Armenologist. His cousin Ghevond became a clergyman too, crossing the Atlantic to serve the Armenian Church in America as Archbishop till the knives of Dashnak assassins felled him, on Christmas of 1933 in upper Manhattan, a few blocks from where, twenty years later, I was born. Most of all, I think, it is the work we do that imparts meaning and lessens death’s sting. So Bosphorus Nights brings to you the creative work, all the poems of Bedros Tourian, who will, if I may paraphrase Vladimir Nabokov’s obituary of Khodasevich, remain the pride of Armenian poetry as long as its last memory lives. Nabokov concludes his necrology this way, with the release only art can give, the only Phoenix that can take wing: “Well, so it goes … There is no sense of consolation, if one starts to encourage the sense of loss by one’s private recollections of a brief, brittle, human image that melts like a hailstone on a window sill. Let us turn to the poems.”

Kharpert (from page 4)

An estimated 204,000 Armenians lived in the province of Kharpert in 1914. How could nothing be left? The Turks had wiped out all trace of Armenians here. Some homes of Turks still stand, as well as a small bazaar, a few shops, a little playground and refreshment area, a military base, some old cemeteries and a huge, several-story house being built on a hill overlooking Elazig. The real action now is down the hill in Elazig where all of 16 Armenians live today You can’t help but feel that the Turks prevailed. They wanted to eradicate Armenians from this area and they accomplished their goal. Not only is not an Armenian left, but not a trace that they ever lived here except the crumbling stone walls of a couple of churches and some old cemeteries.

I can see why Grampa never wanted to return. Why would he? To see the total devastation? To feel the effects of the campaign of hate that the Committee of Union and Progress in Turkey launched against the Armenians in this once prosperous city? To feel a deep rage welling up inside that he could not act upon to seek justice? To be consumed by a sadness and grief that no amount of tears could bring to an end? And yet he would have loved to return, to see it again, to re-connect to the memories of his youth, and to walk the paths of the old town—had it been left standing for him. I am so grateful I was able to do at least that.

NAASR Director of Programs & Publications Speaks at “Armenians and the Left” Conference

NAASR’s Director of Programs and Publications Marc A. Mamigonian spoke at the conference “Armenians and the Left” on April 8 at the City University of New York in Manhattan. The conference was hosted by the Armenian Revolutionary Federation-Eastern U.S. and The Nation Institute.

Mamigonian appeared on the panel “Armeno-Turkish Dialogue” with Dikran Kaligian of the ANC and Turkish publisher Ragip Zarakolu.

“It is no longer operable to say ‘the Turks say’ or ‘the Turks deny’ because courageous Turks, even if they are a minority, have rendered it inoperable. We should not speak about Turks as if they were all deniers. We should say “the Turkish state” or “Turkish denialists” – and we know that not all denialists are Turks, and not all Turks are denialists,” said Mamigonian.

Video of Mamigonian’s presentation, as well as those of other conference participants, is online at www.armeniansandtheleft.com.