

How to achieve the decision of the problem of the Armenian Genocide

by Ara Abrahamyan, Chairman of Union of Russian Armenians

AZG daily, September 13, 2003

Normalization of relations with Turkey and construction of further neighborly, and in the long term also friendly relations, assumes the necessity of summarizing in a civilized manner under the past - condemnation of the crime of the Armenian Genocide accomplished by it and acceptance of the adequate measures directed to liquidation of the consequences of this crime on the basis of international law. Therefore one of the overall objectives of the establishment of the World Armenian Organization and, accordingly, its tasks is full and a final confirmation of the fact of the Armenian Genocide by the international community, including its recognition by Turkey, and peaceful settlement of all problems connected to it on an objective basis of international law. This is a very difficult task. First of all, from the point of view of foreign policy.

Why do not Turks admit the fact of the Genocide?

Turkish leaders distinctly imagine the international legal consequences of the crime of genocide. They know also how the international community understood the contents of the political responsibility of the Turkish State. It was most completely expressed in the multilateral Sevres treaty on peace. All attempts undertaken by Turks in 1918-1920 to impose Armenia unequal contracts with the purpose of achieving voluntary refusal of the victim of Genocide of the rights have not crowned with success. The Brest - Lithuanian contract with the RSFSR was cancelled, and Batumi and Alexandrapol contracts with Armenia did not come into force. It is, probably considered in Turkey that Kars contract imposed to the puppet communistic government of the Armenian SSR, will not remove the question of consequences of the recognition by the international community of the responsibility for the crime of the genocide. Probably therefore Ankara probes opportunities of its replacement or confirmation by a new contract with the sovereign Republic Armenia.

Signing of a new, equitable treaty, which could become a basis for strong, really friendly and neighbourly relations, in our opinion, should be a result of arrangements on settlement of all questions, remained from the past, including the questions connected to the Armenian Genocide.

The question on the responsibility for the committed crime still induces Turkey to resist fiercely to the recognition of the fact of the Armenian Genocide. Today we are witnesses of escalation of official campaign of denying the Armenian Genocide. The Turkish State mobilizes all opportunities, spends huge means. Not limiting itself with the traditional means of political pressure on the governments and subornation of mass media, Turkey widely resorts to paid services of the professional lobbying organizations.

Maintenance of the Foreign policy of the state with denying of the committed crime is, as before, a subject of special concern of the government of Turkey. Just as it was at the end of the nineteenth and all along the twentieth centuries, Turkey puts obstacles in the way of the decision of the Armenian question on the basis of the right and justice, basing on political support of some great states. Despite the basic change of conditions in the world, the USA still assigns Turkey a role of one of its basic military partners.

Persistent refusal of George Bush, the President of the USA to qualify the murder of one and a half millions of Armenians as Genocide is perceived by successors of the policy of the Genocide of Armenians in Turkey as a direct support.

The argument put into circulation as if persistence of Armenians in the question of the responsibility of Turkey for the Genocide "does not respond" to the interests of normalisation of relations between Armenia and Turkey not only contradicts the most elementary perception of the bases of modern international relations, but directly encourages the Turkish government to show irreconcilability, strengthen determination not to admit the fact of fulfilment of the Genocide of Armenians.

Attempts to start political consultations and negotiations with the Turkish party for settlement of relations on the basis of international law practically appear unpromising. It is fair also concerning the attempt undertaken by the USA initiative of so-called Turkish-Armenian reconciliation ('so-called' as the word 'reconciliation' is not applicable to the Armenian party being a victim of this crime). Ankara continues to refuse the recognition of the Armenian Genocide and liquidation of its consequences on the basis of principles and norms of international law. Turks believe that the given question cannot become a subject of political negotiations and decisions, that, as a last resort, it can be considered by historians a disputable scientific problem.

Moreover, official political representatives of Turkey in their statements (for example, in the publication of the Ambassador to Russia Mr. Kurtulusha Tashkent in reply to my rather constrained article) consider it allowable to come out with hardly veiled threats of 'complications' if Armenians do not cease to demand condemnation of the Genocide and elimination of its consequences on the basis of international law.

In order to somehow reconcile its policy of the justification of murder of a whole people to the policy of counteraction carried out at present in the world to extremism and the international terrorism and understanding that hiding of annihilation of one of the civilised nations of the world becomes more and more difficult, the Turkish government starts new tricks and means for denying the Armenian Genocide. If until recently the preference was given to misinformation, to a direct deceit of the international community by denying or distortion of the facts, now Turks began to combine these primitive traditional methods with more and more refined - formal - legal arguments.

Hiding their real attitude to international law, Turks began to represent themselves as adherents of international law. As for Armenians, they are ascribed to aspiration for substituting the just by the history, unwillingness to settle the relations with Turkey on the basis of international law.

The idea of escalation of the campaign of denying the Genocide will be incomplete if do not specify the new phenomenon, arousing the necessity to accept strict measures in Turkey itself. For the first time in its history responsible Turkish scientists and public figures have appeared wanting the recognition of commitment of the crime, a frank confession according to the example of Germany to wash off the shameful stain from the country. Though they are only a few, the ruling circles of Turkey see serious threat of the traditional political line of rigid denying of the Armenian Genocide in their appearance.

In connection with the cases of expression of doubts becoming more frequent in reliability of the governmental version of the relation of the Turkish State to Armenians, measures are taken also for washing brains of Turks. According to the order of Huseyn Chelik, the Minister of Education a new subject is introduced at the schools in Turkey - policy of denying the Armenian Genocide. Not only the recognition of the Armenian Genocide, but even a simple expression of doubt in reliability of denying the Armenian Genocide in Turkey is punishable.

New turn in the tactics of protection of the Genocide state

Recently a tendency of the western states to recognise the Armenian Genocide without international legal consequences in the form of the responsibility of Turkey and necessity of restoring to the extent possible the violated rights of Armenian people is shown more and more distinctly.

It was appeared most clearly in the conclusion of the legal advisers invited by the New York Center of Justice of the Transitional period for answering the question of Turkish and Armenian members of the Turkish-Armenian Reconciliation Commission (TARC) about applicability of the Convention on the prevention of the crime of Genocide and punishment for it "to the events of the past in Eastern Anatoly" (euphemism for the designation of the Genocide of Armenians in Armenian vilayets (regions) of Ottoman Empire).

Having answered that these events can be qualified as a Genocide in the sense this term is applied in the Convention, anonymous legal advisers have reduced the value of the recognition to an opportunity to refer to the Armenian Genocide as to a "historic fact", which does not attract legal consequences. They have excluded the possibility of responsibility of Turkey and the Turks for the Genocide on the basis of the Convention, motivating it with its not having a retroactive force concerning the events, which took place before its coming into force on January, 12, 1951.

Such an arrangement of the question forces us to continue the development of the arguments, confirming the possibility of not only historical ascertaining of the fact of commitment of a crime of genocide, but also of its legal ascertaining - with all international legal consequences.

The mistake of ignoring the indisputable, documentary confirmed fact of the Armenian Genocide, which recognized the international community on behalf of the Parisian Peace Conference and League of Nations and established the political responsibility of Turkey as a state already when this crime was made, becomes specially obvious .

It is necessary to define: what we want to achieve

In complex political conditions of the struggle for the recognition of the Genocide of Armenians, achieving a positive decision is possible only in the event, if we unite our efforts and act on a basis of a uniform national concept.

First of all it is necessary to define: what do we want to achieve?

The answer is like offering itself: recognition of the Armenian Genocide by the international community of the states and the Turkey itself. However, as we already mentioned, the Armenian

Genocide has been recognised both by the international community, and the Turkish state – Ottoman Empire, and the responsibility of the Turks and Turkey has been established when the crime was being committed.

It means that the question is a repeated recognition on the part of those states, which have already admitted this fact, and a primary recognition - on the part of the new states, though they too have been drawn in with the act of the recognition by their former mother countries. If we recognize that the international community on behalf of the Parisian Peace Conference and League of Nations representing all mankind, has not only admitted the fact of “the annihilation of an entire nation”, but also has established the international responsibility of the Turkish state for this crime, it would be more exact and more correct to speak about the necessity of realization of the already established responsibility.

This ascertaining has a big practical value. It considerably facilitates the achievement of the set objective. If we remind the world that the governments of the great states - USA, the Great Britain, France and others have officially recognised that Turkey is guilty in the crime of the Genocide called then as ‘annihilation of an entire nation’, that the competent international bodies on behalf of the Parisian Peace Conference and the predecessor of the United Nations – the League of Nations have established the responsibility of Turkey and the Turks for the Armenian Genocide on the same international legal basis on which, after a quarter of a century the responsibility of Germany and nazi leaders was established, it will essentially reduce their opportunity of manoeuvring.

What do we understand as a recognition? Whether only moral satisfaction, an abstract triumph of idea of the right and justice? Will we be satisfied with acknowledgement by the international community of the fact of the Armenian Genocide already recognised by it or we want to achieve finally the recognition by Turkey itself of the crime committed by it? Restoration of what rights of Armenians and Armenian people as a whole should we achieve? In other words, we need to have a uniform realistic programme of settlement of all questions remaining from the past taking into account, certainly, prospects of development of relations with Turkey and the Turkish people.

Is a compromise in the question of recognition is possible?

In the question of the recognition and condemnation of the crime of Genocide there cannot be a compromise. The question of the life and death of a nation cannot be a subject of diplomatic combinations. Only in case of frank confession and condemnation of this grave crime by the Turkey itself is it possible to search solutions of concrete questions.

The international law proceeds from the principle that an offence against the law and furthermore the crime against humanity, cannot generate any rights for the state, which have committed the crime. It is obvious also, that Armenians, being guided by the desire to create a strong base for neighbourly relations, should display a certain realism.

The compromise is possible only after the recognition of the fact of the Armenian Genocide by Turkey, development and acceptance of concrete measures on elimination of the consequences of this crime on the basis of the package of political and legal decisions on the whole complex of Armenian-Turkish relations.

About the unified concept of the decision of the Armenian question

The development of such a Pan-Armenian programme of actions is a very complex task. It touches upon quite a number of problems both in the intra-Armenian life, and in the international relations - international legal, political, economic, financial, etc.

Decisions concerning conditions of settlement should be the result of all-round discussion, and procedure of discussion and decision-making should provide free expression of will for all Armenian people but in particular, the descendants of that part, which directly and personally has suffered from the Genocide.

The development of such a national position cannot be the monopoly of any group of persons or any political party. Moreover, despite the importance of the role of Armenian State in the solution of this problem, the development of Pan-Armenian positions cannot be the monopoly of the Government of the Republic of Armenia. It is obvious that in the development of this common programme, both competent bodies of the Government, scientific institutions and public organisations of the Republic of Armenia, and the non-governmental organisations and institutions of Diaspora, the basis of which were the refugees of the Western (Turkish) Armenia should participate. To do this work, the existing friendly associations of Turkish Armenians, which consolidate the descendants and successors of Turkish Armenians should be involved, those who mostly have suffered from the Genocide. It is especially important to provide the representation of all political spectra and, first of all, the political parties.

The creation of such a national programme assumes the necessity of the development of the well-grounded positions on some issues of history, geography, statistics and so forth. Such, for example,

as the time of perpetration of the Genocide and its periodization, a spatial area of the Genocide within and outside the frontiers of the Turkish State, dynamics of the population and victims of the Genocide (massacred, deported, dead, turkized, islamized, etc.). It is necessary to remember that the opposite party will use on the spot the slightest divergences or inaccuracies.

It is impossible to negotiate extemporaneously on such crucial issues and with such an experienced opponent at any level. Each aspect, each detail should be weighed, carefully worked out, argued. Negotiations should be based on the uniform concept of settlement. Only after the development of Pan-Armenian position and definitions of limits of possible concessions, the negotiations with the Turkish side can start.

According to the world experience, the negotiations will be carried out, most likely, by a political and legal principle of a package, which facilitates the decision-making on a number of the interconnected decisions when concessions on one problem are compensated by benefit of another.

It is obvious, that our variant of the political and legal package, i.e. a set of decisions as the constituent of the national programme of settlement of Armenian-Turkish relations, should be preliminary elaborated. One should meet the requirements of the right and justice and, at the same time, to take into account to the extent possible, the existing realities.

From our point of view, such a package should include necessarily the refusal by Turkey of unilateral support of the extremist position of Azerbaijan on the problem of Nagorno Karabagh. It is proved not only by the fact that Turkish armies together with the Azerbaijan gangs took part in the Genocide of Armenian population of Nagorno Karabagh (in particular, in the slaughter of 20 thousand Armenians of Shoushi by spring of 1920). If they demand to take into account the ethnic realities, existing because of the crime of the Genocide, we especially have the right to insist for respecting the realities existing in Karabagh during millennia. Struggling for liquidation of consequences of the Genocide and establishment of new relations with Turkey, it is unallowable failing to not take into account the external security of the Armenian state, a guarantee against the relapse of the Genocide.

Who and how should negotiate?

Refusing in the most categorical form the recognition of the fact of the Genocide of Armenians and laying down unacceptable preliminary conditions for official negotiations with representatives of Armenia about normalisation of relations, the government of Turkey, at the same time, initiates "negotiations" with representatives of Diaspora over the Armenian government's head. Recently, the intention to negotiate with the representatives of the Armenian communities of the various countries the intelligence service (Department of the information and researches of the Turkish Ministry for Foreign Affairs) has shown.

We are not against the genuine "people's diplomacy" when representatives of the nations from both sides come forward with the purpose of bridging. Genuine "people's diplomacy" can promote settlement of relations between two nations and the states from both sides. Its value and the importance grow when the problem is such complex relations, as Armenian-Turkish ones. We are against the simulation of "negotiations", when the state body tries to talk, openly or secretly, with any groups of Armenians at the choice of the Turks or their friends.

Negotiations of representatives of the nations are possible and even are necessary but as a part of the process of the valid normalisation of relations, instead of negotiations for political manipulations for the benefit of the state, which does not wish to repent for perpetration of very grave crime against humanity. "Negotiations", when bodies of the state flatly denying the opportunity of discussion of the problem of the Genocide come out on the one hand, and the representatives of unorganised communities of Diaspora on the other hand, have nothing in common with the "people's diplomacy". It is obvious, that this manoeuvre is designed for easing the positions of Armenians, for splitting them. The main thing is that creating semblance of the negotiations, as if carried out with the purpose of normalisation of relations between Turkish and Armenian peoples, between Turkey and Armenia, in practice aspire to undermine the forward process of recognition of the Genocide of Armenians.

The subject of Genocide touches each Armenian and consequently, it is natural, that each Armenian wants to express himself, to give his appraisal, to offer his own recommendations. However, not each Armenian owns materials of the statistical data, an extensive documentary file, a history of the international relations of this complex period, the necessary knowledge of international law.

The time of improvisations and amateurish reasoning has passed. It should not be any haphazard work. Nobody should assume the right to speak on behalf of the Armenian people on substantial problems of national value. Self-appointed representatives should not carry out such negotiations obliging the Armenian people. On behalf of Armenian people, the official and unofficial negotiations on such a complicated problem can be carried out only by the authorised competent representatives.

Official intergovernmental negotiations can be carried out only by the official representatives. As opposed to the case of negotiations of representatives of the public, the private negotiations of the states

are carried out by the private representatives of the states and under their guidance, supervision and control.

Such informal negotiations play an important role for solution of vexed and complicated question helping the States in the search of mutually acceptable conclusions.

Thereupon is a problem: which of these categories the Turkish-Armenian Reconciliation Commission (TARC) should be ranked to? Though there are former Ministers for Foreign Affairs in its ranks, any of two states did not show the desire to be represented by them, even informally. Anyway, from our point of view, the government of Armenia is not related to the assignment of the Armenian members of the Commission. There is a problem: whether TARC can be used as one of channels for informal negotiations of the interested sides?

Acceptance of such a decision is the prerogative of the governments of Armenia and Turkey. They can make such a decision based on the assessment of works of the Commission. In this case, the corresponding adaptation of its structure is required: it should not be determined by a third party, independent on how good intentions it has, but by Armenian and Turkish sides, accordingly.

The structure of negotiators from the Armenian side should provide not only representation of the basic part of the political spectrum, but also the representation of "Western Armenians", which are the direct victims of the Genocide. It is obvious also that the sufficient level of competence in the problems of the international relations, diplomacy and law should be provided.

To increase the role of the state

To take away from us the opportunity to protect our sacred rights, Turkey together with the Bolshevik government of the Soviet Russia has deprived us with our national statehood. The puppet communist government of the Armenian SSR had no opportunities to raise the problem officially. In the USSR, a ban was imposed on the subject of the Genocide of Armenians. After finding independence and entering in the United Nations Armenia, as an entity of international law, has all the opportunities for raising this problem among the competent international organisations and establishments. However, in reality these formal and legal opportunities are strongly limited to the influence of a political factor. Though the present leadership of Armenia, taking into account the will of the Armenian people, raises officially the problem of recognition of the Genocide of Armenians as one of the goals of foreign policy of Armenia, one probably have doubts concerning the international legal bases for our requirements. If this assumption is correct, it should be said directly that such doubts have no grounds. Such a judgement of our opportunities implies that the international legal maintenance of Foreign policy of Armenia, is to put it mildly, unequal to the occasion. It would be desirable to think, that we are mistaken.

How, in that case, the fact of rather constrained attitude to raising the problem of the Genocide can be explained? Why the state does not issue "White" books with the official publication of documents confirming that the deliberate "murder of the whole nation" has been condemned by the whole world already at the time when this crime happened? The criminal liability of Turks as physical persons, and the political responsibility of Turkey as States have been established by the whole international community on behalf of the Parisian Peace Conference and confirmed by the League of Nations. Why the documents issued in Armenia do not have the status of official publications? Why a long-awaited Museum of the Genocide is not a State Institution, but an Academic one? Why the international legal elaboration of the committed crime of the Genocide of Armenians is carried out only in Diaspora but not in Armenia? If the present administration has refused the absolutely incorrect and vicious thesis, that the Genocide of Armenians is only the problem of morals and history and if this problem is considered, first of all, as a problem of international law, as a problem of the responsibility of Turkey and liquidation of consequences of this crime, why these problems are not elaborated and not raised officially?

If abstention from raising the problem of responsibility of Turkey for the Genocide is the result of a conscious line of behaviour then we have the right to declare that it is, to put it mildly, wrong policy, which contradicts the will of the Armenian people both in Armenia and in Diaspora. The State should not separate itself from the rising of radical problem on the international legal responsibility of Turkey and the Turks for the crime of the Genocide committed by them.

When the government of the Armenian SSR was silent, it was explainable, however, nobody could imagine such a behaviour as something binding Armenia in the international legal point of view, as the consent of the Armenian State to the existing situation.

After finding the independence of Armenia and entering in the United Nations, the position has changed. It is impossible to forget, that according to the international law the silence of the sovereign state is considered as its consent or, at the best, as reconciliation with the existing situation. It is possible to bring examples, when the State lost unequivocally a just cause in the International court about restoration of the broken right only because of not raising the problem in due time. Such a behaviour was regarded as a tacit consent transforming illegal situation into legal.

Now, when Armenia has an opportunity to achieve elimination of consequences of the Genocide by peaceful means, on the objective basis of the international law, the natural problem arises: how the Government of the Republic of Armenia uses this right. In fact, the meaning of finding the independence consisted in obtaining the opportunity to defend the legitimate rights and vital interests of Armenia and all Armenian people as a subject of international law. We do not want to simplify the problem. We understand that under present international relations the right and fair business is not always automatically accompanied with success. As well as it was at the end of the nineteenth and during all twentieth century, the geopolitical situation today also does not favour to the celebration of the right and justice. It is necessary persistently and skilfully stand for a just cause, instead of betraying it to silence.

Approving the refusal of administration of President R. Kocharian from antinational capitulatory position in the problem of Genocide, we call for consistent and essential assertion of legitimate rights and interests of all Armenian people as victim of this crime. In the most complicated geopolitical conditions, asserting the highest state interests of the Republic of Armenia, the leadership of the country, at the same time, should press for the equitable solution of Pan-Armenian problem of elimination of consequences of the Genocide to the extent possible. It is demanded not only by our memory, not only by the most elementary representation of the right and justice. This is the imperative requirement of practical policy, too.

Contrary to false and hypocritical whisperings of "well-wishers" of Armenia, the demand for recognition of the fact of perpetration of the Genocide of Armenians by Turkey, the condemnation of this crime by it cannot be considered as a factor complicating its relations with Armenia and Armenian people. We already mentioned that the problem of recognition of the Genocide of Armenians by Turkey is not the problem of morals and history. The problem is much greater, that is, about the safety of whole people, about existence of the Armenian state. When the strong neighbouring state does not admit its guilt for extermination of 1,5 million innocent people on their Homeland, when it assumes the right of Security Council of the United Nations and establishes the blockade of a sovereign state being a member of the United Nations, when the highest officials of this state dare to threaten Armenia with "one more lesson" and when the hostility and even hatred to Armenians is cultivated in public consciousness in this state then the persistent denying of the Genocide of Armenians gains scales of a geo-strategic problem fraught with an opportunity of recurrence of the tragically past for Armenia.

We are pragmatics; we are trying to estimate sensibly the situation when the problem is the future of our people. Therefore we consider that the problem of safety of the country needs to be put in the agenda of the world policy and to concentrate the attention of the world community on the potential threat, which is fraught with refusal of Turkey to condemn the Genocide of Armenians. The veiled threats of "complication" of relations only confirm the validity of fears of relapse of the former politics of territorial expansion and Genocide, strengthen our determination to achieve the condemnation of the Genocide of Armenians as the guarantee that the relapse of the Genocide will not take place.

Guarantee of diplomatic support

Denying of the Genocide of Armenians, as well as of committing of this crime, are possible only under conditions of support that some great powers render to Turkey.

At all times, the Great Britain, Kaizer Germany, Soviet Russia, Nazi Germany, the USA and some NATO countries rendered political and diplomatic support to Turks in carrying out the genocide politics. Turkey widely uses political and diplomatic means today, too. In existing political conditions of present international relations, the opportunity of successful protection of interests of Armenian people is related to the skill to be guided in problems of the world policy correctly. First of all, it is the task of the political leadership of the Republic of Armenia and its foreign policy department. As a member of the United Nations and other international organisations and institutions, the Republic of Armenia can and should assert rights and interests of Armenian people.

The Armenian communities, especially in such countries as the USA, Russia, France, Greece, etc. also have some opportunities to resist the Turkish offensive on the diplomatic front. Influencing the foreign policy activity of their countries, they can achieve a fair political line carrying out by their governments.

International-legal guaranteeing

Under present international conditions when Turkey began to emphasize the formal and legal arguments based on falsification of the Convention on the prevention of the crime of the Genocide and punishment for it and on the evil perversion of norms of international law, the international legal guaranteeing of struggle of Armenian people for the triumph of justice is brought to the forefront.

Unfortunately, the value of international law for protection of interests of Armenian people is underestimated. Since the Central committee of Armenian refugees appealed for legal consultation to four outstanding lawyers, the foreign affairs specialists - Guilber Jidel, Albert Lapradelu, Lui Lefur and

Andre Mandelstam, the other cases of consulting the experts to protect the rights of victims of this crime are not known to us. Importance of international legal maintenance would be possible to illustrate by the example of controversy about application of Convention about Genocide, between Bosnia - Herzegovina and Yugoslavia during proceeding in the International Court. As advisers of Bosnia- Herzegovina in Court, Thomas Frank, Prof. of School of Law and Director of the Center of the international researches, member of the Commission of international law, and Alain Pelle, Prof. of the Parisian University, Bridgit Stern, Prof. of Parisian university and other lawyers were taking part. From the part of Yugoslavia R. Etinski's, the Senior legal adviser of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Prof. of international law of University Novi Sad; J.Brounli, Prof. of international law from Oxford university; Eric Soy, Prof. of Catholic university in Luvène, the former assistant to the Secretary general and the main legal adviser of the United Nations; St. Jorjevich, Prof. of international law of the Belgrad University; the Ambassador Shabtaj Rozein, a well-known Israeli lawyer; Gavro Perazik, Prof. of international law of Podgoriki University.

Now let us ask: advices of what authorities in the field of international law the Armenian Ministry for Foreign Affairs uses when determining its positions regarding the problem of the Genocide of Armenians? The answer is obvious if taking into account the stereotype of the "Genocide of 1915" used by it and the thesis that Armenia can achieve the recognition of the Genocide but cannot pose the issue of its rights. Heavy experience of Armenians, the rights of which permanently were sacrificed to the political interests of great powers, has developed the steady, almost fatalistic representation on omnipotence of politics among them. Many present Armenian politicians think almost as well as the medieval Armenian historian who has said "...the right has died. If it were lost, we would find it".

Position is aggravated, since during the Soviet time, when the world policy, as well as application of international law, were considered as a prerogative of the center, preparation of lawyers in foreign affairs in the Armenian SSR has been completely neglected. The communistic leadership of Armenia, as distinct from its neighbours, saw no further than its nose.

Outstanding lawyers - specialists of foreign affairs of Armenian origin appeared in Russia and successfully protected its state interests. The external politics of Armenia remained and still remains without due international legal maintenance. Whether on financial, or any other reasons the Armenian leadership, far as we know, does not involve experts with a world-famed names for elaboration of the political line of these problems.

About the opportunity of appealing to legal proceedings

"To solve the problem of the consequences of the Genocide of Armenians on an objective basis of international law, we think, Armenia could suggest to Turkey to appeal to the International court for the consultative conclusion in accordance with the article IX of the Convention about the prevention of crime of Genocide and punishment for it". The opportunity to transfer to the Court the controversy on the problem of interpretation applications or performance of the Convention is provided in this article, including disputes concerning the responsibility of the state for perpetration of Genocide .

If Turkey will continue to stand firm for categorical denying of the fact of the Genocide of Armenians, the Republic of Armenia could institute legal proceedings to unilaterally taking into account, that Turkey is the participant of the Convention on Genocide.

On expansion of the circle of sponsors

It would be useful, we think, if the circle of sponsors supporting the process of adjustment of contacts and search of mutually acceptable decisions would be expanded by incorporating of Russia, in particular, which is noted by its traditionally humanistic approach to the solution of the Armenian problem. It would guarantee against possible political faults.

Tasks of " the World Armenian Organisation »

During the last decades, we achieved the recognition of the Genocide on the part of series of countries and the authoritative international organisations. So, the European Parliament has demanded the recognition of Genocide of Armenians by Turkey as one of the preliminary conditions for consideration of an opportunity of acceptance of the Turkish state into structure of the European Union. Due to initiatives of the Armenian Diaspora and its representative institutes (first of all, traditional national parties) today in many countries of the world we have an authoritative pro-Armenian lobby and the certain opportunities of rendering of positive influence on the decision-making processes connected to the Armenians' destiny and Armenia. In addition, at last, the principal result of the Armenian national movement against Pan-Turkist policy of genocides at the end of XX and in the beginning of XXI centuries became the liberation of Nagorno Karabagh and restoration of Armenian statehood there on behalf of the Nagorno Karabagh Republic. Armenian people showed the determination on a way to freedom and democracies, skill to consolidate itself when the Homeland is threatened.

At the same time, there is a need to improve our approach to the process of struggle for liquidation of consequences of the Genocide, to use present international legal, information, political and organisational opportunities more widely. A great deal depends on good organisation of Armenians, from the level of our preparation for and possessing the problem, from our ability to unite around epoch-making problems of the nation.

The problem of liquidation of consequences of the Genocide of Armenians is among the national problems of vital importance, and this implies the necessity for searching and developing a programme adequate to the present conditions and a mechanism of joint activity of Armenia and Diaspora. To solve successfully this Pan-Armenian task of special importance under our dissociation is very difficult, and even impossible.

Despite the complexities of foreign policy, to overcome the difficulties in a political life of Armenians incomparably is more difficult. Vicissitudes of history have transformed us into dividable people. If the territory of historic Armenia is divided by borders of the several states, Armenians divided almost by hundreds states borders. Even worse, we are divided by party and other barriers, overcoming of which sometimes is more difficult than a frontier. Since we have lost statehood, during centuries enslavers with success applied a known principle "divide et impera" (divide and dominate). It came to separate commemoration day to the memory of victims of Genocide, by party affiliation.

Today, the understanding of the necessity of unity of actions, apparently, began to prevail in the interests of the solution of Pan-Armenian problems, including the problem of Genocide. Our hard experience suggests to us that it is impossible to solve the problem of Genocide and more widely, the Armenian problem as a whole from positions of one party, of one community or of the Republic of Armenia only. The understanding is strengthened that uniting, combining efforts, developing of the united, integrated programme of actions is a condition sine qua non of success. Natural demonstration of this historic tendency is creation of the World Armenian Organisation. One which is created to increase the level of national self-organisation and self-organisation of Armenians all over the world, for consolidation of scientific economic, financial and political potential of Armenians world-wide for the successful solution of Pan-Armenian problems to which also the problem of the Genocide of Armenians, undoubtedly, belongs.

In view of negative consequences of the Genocide and due to its influence on all life of the Armenian people, and, in particular, on political life, the problem of liquidation of its consequences and normalisation of relations with Turkey will take a special place in the activity of the "World Armenian Organisation". We are sure, that establishment of this organisation will allow us to co-ordinate and adjust the positions of the Armenian political forces and to develop the common approaches to the solution of arising problems.

Creation of Pan-Armenian structures will allow us to fill in the gap in the international legal maintenance of the Armenian position both by using of the Armenian experts of Diaspora, and by financing services of lawyers, the foreign affairs specialists of non-Armenian origin. In the frameworks of the "World Armenian Organisation", formation of the professional structural divisions specialising in the development of political, international legal, historical and other aspects of the problem of settlement of Armenian-Turkish relations is supposed. In particular, there is a problem of establishment of an International center or Institute for studying of Armenian problem and the problem of Genocide. Having united our forces, we shall achieve the solution of the just cause of Armenian people and we shall create conditions for the strong peace with our neighbour, for establishing of genuine good neighbourhood.

*Moscou,
Copyright AZG*