



Հարգելի՛ ընթերցող.

ԵՊՀ հայագիտական հետազոտությունների ինստիտուտը, չհետապնդելով որևէ եկամուտ, իր կայքերում ներկայացնելով հայագիտական հրատարակություններ, նպատակ ունի հանրությանն ավելի հասանելի դարձնել այդ ուսումնասիրությունները:

Մենք շնորհակալություն ենք հայտնում հայագիտական աշխատասիրությունների հեղինակներին, հրատարակիչներին:

Մեր կոնտակտները՝

Պաշտոնական կայք՝ <http://www.armin.am>

Էլ. փոստ՝ info@armin.am

REPORTS ON THE MASSACRES IN ADANA BY AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN NEWSPAPERS

Éva Merénics

The following analysis of the articles available about the massacres in Adana tries to reconstruct a general perspective from which the Austro-Hungarian readers of the examined newspapers were able to understand the events. Even though the examined newspapers had different orientations, common features can be observed. These mean first of all solidarity with Armenians. There may be also conclusions made about the start of the massacres which exclude Armenian provocation. Concerning responsibility, Abdul Hamid II's involvement cannot be excluded, but that of the Young Turks' is clear. It also turned out that the great powers intervened mainly because their citizens and properties were endangered.

The massacres of Adana are reported in a detailed way and in an extensive quantity in Austro-Hungarian newspapers. The way how the reports describe the events of internal politics in the Ottoman Empire shows a vital interest of journalists and probably also that of the readers. Within the descriptions of the events there is a relatively high proportion of articles dedicated to the situation of Armenians in the Empire.

The following analysis of the articles available about the Adana massacres tries to reconstruct a general perspective from which the readers of the examined newspapers were able to understand the events. First the common features of the three examined dailies and the general ideological orientation of the examined articles. In this framework there can be analysed in a more detailed way how this tragic episode of Armenian history had happened, based on the newspapers. The sources of reconstruction are purely contemporary articles of the examined newspapers written in German. Despite this fact the titles of unrelated articles certainly illustrate main political debates within the Monarchy in the examined period. In case of such cases also historical analyses will be used without analysing the related news.

Concerning the events in Turkey – as the newspapers call the Ottoman Empire¹ – and the massacres, sampling of the articles is needed. The reasons for this are the quantity of news and that the newspapers observed are not digitalised as texts. Thereupon a purely manual elaboration of them is possible at the moment. The examined period takes from 13 April 1909 – the start of the rebellion in Constantinople² – to 20 June 1909 – the day when two of the given newspapers had not reported anything about Armenians for five days. The method of the selection is the following: One daily newspaper from three of the capitals of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy's states is selected. These are *Neue Freie Presse* from Vienna, *Pester Lloyd* from Budapest and *Prager Tagblatt* from Prague. All of them were issued more times a day, and the first daily issues of the examined period are elaborated. Within these the first article handling with the events in the Ottoman Empire, further ones dealing with situation in the provinces, massacres, Ottoman state leaders committed to solve the situation, Armenians, Christians and the great powers' actions connected to the Ottoman Empire – are taken into account. In some cases when the sample indicates other important topics related to Armenians – like freedom of press, actions of diplomatic corps or reactions of foreign states – will be also relied on. These will be marked.

¹ According to this fact the expressions are exceptionally used in this study as synonyms.

² None of the analysed newspapers use a clear term for the events; describe them as riot, rebellion, revolution, counterrevolution and crisis inconsistently.

The overall appearance of the articles is slightly different from the average ones of today's printed press products. Most of the articles' authors are not known, while the issuer of the source on which the given article relies on, is marked. In some cases, articles do not even have a title, which is especially characteristic in case of the leading articles. This is the reason why the data of references may seem incomplete.

The examined newspapers have a similar structure. The leading article usually deals with a significant internal or external affair. This is followed by a part analysing internal affairs, and in the end external events are dealt with. The news documenting the massacres of Adana are usually in the final chapter of the news about the Ottoman Empire. The reports are based on telegraphs by own reporters of the newspapers, by diplomatic corps, official reports of Ottoman state institutions or sometimes on reports of other press agencies or newspapers.

To understand the importance of the news from the Ottoman Empire and the ones dealing with the Armenian massacres, a quantitative analysis was made, but also the qualitative relations between the used indexes are analysed. Measuring the significance (see also as interest, popularity and importance) of the affairs of the Ottoman Empire and the massacres is carried out as it follows: The page number of the beginning of the first articles in these given two topics will be relied on. The highest page number dealing with the massacres is page 11.³ Henceforth the interest will be measured on an 11-grade scale where the page number is inverted. Furthermore if Armenian news is mentioned before general news on the Empire, that means 0.5 grade more to the Armenian one. In case there are not any articles published in the given topic, the popularity grade of it is 0. In case of missing or damaged newspapers, the grade is -1.⁴ If the tendency of increasing or decreasing of the page number of the chosen articles can be clearly stated then the importance of their topic can also be judged.

The events in the Ottoman Empire can be divided into three phases. The first means approximately the first two weeks of the whole examined period. This was characterised by a high popularity of the events in the Ottoman state. The second phase took approximately until the end or minimally until the last week of May when the situation of the Ottoman Empire did not seem to be as important as it had been in the first stage but the massacres are constantly reported. The third and final phase took from the end of May when the massacres were relatively rarely reported and the Empire was getting into the focus of the news again rather due to the question of Crete. A further common feature of the popularity of the news from the Ottoman Empire is that due to a given occasion the importance of the related reports grows radically and after this a gradual sinking can be observed. This process usually divides the three phases into cycles which are entirely different in all of the three newspapers.

The first one analysed is *Pester Lloyd* in which the first report on the massacres in Adana was published on 16 April. This phase when the Ottoman Empire enjoyed a high significance ended on 1 May. In this period the massacres' popularity moved parallel with that of the general Ottoman proceedings and three cycles were present. The first took until 21 April. The general articles dealt with the background and chronology of the events while the massacres were appearing usually among the last news on the Empire. Only the leading article on 17 April may be connected to Armenians which states that the unionists would mean the right solution for the nationalities of the Empire because they are against the centralisation of the

³ *Neue Freie Presse* 30 May 1909, p. 11.

⁴ For popularity rates see the annexes.

Ottoman state system. Therefore the author does not agree with the minorities' supporting the Young Turks.⁵ This criticism may indicate the newspaper's sympathy towards Abdul Hamid II in this cycle. From 22 until 27 April the interest level of the descriptions about the Ottoman Empire lost of its height because of a serious crisis within the Hungarian government, which heavily affected the relations between Austria and Hungary, thereby the foreign affairs of the Monarchy as well. On the other hand there was a relative closeness between the importance of the general Ottoman and Armenian reports. This was due to the possible intervention of the European Powers.⁶

From 28 April to 1 May the situation of the Armenians reached a high grade of importance while the general news on the Empire gained back the same popularity that they had at the beginning of the events. The latter was due to the dethronement of sultan Abdul Hamid II. His person guided attention towards the massacres, as he was indicated by Pester Lloyd as responsible for the massacres of the 1890's.⁷ The number and detailed description of victims and damaged properties also supported the Armenian issue's popularity.⁸ Along with foreign citizens' and therefore foreign powers' further involvement.⁹

The second period took in Pester Lloyd from 3 till 20 May. Gaining relative importance of the Armenian affairs compared to the ones of the Ottoman Empire in general featured these days. The cause of these proceedings was that the dethronement of sultan Abdul Hamid seemed to stabilise the general situation. Articles about Armenians were leading the news about the Empire in five cases. Among other frequently handled topics Austria-Hungary's annexing Bosnia and Herzegovina was mentioned in connection with the Monarchy's rival, Serbia. To counterbalance this tense situation, friendly relation with the Ottoman Empire was required for the Monarchy.¹⁰

After the new sultan was inaugurated the general events and thereby also the ones in the Armenian vilayets repeatedly gained interest as the new emperor had mentioned the need for a peaceful interethnic and interreligious life in the Empire.¹¹ The news about Armenians was still grave and mentioned the international connections of the issue. There is another frequently described question found in these Articles, the efforts of the Ottoman state bodies to handle the bloodshed.¹²

The five leading articles are mainly tied to foreign intervention. The one on 4 May is about the possible intervention of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy in Asia Minor. Its title is 'Protection of Austro-Hungarian citizens', while the text itself only mentions the fact that the cruiser Zenta had started its journey to Mersina, joining cruisers of other states.¹³ Zenta's Hungarian ties are evident.¹⁴ These are clear reasons why the report became that important, although

5 Article 1 (For exact data of the articles see the bibliography)

6 Article 2; Article 3; Article 4; Article 5; Article 6

7 Article 7; Article 8; Article 9

8 Article 10; Article 11; Article 9; Article 12

9 Article 7; Article 10; Article 11; Article 9

10 DIÓSZEGI István *Az Osztrák-Magyar Monarchia külpolitikája (The Foreign Policy of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy)* (Budapest; Vince Kiadó, 2001) p. 124.

11 See for example Article 13

12 Article 14; Article 15; Article 16; Article 17; Article 18; Article 19; Article 20; Article 21

13 Article 22

14 "Zenta cirkáló története" (History of Cruiser Zenta), <http://hajomakett.hu/content/view/655/41/>

many articles discuss other great powers' announced inactivity parallel with their intervention in reality. The next leading article one on 10 May relied on *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* which also denied a possible intervention justifying this as it follows: '[s]uch a big juncture as the one that took place in Turkey has rarely resulted in such a small number of victims and blood[...]'¹⁵ and stated that the new power still needed time to stabilise its power even in the problematic parts of the empire.¹⁶ This contradicts to the foreign battleships' presence at the coast of Asia Minor.

The further leading articles were about the French lower house's debate, an interpellation by deputy Denis-Cochin. The conclusion according to them is that France was willing to save the Armenians while the country must have not accused the Young Turks of the massacres because the bloodshed was tied to the reign of Abdul Hamid, and France needed to maintain a good relationship with the Ottoman Empire. France had connected the possibility of an intervention to the collective will of the great powers.

The cycle from 10 until 16 May within the period furthermore can be described as a one that opposes the magnitude of the bloodsheds exactly by mentioning them primarily. This means that the graveness of the situation was denied by leading articles' titles, contradicting their content. Beside this fact the events are described as ones that will be solved if the new power becomes stable. Despite this on May 11 it was mentioned in the leading article of Pester Lloyd that Armenians were the only ones in the empire who did not welcome the new Sultan enthusiastically. It was also stated that the massacres were bound to the name of Abdul Hamid II., therefore the author implicitly forecasted that the situation would ameliorate.¹⁷ On the contrary Shefket pasha told that: '[t]he Turkish side hopes that due to the mentioned assurance and similar others the excited Armenian nation would calm down, so the further chase of them could be prevented.'¹⁸ This opinion warns of a retrospective accusation of Armenians for the massacres. Furthermore the issue of 11 May emphasises also critics about data related to the massacres which are alleged to be manipulated by the Ottoman authorities.

The last phase was introduced by an intermediary cycle – 20-22 May – which added a new element to the news known in the former period. The insult of Armenians by Kurdish groups in Van, Mush, Bitlis and even again near Aleppo was also reported parallel with criticising the passiveness or inefficiency of the local authorities.¹⁹ The Armenians also appealed to Russia, France and England for help.²⁰ This highlights again that the international involvement gave importance to the problem.

In the last stage the general events of the Empire had quite a constant popularity. Even a new analysis dealt with the change of the sultan in a leading article which is also similar to the former ones.²¹ The main topics concerning the Ottoman Empire described in the newspaper

15 Article 23

16 Own translation, original phrase: "Eine so große Umwälzung, wie es sich jetzt in der Türkei vollzogen hat, hat wohl nur selten so wenig Opfer und Blut gefordert[...]" Article 23

17 Article 24

18 Own translation, original phrase: "Türkischerseits hofft man, daß durch die erwähnte Versicherung und ähnliche andere die erregte armenische Nation sich beruhigen werde, so daß die weitere Verfolgung der Armenier verhindert werden wird." Article 25, p. 5.

19 Article 25 p. 4.

20 Article 26

21 Article 27

are the programme of the government, the diplomatic affairs in connection with the inauguration of Mohamed V.,²² the consequences of the crisis and of the massacres.

The Armenian massacres were mentioned with almost the same importance as the general articles about the empire, but there were not any reports published on 13 days of 28. The relative calmness was only contradicted by the riots following the planned disarmament of Zeytun's and Van's Armenians,²³ Furthermore the reports from Dortyol were mentioned, where according to the newspaper a sergeant had fired against his own troop and there had been a panic due to this.

On 25 May the article dealing with the new governmental programme expressed that the state power treat the massacres of Adana as events connected to the general reactionary movement in the country, and the newspaper started to do the same. The daily only reported the events and did not criticise them or parallel them with news from critical sources any more. In this period there was only one article which opposed the Ottoman state bodies because of the massacres and this even relied on the Russian and English diplomacy.²⁴ Furthermore it was also expressed in an Ottoman politician's opinion that the difference between the Ottoman state statistics and the Armenian and foreign estimations about the massacres would put an inconvenient impression on European powers.²⁵

As a conclusion Pester Lloyd expressed a kind of solidarity during the massacres which was embodied in the criticism towards the experiments to solve the problem. Putting emphasis on the difference between Ottoman and foreign data about the massacres²⁶ may be seen as such an effort. Another such attempt is the one which reports about the massacres stating that there were many children and women victimised or harassed,²⁷ or the articles which express the similarity between the massacres of 1909 and of 1895-96,²⁸ furthermore the ones dealing with the cruelty of the Kurds.²⁹ On the other hand the Ottoman state rhetoric, the fading of the events and the alleged ties between the massacres and Abdul Hamid II. caused that the newspaper had less frequently criticised the situation of Armenians and the passivity of the authorities as the time was passing by.

The next newspaper to be analysed is Prager Tagblatt. It has to be stated that the Czech Kingdom was politically drawn back in the dualist system of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy³⁰ therefore the events concerning the whole Monarchy had to be completed with the local news in a greater proportion than in Hungary for example. This might draw back the importance of the articles' about foreign affairs.

The three main phases can be found in Prager Tagblatt, too. The first period between 13 April and 1 May shows homogenous and vivid interest towards the events in the Ottoman Empire. The political background was analysed in the greatest proportion. The Young Turk

regime is described as the one which had satisfied the West in the previous year.³¹ Although Prager Tagblatt stated based on information from a diplomat that the liberals planned a federal state, where the minorities might have equal rights.³² The daily did not agree or disagree with this plan. Later also the topic of Abul Hamid's dethronement appeared in the news who was frequently mentioned in a pejorative manner.³³ See for example the following expression: 'The old wish for full power remained in his heart and grained down the burning wish for revenge.'³⁴ On 22 April the leading article pictured reconciliation between the sultan and the Young Turks which would lead to the further reign of Abdul Hamid II. The newspaper roughly criticised this possible case.³⁵

The significance of the Adana massacres was also similar to that of the general affairs, although the bloodshed was not mentioned 5 times after their first occurrence in the newspaper. On the other hand they were mentioned three times in leading articles. The first report on the massacres is a short article based on a consular telegraph describing the danger which was surrounding also foreign citizens residing in the given area. The report furthermore stated that the slaughter of Armenians was constant since 15 April and that the local authorities were not in position to stop the events.³⁶ In two cases the bloodshed was mentioned in connection with the intervention of the great powers.³⁷ This signals, that the international involvement caused an increased level of popularity. One more article with one of the highest popularity described the massacres of 1895-96 as ones which were alleged to have connections to Abdul Hamid and this caused that the Armenians had been taking part constantly in activities against the sultan.³⁸

The second significant period in Prager Tagblatt took from 3 to 22 May. The feature of this is that the Armenian affairs were mainly published on the same page as the Ottoman general issues, while the news generally take only some paragraphs, if any. The reports about the Empire described the stabilisation of the Young Turks' power and Abdul Hamid's fate. The cause for the visible but not real cycles is that more topics from inside the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy were reported in a differently detailed way.

Concerning Armenians, their hard situation was described. The Newspaper reported continuous riots from Asia Minor. It is also stressed that '[t]he massacres keep on gaining a greater extent, and the details which are reported here mock at all descriptions.'³⁹ The newspaper communicated also that military troops and a courtmartial was sent to the problematic region, and that the massacres were not spreading which is a serious contradiction compared to the former citation. Between 15 and 22 May the articles about Armenians depicted further planned measures to stop the bloodshed. These were a circular letter promised by the Sheikh ul-Islam to calm down the Muslims in the region thanks to former complaints of the Armenian

22 Article 28; Article 29; Article 30; Article 31; Article 32;

23 Article 33

24 Article 120

25 Article 33

26 Article 33; Article 121

27 See for example Article 34; Article 35

28 See for example Article 34; Article 7

29 See for example Article 10; Article 9; Article 15; Article 36; Article 37

30 DIÓSZEGI ISTVÁN *A nagyhatalmi politika másfél évszázada* (One and a Half Century of the Politics of Power) (Budapest; História, MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1997.)

31 Article 38

32 Article 39

33 See for example: Article 40; Article 41

34 Article 42

35 Article 43

36 Article 44

37 Article 45; Article 46; Article 47; Article 48

38 Article 49

39 Own translation, original phrase: "Die Massakers nehmen noch immer an Umfang zu, und die Einzelheiten, über die hierher berichtet wird, spotten jeder Beschreibung." in Article 50

notabilities.⁴⁰ Furthermore disarmament was also in view, but the article does not mark whom the measures should rely on.⁴¹ The Armenian issue was mentioned also frequently together or because of the great powers.⁴²

After this Prager Tagblatt also emphasised that the situation was ameliorating although the Austro-Hungarian cruiser, Zenta had to leave Mersina for Alexandretta because riots were reported from there. The same caused that English marines had landed at the same place to protect the English consulate. Shefket pasha had even mustered the Ottoman navy.⁴³ This had happened despite the fact that on 10 May the news described that according to Germany the international intervention was unnecessary which was also agreed by the Porte.⁴⁴ In these days a denial of the situation's graveness was not denied by articles mentioned in the first row.

The last period took from 23 May till 7 June in case of the Armenian news and 20 June in case of the news About the Ottoman Empire. The news about Armenians highlighted the fact again that the activity of the court-martials and of the troops sent to the problematic areas⁴⁵ was not as efficient as it had been planned to be. The newspaper did not criticise this, only communicated reports about their incapability without any comments. On the other hand Prager Tagblatt did not state in this fading period, that Abdul Hamid was responsible for the massacres while the events were echoed in a gradually fading way.

Concluding Prager Tagblatt's picture about the massacres, the relatively small quantity of articles dealing with the issue does not result in an as representative image as in Pester Lloyd. But paying attention to the fact that the Czech newspaper had more internal issues to deal with, the significance of the news from the Ottoman Empire is quite noteworthy. The daily did not have strongly contradictory phases, and the massacres were tied to Abdul Hamid II. only in the earlier phase of the events, but the earlier opinions about his responsibility might contribute to the disappearing importance of the events.

The last newspaper which dealt with the Ottoman Empire in the greatest quantity is Neue Freie Presse. The daily's three phases are also clearly visible though the newspaper had its own perspective, too. The first period took from 13 to 27 April when the general news on the Empire were at a quite homogenous importance level, almost always leading articles, but the massacres' significance did not parallel with this.

At the beginning of the massacres there was a unique speculation present, that the incident of Adana had been only due to the fact that the local Muslim mob had heard about the situation in the capital. One of the articles states that the sultan must have not risked his situation by his having been suspicious for supporting a reactionary movement, so his responsibility is denied. Furthermore the international balance of power might cause Russia's and Britain's intervention in favour of Christians.⁴⁶ The government was also unsuspected according to the newspaper, for they must have not provoked international intervention, therefore they also had

40 Article 51
41 Article 52
42 Article 53
43 Article 54
44 Article 55
45 Article 56; Article 57; Article 58; Article 59; Article 60;
46 Article 61

to make confident steps in order to stop the massacres.⁴⁷

Between 19 and 22 April the Armenians' issue was dealt with a higher importance than in the previous days. The articles about the massacres reported their cruelty, but the efforts to stop them were often mentioned, like the debate by the Chamber of Deputies was described together with the attempts for examination of the case and sending military forces to the Adana Vilayet.⁴⁸ There was also a sign of the start of an international intervention, but the news stated that the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy was about to send one cruiser to protect Austro-Hungarian citizens and the embassy in Constantinople and further actions were in sight only in accordance with the great powers.⁴⁹

From 23 till 26 April the news signalled loss of popularity of the Armenian news, while the Ottoman Empire was treated in leading articles. An author underlined the opinion that the victory of the Young Turks was inevitable, for '[y]outh always wins because she is the maintainer of folks and is the mark of vital vigour deepest inside [in them].'⁵⁰ Hereby the newspaper expressed solidarity with the Young Turks like in other articles.⁵¹

The leading article on 24 April article stated that the conflict in Adana showed the bloodshed's mainly religious roots.⁵² After this the newspaper alleged ties between Abdul Hamid and the events by comparing the current massacres to the ones of 1895-96.⁵³ The other occurrences of the bloodshed were usually connected to foreign intervention while mainly reports from Ottoman state sources denied any tensions.⁵⁴ Such contradictions were commented in only one case, but the article is important, because it is present in all of the three examined newspapers. This reported for the first time the retrospective accusation of Armenians having provoked the massacres. This is a clear sign of solidarity in all of the newspapers. Neue Freie Presse Furthermore stated that the 'civilised world' must not have left this issue unsolved.⁵⁵ On the other hand on 25 April also a report by the Ottoman Embassy in Vienna was published without any comments stating that armed Armenians had insulted Muslims in Dortyol and the English vice-consul in Mersina, but the authorities had done everything they could in order to protect foreign properties.⁵⁶

The next phase took from 27 April to 24 May. From 5 to 9 May the importance of the Ottoman Empire was decreasing because the newspaper also tended to report and analyse the crisis in Hungary, Bosnia and Herzegovina is mentioned, together with other unrelated issues. Generally the significance of news on the Ottoman Empire tended to have more visible cycles while the popularity of reports on Armenians were following the importance of general articles about the Ottoman Empire. The latter ones signalled growing distrust towards Abdul Hamid II in parallel with Mohamed V's inauguration.⁵⁷ An article even stated that Ab-

47 Article 62
48 Article 63; Article 64; Article 65
49 Article 66; Article 67; Article 68; Article 69; Article 70; Article 71; Article 72; Article 64
50 Article 73
51 Article 74; Article 61
52 Article 75
53 Article 76
54 Article 77
55 Article 76
56 Article 78
57 Article 79; Article 80; Article 81

dul Hamid or people in his confidence had ordered the massacres, as the soldiers sent to the region had gotten serious financial supports from them. He was also accused of his keeping the current massacres quiet. At the same time the new leadership's chances to solve the problem seemed to be low although the massacres were described as the first test for the Young Turks.⁵⁸ In spite of this fact even military troops which had the task to re-establish order took part in slaughtering people and Kurdish participation was also evident.⁵⁹ Local authorities' reports were shown to the Chamber of Deputies which reports were said to prove Armenian provocation and were opposed by Armenian deputies.⁶⁰ The latter ones had even organised a solidarity march where Young Turk leaders had also taken part,⁶¹ which indicates the light-mindedness of their presence if we take their future leading role during the genocide into account. The author of the report had chosen the title 'Young Turks' demonstration against the Armenian Massacres'. Meanwhile the organisers were of Armenian origin, irrespective of their political orientation.

The first comment indicating the responsibility of the current rulers was published on 30 April: 'It is noteworthy that the circles of the Porte are going on ascribing the events in Vilayet Adana to the Armenian [Revolutionary] Commission.' This appeared after having stated that Adana was only a pile of ash and the Armenians were extirpated.⁶² After these controversial statements Neue Freie Presse based on the opinion of a professor not named, wrote on the responsibility of western press in case of such a massacre.⁶³ The articles mentioned also some efforts of the state power to intervene. The Ottoman authorities made symbolic measures to stop the massacres, for example Mahmud Shefket's visit to the Armenian patriarch or the lecture of Niazi Bey in an Armenian school.⁶⁴ The real intervention had been characterised by handling the aftermath of the massacres, not its roots. This means charity, troop-sending, strong censorship of press, and restriction of telegrams from the region.⁶⁵ In these days the rulers started to deny still humiliating actions against Armenians and to emphasise Muslim inhabitants' much graver situation.⁶⁶ Neue Freie Presse on the contrary remarkably started to rely on Armenian sources at a greater extent. Meanwhile foreign intervention was one of the least important issues in the newspaper among the articles on the massacres as they were mentioned in the last row and in a small quantity.⁶⁷

In the last period after 24 May the Armenian massacres appeared only on 13 days. Turkey was mentioned more in connection with the international share of power and within this with the Crete question. The news already known from Pester Lloyd and Prager Tagblatt was nearly the same,⁶⁸ but Neue Freie Presse did not take into account the statement of Hilmi pasha that

58 Article 82; Article 83; Article 84; Article 85; Article 86; Article 87

59 Article 88; Article 89; Article 87; Article 90; Article 91; Article 92

60 Article 93

61 Article 94

62 Own translation, original phrase: "Bemerkenswert ist, daß die Pfortenkreise fortfahren, die Ereignisse in Vilajet Adana dem Armenischen Komitee zuzuschreiben" Article 89

63 Article 95

64 Article 96; Article 97

65 Article 98; Article 99; Article 100; Article 101; Article 102; Article 103; Article 104; Article 105; Article 106; Article 104

66 Article 107

67 Article 99; Article 108; Article 109; Article 110; Article 111; Article 112; Article 113;

68 See for example Article 114; Article 115; Article 116; Article 117; Article 118; Article 119;

the massacres had been caused by Abdul Hamid and the Armenians tied the events to his reign. Therefore greater neutrality can be stated in this case.

The conclusion about the newspaper is that it was generally less influenced by the great powers' and the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy's opinion. The vivid international attention did not even cause growing importance of the events in the daily. While in the beginning it was understating the graveness of the massacres by describing them as a local religious conflict, this started to be balanced by giving more reliability to Armenian sources. Hereby also the incapability of the state bodies was more visible. Concerning Abdul Hamid's responsibility, the newspaper stated it was proven, but expressed that the situation was not solved by the change of power.

Now that all newspapers are described there are still factors of the events which can only be reconstructed from all three newspapers. Such is the direct cause of the events. Pester Lloyd described that the massacres had started because of a murder.⁶⁹ Prager Tagblatt wrote that an Armenian had wounded two Muslims for self-defence and due to this, local Muslims started to slaughter Armenians.⁷⁰ Finally Neue Freie Presse published the report of the Ottoman Embassy in Vienna stating that an Armenian had been attacked by two Muslims because of an incident in connection with a woman. After this the Armenian had wounded them and one of them died. This event had been followed by scattered fights, and armed Armenians had rallied in the surroundings, Muslims had resisted, and the local authorities had intervened.⁷¹ Paying attention to the frequent official distortion of reports, and the beginning of the Ottoman embassy's report overlap Prager Tagblatt's version, the latter seems to be the most probable.

The dailies had found proofs of Abdul Hamid's direct responsibility. This might be true, but could also signal the witnesses' fear from being impeached by the new reigning power. After this non-excludable accountability of Abdul Hamid II also the responsibility of the Young Turks has to be stated. All newspapers made visible, that the new authorities had remained passive, had distorted reports and had accused Armenians in a retrospective manner.

External actors in the events have to be mentioned, too. The great powers intervened mainly because their citizens and properties were endangered. Though, there was a sign of solidarity, the personnel of the battleships and of diplomatic bodies often helped Armenians. Among these the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy frequently expressed its passivity, but this had been probably possible because of annexing Bosnia and Herzegovina, as it was already analysed in the part about Pester Lloyd.⁷²

Despite these the newspapers signalled that there must have been social solidarity towards Armenians in the Ottoman Empire if the significance of this issue was this high. The origins of sympathy exceed the framework of this analysis. Despite it may be stated or mentioned as questions to be answered later, that the probable cause could be the common Christian traditions of the different peoples and by the historical presence of Armenians in the Monarchy. It remains also a question how some years later this solidarity and the memory of the massacres of 1909 influenced the situation of Armenian refugees after the genocide.

69 Article 122

70 Article 123



71 Article 68

72 Diöszegi István *Az Osztrák-Magyar Monarchia külpolitikája* (The Foreign Policy of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy) (Budapest; Vince Kiadó, 2001.) p. 124.



Annexes

Annex I. Significance of the first articles connected to the topics indicated in Pester Lloyd


- First article about the Ottoman Empire
- x First article about Armenians




Annex II. Prager Tagblatt



Annex III. Neue Freie Presse





Bibliography

DIÓSZEGI István A nagyhatalmi politika másfél évszázada (One and a Half Century of the of Great Power Politics) (Budapest; História, MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1997.)

DIÓSZEGI István Az Osztrák-Magyar Monarchia külpolitikája (The Foreign Policy of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy) (Budapest; Vince Kiadó, 2001.) p. 124.

 "Zenta cirkáló története" (History of Cruiser Zenta) <http://hajomakett.hu/content/view/655/41/>

- Article 1** Leading article in Pester Lloyd, 17 April 1909 p. 1.
Article 2 "Unterredung mit einem Diplomaten" in Pester Lloyd, 23 April 1909. p. 3.
Article 3 "Die Lage in den Provinzen" in Pester Lloyd, 22 April 1909 p. 4.
Article 4 "Die Situation in der Türkei" in Pester Lloyd, 23 April 1909
Article 5 "Die Armeniermassakers" in Pester Lloyd, 26 April 1909 p. 5.
Article 6 "Die Armeniermassakers" in Pester Lloyd, 27 April 1909 p. 7.
Article 7 VÁMBÉRY Ármín "Die Absetzung des Sultans" in Pester Lloyd, 28 April 1909 pp. 1-3.
Article 8 Leading article in Pester Lloyd 29 April 1909 p. 1.
Article 9 "Die Armeniermassakers" in Pester Lloyd, 30 April 1909 p. 4.
Article 10 "Die Armeniermassakers" in Pester Lloyd, 28 April 1909. p. 6.
Article 11 "Christen- un Fremdenfeindliche Bewegung" in Pester Lloyd, 29 April 1909 p. 5.;
Article 12 "Die Armeniermassakers" in Pester Lloyd 1 May 1909 p. 5.
Article 13 "Die Vorgänge im Orient" in Pester Lloyd, 3 May 1909 p. 3.
Article 14 "Die Armeniermassakers" in Pester Lloyd 3 May 1909 p. 5.
Article 15 "Die Armenischen Massakers" in Pester Lloyd 4 May 1909 p. 4.
Article 16 "Maßrichtungen gegen die Presse" (not part of the described sample) p. 3. in Pester Lloyd 5 May 1909,
Article 17 "Die Armeniermassakers" p. 4. in Pester Lloyd 5 May 1909
Article 18 "Maßregelung der Presse" (not part of the sample) Pester Lloyd 6 May 1909 p. 3.
Article 19 Die Ereignisse in der Türkei in Pester Lloyd 7 May 1909 p. 4.
Article 20 "Vorstellungen der Mächte wegen der Gefährdung der Christen" in Pester Lloyd 8 May 1909 p. 5.
Article 21 Die Armeniermassakers" in Pester Lloyd 9 May 1909 p. 4.
Article 22 "Schutz Österreich-Ungarischen Untertanen" in Pester Lloyd 4 May 1909 p. 4.

- Article 23** "Die Intervention der Mächte" in Pester Lloyd 10 May 1909 p. 3.
Article 24 Leading article in Pester Lloyd 11 May 1909 p. 1.
Article 25 "Die Lage in den Provinzen" in Pester Lloyd 16 May 1909 p. 5.
Article 26 "Ansuchen der Armenier um Hilfe" in Pester Lloyd 21 May 1909 p. 2.
Article 27 Leading article in Pester Lloyd 26 May 1909. p. 1.
Article 28 "Audienz des Botschafters Markgrafen Pallavicini beim König" in Pester Lloyd 26 May 1909 p. 6.
Article 29 "Die Ereignisse in der Türkei" p. 7. in Pester Lloyd 26 May 1909
Article 30 Leading Article in Pester Lloyd 8 June 1909. p. 1.
Article 31 Die Kretische Frage in Pester Lloyd 14 June 1909. p. 2.
Article 32 Leading article in Pester Lloyd 16 June 1909. p. 1.
Article 33 "Die armenischen Unruhen" in Pester Lloyd 24 May 1909 p. 2.
Article 34 "Die armenischen Massakers" in Pester Lloyd 23 April 1909 p. 4.
Article 35 "Die Armeniermassakers" 13 May 1909, p.3.
Article 36 "Armeniermassakers" in Pester Lloyd 12 May 1909. p. 3.
Article 37 "Die Lage in den Provinzen" in Pester Lloyd 15 May 1909., p. 6.
Article 38 "Der Sturz der Jungtürken" in Prager Tagblatt 15. April 1909 p. 1.
Article 39 "Berliner Regierungskreise über die Gegenrevolution" in Prager Tagblatt, 15 April 1909. p. 3.
Article 40 "Abdul Hamid" in Prager Tagblatt 25 April 1909 p. 2.
Article 41 "Der Gerettete Sultan" in Prager Tagblatt 24 April 1909 p. 1.
Article 42 "Der Triumph der Jungtürken" in Prager Tagblatt 20 April 1909 p. 1.
Article 43 "Der pardonierte Despot" in Prager Tagblatt 22 April 1909, p.1.
Article 44 "Massacre zwischen Mohammedanern und Armeniern" in Prager Tagblatt 17 April 1909 p. 3.
Article 45 "Die Ereignisse in der Türkei" in Prager Tagblatt 18 April 1909 p. 1.
Article 46 "Die Ergebnisse in der Türkei" in Prager Tagblatt 19 April 1909. p. 1.
Article 47 "Massacres in Kleinasien und Syrien" in Prager Tagblatt 22 April 1909 p. 2.;
Article 48 "Christenverfolgungen in Kleinasien und Syrien" in Prager Tagblatt 23 April 1909 pp. 2-3.
Article 49 "Der Thronwechsel in der Türkei" in Prager Tagblatt 21 April 1909 pp. 1-2.
Article 50 "Massakers in Syrien" in Prager Tagblatt 3 May 1909 p. 3.
Article 51 "Türkei" in Prager Tagblatt 18 May 1909 p. 3.
Article 52 "Türkei" in Prager Tagblatt 15 May 1909 p. 4.
Article 53 "Die Armenier flehen um Hilfe" in Prager Tagblatt 21 May 1909. p. 4.
Article 54 "Türkei" in Prager Tagblatt 12 May 1909. p.4.
Article 55 "Die Lage in der Türkei" in Prager Tagblatt 10 May 1909. p. 2.
Article 56 "Das Strafgericht in Adana" in Prager Tagblatt 23 May 1909. p. 3.
Article 57 "Türkei" in Prager Tagblatt 24 May 1909 p. 3.
Article 58 "Unruhen in Armenien und Albanien" in Prager Tagblatt 29 May 1909 p. 3.
Article 59 "Tätigkeit der Kriegsgerichte" in Prager Tagblatt 3 June 1909. p. 2.
Article 60 "Zu den Metzleien von Adana" in Prager Tagblatt 7 June 1909. p. 2.
Article 61 Leading article in Neue Freie Presse 17 April 1909 p. 1.
Article 62 "Die Jungtürken vor Konstantinopel" 18 April 1909 p.2.
Article 63 "Debatte in der Kammer über die Vorgänge in Adana" in Neue Freie Presse 19 April 1909 p. 4.
Article 64 "Unterredungen mit zwei Syrischen Politikern" in Neue Freie Presse 21 April 1909 p. 4.
Article 65 "Maßnahmen von Verhütung von Blutvergießen" in Neue Freie Presse 22 April 1909. p. 4.
Article 66 "Die eventuelle Entsendung von Kriegsschiffen nach Konstantinopel" in Neue Freie Presse 16 April 1909 p. 4.
Article 67 "Die Metzleien in Adana" in Neue Freie Presse 19 April 1909. p. 4.

Article 68 "Die Armeniermetzleien in Kleinasien" p. 5. in Neue Freie Presse 20 April 1909

Article 69 "Entsendung amerikanischer Kriegsschiffe" in Neue Freie Presse 21 April 1909 p. 7.

Article 70 "Einigung der Mächte für den Fall einer Intervention" p. 5.

Article 71 "Die Metzleien in Syrien" p. 7. in Neue Freie Presse 22 April 1909

Article 72 "Die Haltung Österreich-Ungarns" in Neue Freie Presse 20 April 1909 p. 6.

Article 73 Leading article in Neue Freie Presse 25 April 1909 p. 1.

Article 74 "Die Katastrophe in der Türkei" in Neue Freie Presse 21 April 1909 p. 1.

Article 75 Leading article in Neue Freie Presse 24 April 1909 p. 1.

Article 76 "Das Armeniermetzlei in Kleinasien" in Neue Freie Presse 23 April 1909 p. 5-6.

Article 77 See for example: "Eine Zuschrift der Türkischen Botschaft" in Neue Freie Presse 23 April 1909 p. 6.

Article 78 "Die Unruhen in Adana" in Neue Freie Presse 25 April 1909 p. 6.

Article 79 "Der Thronwechsel in der Türkei" in Neue Freie Presse 5 May 1909 p. 2.

Article 80 "Der Thronwechsel in der Türkei" in Neue Freie Presse 7 May 1909 p. 6.

Article 81 "Der Thronwechsel in der Türkei" in Neue Freie Presse 8 May 1909 p. 5.

Article 82 "Das Schicksal des Sultans" in Neue Freie Presse 27 April 1909. p. 2.

Article 83 Leading article in Neue Freie Presse 28 April 1909. p. 1.

Article 84 "Der Sultan und die Armenier" p. 4. in Neue Freie Presse 28 April 1909.

Article 85 "Die Christenmetzleien in Syrien" p. 6. in Neue Freie Presse 28 April 1909.; Article 86 "Der Gefangene von Saloniki" in Neue Freie Presse 30 April 1909. p. 2.

Article 86 "Die erste Kraftprobe des Jungtürkentums" in Neue Freie Presse 1 May 1909 p. 2.

Article 87 "Die Christenmetzleien in Syrien" in Neue Freie Presse 27 April 1909 p. 5.; Article 89 "Das Armenierblutbad in Adana" in Neue Freie Presse 30. April 1909, p. 2.;

Article 88 "Das Gemetzel in den Vilajets Adana und Aleppo" in Neue Freie Presse 3 May 1909 p. 4

Article 89 "Bedrohung der Armenier in Kleinasien" in Neue Freie Presse 3 May 1909 p. 4.; Article 92 "Die Armeniergemetzel" in Neue Freie Presse 4 May 1909 p. 5.

Article 90 "Eine Debatte über die Armeniergemetzel" in Neue Freie Presse 3 May 1909 p. 4.

Article 91 "Demonstration der Jungtürken gegen die Armeniermetzleien" in Neue Freie Presse 4 May 1909 p. 5.

Article 92 "Sultan Abdul Hamid und die Christen im Orient" in Neue Freie Presse 1 May 1909 p. 2.

Article 93 "Zur Beruhigung der Armenier in Neue Freie Presse 16 May 1909 p. 8.; Article 97 Die türkischen Behörden und die Armenier" in Neue Freie Presse 17 May 1909 p. 3.

Article 94 "Maßregeln gegen die Presse" (not part of the sample) in Neue Freie Presse 5 May 1909 p. 3.

Article 95 "Die Aufschreitungen gegen die Armenier" in Neue Freie Presse 5 May 1909 p. 3. p. 4.

Article 96 "Anordnungen des Generalissimus Scheffet Pascha" in Neue Freie Presse 6 May 1909 p. 4.

Article 97 "Verlängerung des Termins für die Waffenabsetzung" in Neue Freie Presse 9 May 1909 p. 7.

Article 98 "Das Programm des neuen Kabinetts in Neue Freie Presse 13 May 1909. p. 8., Article 103 "Kriegsgerichtliche Verfolgung von Zeitungsherausgebern" in Neue Freie Presse 19 May 1909. p. 5. (not part of the sample)

Article 99 "Die Lage in Syrien" in Neue Freie Presse 20 May 1909. p. 5.

Article 100 "Verschärfungen des Preßgesetzes" (not part of the sample)

Article 101 "Weisungen Mahmud Scheffet Paschas an die Presse" in Neue Freie Presse 21 May 1909 p. 5.

Article 102 "Die Aufschreitungen gegen die Armenier" in Neue Freie Presse 12 May 1909. p. 5.

Article 103 "Die Metzleien in Adana" in Neue Freie Presse 6 May 1909 p. 5.

Article 104 "Die angebliche Intervention fremder Mächte" in Neue Freie Presse 9 May 1909 p. 7.

Article 105 Intervention des Russischen Botschafters für die Armenier in Musch" in Neue Freie Presse 16 May 1909. p. 8.

Article 106 "Die Vereinigten Staaten für den Schutz der Christen im Orient" in Neue Freie Presse 17 May 1909 p. 3.

Article 107 "Bitte der türkischen Armenier um Hilfe" in Neue Freie Presse 21 May 1909 p. 5.

Article 108 "Minister Pichon über die Armeniergemetzel" in Neue Freie Presse 18 May 1909 p. 4.

Article 109 "Befürchtungen über Armeniermetzleien in Zeitun" in Neue Freie Presse 24 May 1909 p. 3.

Article 110 "Das Regierungsprogramm Hilmi Paschas" in Neue Freie Presse 25 May 1909 p. 3.

Article 111 "Furcht vor einem Angriff der Kurden" in Neue Freie Presse 27 May 1909 p. 6.; Article 117 "Kriegsgerichtliche Urteile und Verhaftungen" in Neue Freie Presse 3 June 1909 p. 5.

Article 112 "Ein Blutiger Vorfall in Adana" in Neue Freie Presse 6 June 1909 p. 8.

Article 113 "Russische und englische Ratschläge an die Pforte" in Neue Freie Presse 13 June 1909, p. 6.

Article 114 "Die Lage in Adana" in Pester Lloyd 13 June 1909. p. 5.

Article 115 "Die Armeniermassakers" in Pester Lloyd 11 May 1909 p. 5.

Article 116 "Beunruhigung in der Provinz" in Pester Lloyd 16 April 1909 p. 4.;

Article 117 "Die Schreckenerrschaft des Moslims" in Prager Tagblatt 18 April 1909 p. 2.

Other related issues of the newspapers are from 13 April 1909 till 20 June, available at: <http://anno.onb.ac.at>

Էվա Մերենիչ
Ադանայի կոտորածներն ըստ ավստրո-հունգարական
թերթերի հաղորդումների
ամփոփում

Հոդվածում քննության է առնվում ավստրո-հունգարական մամուլում 1909 թ. Ադանայի կոտորածների արձագանքը: Հետազոտության համար ընտրվել է երեք թերթ՝ Վիեննայի «Neue Freie Presse»-ը, Բուդապեշտի «Pester Lloyd»-ը և Պրահայի «Prager Tagblatt»-ը: Ժամանակագրական առումով քննության են առնվում 1909 թ. ապրիլի 13-ից մինչև 1909 թ. հունիսի 20-ը ընկած հրապարակումները: Հոդվածը, հիմնած լինելով գերազանցապես ավստրո-հունգարական մամուլի հաղորդած տվյալների վրա, ուշագրավ տեղեկություններ հաղորդելուց բացի, արտահայտում է նաև այն հիմնական միտումները, որոնք ընկած էին այդ թեմայի լուսաբանման հիմքում՝ կապված հայկական կոտորածների և Օսմանյան Թուրքիայի ներսում անցուդարձերի շուրջ Ավստրո-Հունգարիայի դիրքորոշման հետ: