

International Treaties

Legal and Political Aspects

Sèvres: Peace Treaty, August 10, 1920
Sèvres: The Tripartite Agreement, August 10, 1920
Sèvres: Treaty between the Allied Powers and Armenia, August 10, 1920
Moscow: Friendship Treaty, March 16, 1921
Lausanne: Peace Treaty, July 24, 1923

By
T. S. Kahvé
Executive Chairman
Ararat Heritage

Second Edition©

**Presentation Regarding
The Lausanne Treaty of 1923**

Were the Armenians, Assyrians and Kurds Betrayed?

**Committee Room 3A, the House of Lords
9th July 2008**

Ararat Heritage
London
2012

Quotations:
Treaties - **RED**
UN Instruments - **GREEN**
State Papers – **BLUE**

EUROPE: ADVANCING PROJECTIONS



VERSAILLES AND THE PARIS PEACE CONFERENCE

In January 1919, the triumphant members of the international community inaugurated the Paris Peace Conference – an impressive assembly equal of which had never been witnessed. The Great War had destabilised Europe significantly. Consequently, it became a necessity to assemble an authoritative *tour de force* that could tackle numerous pressing and contentious issues. Indeed, in some circles during the War, there even emerged the view that the psychology built up by the European leaders and philosophers for the peaceful development of the ‘European Civilisation’ had, to a large extent, failed. This vast conflagration was, of course, an unforgettable catastrophe but as far as the Civilisation was concerned it could not set back the hands of the clock. As expected, an urgency developed in order to establish new standards, fortify values and promote a stable European order.

The *tour de force* in Paris also possessed a most prominent representation from the new world. Indeed, the American delegation, led by President Woodrow Wilson made important contributions. Wilson’s Fourteen Points were most progressive. He was the former president of Princeton University, and in 1919 he was to receive the Nobel Peace Prize.

Paris Peace Conference drew up a series of peace settlements among the conflicting nations. Attempts were also made to establish conditions that could avoid further belligerence. Subordinate conferences organised by the Allied and Associated Powers continued well into 1920. The Paris Peace Conference, however, ended in January that year. The same month witnessed the establishment of the League of Nations – the precursor organisation to the United Nations. Its creation, at that early stage, was an outstanding step in international and inter-state relations. The Covenant of the League was incorporated within the earlier concluded Versailles Treaty. Indeed, it is the aforementioned Treaty’s fundamental

advancements that are of significant importance and not its overtly political aspects such as reparations.

The Permanent Court of Justice of the League was established in 1922, it is the predecessor of the International Court of Justice. Despite the fact that there were advancements for the establishment of a new era, yet peace was not to attain longevity; primarily due to the severe polarisation of strictly incompatible new ideologies within the European political spectrum. Nevertheless, this era initiated an avenue that helped to direct a more stable order after the Second World War. In any case, international law – fundamentally European in origin – had been incrementally progressing towards a global structure even before this innovative phase.

The ferocity, as well as the geographic expanse, of the First World War had caused the disintegration of a number of empires, the Ottoman and the Austro-Hungarian ones are good examples. It also became the profound duty of the victorious Allied Powers to rapidly bring justice and self-determination to as many national regions of such dismantled imperial entities as possible. In the case of the Ottoman Empire – also referred to as Turkey – it was a long overdue judicious process. According to the mandate system of the League of Nations, the European powers were also willing to administer less developed or less stable territories and prepare them for self-determination.

In some regions, however, resurgence of aggression towards smaller nations barred them from receiving the expected help and justice. In this respect it is apt to examine a specific group. Scrutiny of the relevant clauses of the post-war treaties concerning Anatolia, Armenia and Kurdistan highlight the hostile developments effectively.

SEVRES: PEACE TREATY

The initial Peace Treaty, concluded between the Allied & Associated Powers and Turkey, was the Sèvres Treaty of August 10, 1920. Government representing Turkey was the *de jure* recognised Ottoman administration of Istanbul/Constantinople. The contracting parties were: the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Dominion of Canada, Commonwealth of Australia, Dominion of New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, India, France, Italy, Japan, Armenia, Belgium, Greece, Czecho-Slovak Republic and Turkey. The genetic exordium of the Treaty constitutes the Covenant of the League of Nations in its twenty-six article format. The initial sections of all such primary treaties possess the same text.

Southern Frontier Regions

The aforementioned Treaty's second and third sections embrace political clauses and texts relevant to the frontiers generally. Articles 27/ii/2 and 3 establish the frontiers between Anatolia, Kurdistan and Syria. The most eastern section of historic Cilician Armenia, the Gulf of Alexandretta region as well as the towns of Aintab and Urfa are ceded to Syria; thus establishing the northern frontier of that country.

Kurdistan

Article 62 is relevant to Kurdistan, as well as to the Assyrian-Chaldean Christians. The latter had been inflicted with Genocide:

... a scheme of local autonomy for the predominantly Kurdish areas lying east of the Euphrates, south of the southern boundary of Armenia as it may be

hereafter determined, and north of the frontier of Turkey with Syria and Mesopotamia [Iraq], as defined in Article 27/ii/2 and 3...

...The scheme shall contain full safeguards for the protection of the Assyro-Chaldeans and other racial or religious minorities within these areas...

Article 64 is a provision for Kurdish independence and unification:

If within one year from the coming into force of the present Treaty the Kurdish peoples within the areas defined in Article 62 shall address themselves to the Council of the League of Nations in such a manner as to show that a majority of the population of these areas desire independence from Turkey, and if the Council then considers that those people are capable of such independence and recommend that it should be granted to them, Turkey hereby agrees to execute such a recommendation, and to renounce all rights and titles over these areas.

... no objection will be raised by Principal Allied Powers to the voluntary adhesion to such an independent Kurdish State of the Kurds inhabiting that part of Kurdistan which has hitherto been included in the Mosul Vilayet [northern Iraq].

Smyrna

Articles 65 to 83 relate to Smyrna/Izmir, the Aegean port, and its provincial Anatolian hinterland, as defined in Article 66 – a region which possessed a large Christian population. Article 69 stipulates that although Turkey would maintain its sovereignty over the said region, yet the exercise of sovereignty will be transferred to the Greek Government. Article 72 is a provision for the establishment of a local parliament – under the supervision of the League of Nations –with an electoral system implemented to ensure proportional representation of all sections of the population inclusive of racial, linguistic and religious minorities. Article 77 states that Turkish currency will remain legal tender. Article 83 is to determine the region's final status. Thus, after five years, if there is a majority of votes in the local parliament for unification with Greece, only then the League of Nations may require, as a preliminary, a plebiscite under conditions which it will lay down. The result of that plebiscite is to determine the sovereignty issue.

Armenia

Articles 88 to 93 refer to Armenia. Article 88 states:

Turkey, in accordance with the action already taken by the Allied Powers, hereby recognises Armenia as a free and independent State.

Article 89 is a stipulation for arbitration between Turkey and Armenia. Consequently, that arbitration is also sanctioned by all the contracting states:

Turkey and Armenia as well as the other High Contracting Parties agree to submit to the arbitration of the President of the United States of America the question of the frontiers to be fixed between Turkey and Armenia in the Vilayets [Provinces] of Erzerum, Trebizond, Van and Bitlis, and to accept his decision thereupon...

Article 90 states:

In the event of the determination of the frontier under Article 89 involving the transfer of the whole or any part of the territory of the said Vilayets to Armenia, Turkey hereby renounces as from the date of such decision all rights and title over the territory so transferred.

Article 92 states:

The frontiers between Armenia and Azerbaijan and Georgia respectively will be determined by direct agreement between the states concerned.

Article 93 states:

Armenia accepts and agrees to embody in a Treaty with the Principle Allied Powers such provisions as may be deemed necessary by these Powers to protect the interests of inhabitants of that State who differ from the majority of the population in race, language or religion.

Asiatic and North African Territories:

Articles 94 to 122 relate to a group of Asiatic and North African countries that had separated *de facto* from Turkey which recognised them as independent states, or independent but prospective/mandate territories – the mandatory Powers were to be appointed by the League of Nations. This section also includes renunciations of rights and titles over certain regions as well as the recognition of Allied protectorates.

General Provisions/Brest-Litovsk Treaty:

Article 135 is inclusive to the section classified as “General Provisions” and relates primarily to the Brest-Litovsk Treaty, signed with a Soviet Russian administration during the war.

... Turkey accepts definitely the abrogation of the Brest-Litovsk Treaties and of all treaties, conventions and agreements entered into by her with the Maximalist Government in Russia.

Minorities

Articles 140 to 151 relate to the Protection of Minorities.

Article 141 states:

Turkey undertakes to assure full and complete protection of life and liberty to all inhabitants of Turkey without distinction of birth, nationality, language, race or religion. All inhabitants of Turkey shall be entitled to the free exercise, whether public or private, of any creed, religion or belief.

Article 142 refers to the existence of a “terrorist regime” in Turkey. Additionally, it takes into account persons who had been converted to Sunni Islam by force; thus, causing the Christians untold harm and loss of national identity. The terrorist regime in question, however, refers to the Young Turks who had gained power in January 1913 by a coup d’état that deposed the Ottomanist government of the day. Ottomanist policy – pursued, for example, by the *Hürriyet ve Itilâf* party – was to maintain the Ottoman national identity and provide autonomy to the non-Ottoman nationalities of the Empire. The latter group formed over half the population.

The Young Turks gave a number of evasive reasons for their violence. The veiled primary reason however was that their racist-nationalist ideology of Turkism [*Türkçülük*] had failed to impregnate the Ottoman population solely by propaganda.

The said ideology imposed a racial pedigree – linked to Central Asia – upon the Anatolian Muslim population, the origins of which are astonishingly diverse. Differences between the Anatolians and the Central Asians are extensive. A decade later, the Ottoman nation was forced to discard its national identity officially to that of the *Türk*. The Central Asian nationalities – who are possibly the real Turks – speaking the Altaic group of languages, with similarities to the Ottoman one, refused to be labelled as such and maintained their original national identities; as the ideology of Turkism was and remains impregnated with distortions and ogygian fabrications. In future years, even the Ottoman language *Osmanlica* was to be renamed *Türkçe*. In the Ottoman Empire, the term 'Turk' had a derogatory meaning and referred predominantly to the Turkomens – some nomadic – who formed approximately ten percent of Anatolia's population. Not all classified as Turkomens are such by origin. In history, no major tribe or nation – calling themselves 'Turks' – has ever trekked out of Central Asia into Anatolia. The eastward expansionist principle of this ideology is Turanism-Panturkism; a concept that the Ottomans could have easily enforced during their earlier great expansionary period, by advancing into Central Asia, but they never contemplated such a vision. The entire psychology reverts to the nineteenth century racist-nationalist theories that have now been eliminated in other parts of the world.

Thus, in 1913, Young Turks decided to strengthen their unsustainable position rapidly by the aforementioned *coup d'état*, hence, choosing the violent route to power that could allow them the opportunity to impose Turkism rapidly. Ottoman racist-nationalists – promoting Turkism, and referred to as Young Turks – were predominantly linked to the political party called the Committee of Union and Progress. By November 1914 – with the onset of the war – they had gained total control. Consequently, Ottoman Empire entered a major war, not with an Ottomanist government at its helm, but with one based upon the ideology of Turkism, a development not witnessed previously.

At the end of the war, the Ottomanist administration was re-established in Istanbul/Constantinople. By then, the prominent Young Turk leaders had escaped from the country. Between 1919 and 1923 however, a significant ingathering of Young Turks – now labelled as 'Nationalists' – well armed with the characteristics of a stratocracy, re-established themselves in Anatolia. The strictly secularist form of Turkism has also been labelled as Kemalism – after the name of their new leader – who was a prominent member of the Committee of Union and Progress. They imposed Turkism upon a predominantly illiterate Muslim population and established a republic based upon that racist nationalist ideology. The territory they militarily controlled was declared to be *Türkiye* – a cognate concoction. As expected, the Genocidal destruction was revitalised significantly. This phase encompasses the Completeive period of the Armenian Genocide – as accentuated in Ararat Heritage's, [Armenian Genocide Bibliography](#). Accordingly, the new republic was created within a Genocidal psychology, foundations of which revert to the pre-war period. Sèvres Treaty's article 142 states:

Whereas, in view of the terrorist régime which has existed in Turkey since November 1, 1914, conversions to Islam could not take place under normal conditions, no conversions since that date are recognised and all persons who were non-Muslims before November 1, 1914, will be considered as still remaining

such, unless, after regaining their liberty, they voluntarily performed the necessary formalities for embracing the Islamic faith.

In order to repair so far as possible the wrongs inflicted on individuals in the course of the massacres perpetrated in Turkey during the war, the Turkish Government undertakes to afford all the assistance in its power or in that of the Turkish authorities in the search for and deliverance of all persons, of whatever race or religion, who have disappeared, been carried off, interned or placed in captivity since November 1, 1914.

Article 143 relates to exchange of populations between Greek and Turkish territories.

... Greece and Turkey will enter into a special arrangement relating to the reciprocal and voluntary emigration of the populations of Turkish and Greek race in the territories transferred to Greece and remaining Turkish respectively.

Article 144 relates to the loss of properties – due to state policy – that belonged to the deported or exterminated peoples. Furthermore, the apprehension of those who had committed massacres is also deemed necessary.

The Turkish Government recognises the injustice of the law of 1915 relating to Abandoned Properties (Emval-i-Metroukeh) and the supplementary provisions thereof, and declares them to be null and void, in the past as in the future.

The Turkish Government solemnly undertakes to facilitate to the greatest possible extent the return to their homes and re-establishment in their businesses of the Turkish subjects of non-Turkish races who have been forcibly driven from their homes by fear of massacre or any other form of pressure since January 1, 1914. It recognises, that any immovable or movable property of the said Turkish subjects or of the communities to which they belong, which can be recovered, must be restored to them as soon as possible in whatever hands it may be found.

Article 144 also stipulates that arbitral commissions shall be appointed by the Council of the League of Nations for:

- (2) the removal of any person who, after enquiry, shall be recognised as having taken active part in massacres or deportations or as having provoked them...*
- (3) the disposal of property belonging to members of a community who have died or disappeared since January 1, 1914, without leaving heirs; such property may be handed over to the community instead of the State.*
- (4) the cancellation of all acts of sale or any acts creating rights over immovable property concluded after January 1, 1914.*

Article 145 relates to the equality of all citizens.

All Turkish nationals shall be equal before the law and shall enjoy the same civil and political rights without distinction as to race, language or religion.

Difference of religion, creed or confession shall not prejudice any Turkish national in matters relating to the enjoyment of civil or political rights, as for instance admission to public employments, functions or honours...

No restriction shall be imposed on the free use by any Turkish national of any language in private intercourse, in commerce, religion, in the press or in publications of any kind, or at public meetings.

Article 147 refers to the minorities: their security in law, their rights to establish social institutions as well as schools teaching their languages:

Turkish nationals who belong to racial religious or linguistic minorities shall enjoy the same treatment and security in law and in fact as other Turkish nationals. In particular, they shall have an equal right to establish, manage and control at their own expense, and independently of and without interference by the Turkish authorities, any charitable, religious and social institutions, schools for primary, secondary and higher instruction and other educational establishments, with the right to use their own language and to exercise their own religion freely therein.

Article 149 states:

The Turkish Government undertakes to recognise and respect the ecclesiastical and scholastic autonomy of all racial minorities in Turkey...

Articles 226 to 230 relate to the surrender of persons who have participated in mass crimes, and the procedures for their surrender. Article 230 states:

The Turkish Government undertakes to hand over to the Allied Powers the persons whose surrender may be required by the latter as being responsible for the massacres committed during the continuance of the state of war on territory which formed part of the Turkish Empire on August 1, 1914.

The Allied Powers reserve to themselves the right to designate the tribunal which shall try the persons so accused, and the Turkish Government undertakes to recognise such Tribunal.

In the event of the League of Nations having created in sufficient time a tribunal competent to deal with the said massacres, the Allied Powers reserve to themselves the right to bring the accused persons mentioned above before such tribunal, and the Turkish Government undertakes equally to recognise such tribunal.

SEVRES: THE TRIPARTITE AGREEMENT

On August 10, 1920, also at Sèvres, the Tripartite Agreement – containing eleven articles – was signed between Britain, France and Italy. It is a totally separate accord, and not a peace treaty. Consequently, it was unnecessary for it to acquire the assent of the League of Nations.

As such, it did not involve territorial alterations regarding sovereignty. It was to provide transparency and halt rivalries among the three contracting parties, in certain regions of Anatolia, by establishing zones mainly relevant to economic interests. Turkey has persistently failed to pay large sections of its foreign debt. For long periods, European bond-holders were at risk. Thus, such a measure was deemed as a guarantee against further defaults. The Young Turks, however, viewed externally implemented financial measures and large overseas companies – as well as their personnel – operating in the country as harmful, and classified such practices as capitulations. Fundamental aspects of free trade with Europe were only effectuated widely during the final decade of the twentieth century. During the 1930's, the country was to default once more.

The treaty did not involve Armenia, as its *de jure* status had already been acknowledged. Additionally, the frontiers of its western sector had been submitted to an arbitration procedure as defined by international law. According to the Agreement's axiom, the Allies were to provide:

... assistance in the reorganisation of the administration of justice, the finances, the gendarmerie and the police, in the protection of religious, racial and linguistic minorities and in the economic development of the country, ...

Considering that the autonomy or eventual independence of Kurdistan has been recognised by them, and that it is desirable, with a view to facilitations the development of that country and the provision of any assistance which may be required in its administration, to avoid international rivalries in such matters.

SEVRES: TREATY BETWEEN THE PRINCIPLE ALLIED POWERS AND ARMENIA

On August 10, 1920 an additional multilateral treaty – containing thirteen articles – is concluded in Sèvres, between the British Empire, France, Italy, Japan and Armenia, covering such issues as Minorities, Protection of Inhabitants, Trade and Transit.

It is not a separate peace treaty requiring the assent of the League of Nations. It is in compliance with article 93 of the Sèvres Peace Treaty. The recorded text on its initial page states:

Whereas the Principal Allied Powers have recognised Armenia as a sovereign and independent state...., Armenia [is] ... giving a sure guarantee to all the inhabitants of the territories over which she has assumed or may assume sovereignty;...

It was shortly after the ratification process of the Sèvres Peace Treaty had commenced – Italy was among the first to ratify – when the forces of Anatolian Turkism launched a Genocidal, Turanian-Pan Turk assault upon the Republic of Armenia. The latter had been formed on the Eastern sector of the Plateau – formerly Tsarist territory. Thus, the ratification process was interrupted illicitly due to the renewed violence emanating from the Genocidal element. It was the third such attack within five years; previous ones were during the war years of 1914-1915 and 1918. Once again, contrary to international law, widespread alterations were being

implemented by mass violence. The racist-nationalist regime in Anatolia with its characteristics encompassed within the aforementioned 'terrorist regime' was dilating even further.

Evidence reveals that racist-nationalist ideologies such as Turkism and Nazism possess characteristics that drive them towards a 'final solution' psychology – including expansionist occupation and destruction. On November 8, 1920 the commander of the advancing army of Anatolian Turkism received a *communiqué* from his new capital, Ankara. Many years later in Istanbul, 1969, the said state document was published in the memoirs of the commander. A key section of the *communiqué* received from the minister states:

It is imperative to eradicate Armenia politically and physically [Eremenistani siyaseten ve madden ortadan kaldirmak elzendir].

Genocidal extermination and occupation imposed on Armenia and its nation has remained unchallenged by the major powers – a serious failure. Consequently, it is not surprising that on August 22, 1939, a parallel statement was made – now published in numerous books – by the most trumpeted leader of the Third Reich regarding the Genocidal invasion of Poland:

I have given orders to my Death Units to exterminate without mercy or pity men, women and children belonging to the Polish-speaking race. It is only in this manner that we can acquire the vital territory which we need. After all, who remembers today the extermination of the Armenians?

MOSCOW: FRIENDSHIP TREATY

The catastrophic Armenian developments of 1920-21 were further subverted by the conclusion of a bilateral Friendship Treaty between the Anatolian administration of the Young Turks and the Soviet Russian administration in Moscow, where it was signed on March 16, 1921. Neither represented *de jure* recognised states. On many counts, it is collusion effectively in bad faith – aimed at Armenia. Its text is impregnated with moral turpitude.

It takes no account of the vast destruction and occupation suffered by Armenia and its nation. In fact, the Genocidal developments, chronologically up to the conclusion of the Great War, are veiled. Subsequent Genocidal destructions inflicted during the Complete period of the Genocide are also ignored. The Treaty was ratified, as dictated by its text at the occupied Armenian city of Kars, where supplementary clauses were added to its objectives. Hence, some have classified it as the Kars Treaty. Amazingly, even a diminutive Soviet Armenia, created by Russia, is instructed – under duress – to append its signature.

Russia's minimalist help is deceitful as it is the only European country, in an excellent geographical and military position, that could provide all the necessary assistance to Armenia. Russia, however, proceeds to hand-over to the aggressor's Genocidal military all of Western Armenia and with that malevolent psyche proceeds to give away most of Eastern Armenia to its neighbours. Perpetration is predominantly by force. Armenia's territorial integrity is practically reduced to zero, thus creating sovereignty issues on numerous fronts. Such misfeasance has no place in international law. Widespread corrections are required.

European values have been crushed and European Cultural Frontiers are undermined at a crucial point. From its inception, the aforementioned Friendship Treaty has been null and void, except for those malefactors who initiated it and their licentious entourage. Legal effect is vanquished as two none *de jure* regimes dismantle a *de jure* state. Bad faith is also emphatic. Soviet Armenia, appending its signature, under duress, to a supplementary document is a further nullifying factor.

LAUSANNE: PEACE TREATY

It was within such an illicit psychology that, at the end of October 1922, Britain, France and Italy sponsored a new Peace Conference in Lausanne. It was an attempt to bypass the Sèvres Peace Treaty which had not been abrogated. Moreover, it could not be revised as the same signatory states could not be obtained. A number of countries were invited: Russia and the United States refused to be contracting parties, and only agreed to participate as observers.

On October 30, 1922, the United States presented an *aide-mémoire* to the three European Powers highlighting the injudicious aspect of this new development; a key paragraph declares that:

The United States was neither at war with Turkey nor a party to the Armistice of 1918 and does not desire to participate in the final peace negotiations or to assume responsibility for the political and territorial adjustments which may be effected.

The Lausanne Peace Treaty was concluded on July 24, 1923 between the Allied Powers and the Young Turks' regime in Anatolia. Thus, by default, the *de jure* status of the country's government passed from Istanbul/Constantinople to the new capital in Anatolia. The signatory states are: the British Empire, France, Italy, Japan, Greece, Bulgaria, Belgium, Portugal and Turkey.

Firstly, Lausanne fails to take into account a number of territories specified in the Sèvres Peace Treaty that were due to separate from the Ottoman Empire. In fact, their separation had been effectuated according to the provisions provided by the Sèvres Treaty, well before the conclusion of Lausanne. As a result, Hedjaz/Arabia became independent. Syria and Mesopotamia/Iraq separated as mandate territories under the auspices of the League of Nation, as specified in Sèvres.

Lausanne possesses a section classified as 'Protection of Minorities'; it covers articles 37 to 44. Article 38 is practically identical to Sèvres' article 141, with the addition that "Non-Muslim minorities will enjoy full freedom of movement and of emigration". Immigration is not mentioned. Consequently, Armenian Genocide survivors cannot return to their lands.

In many respects, the non-Muslim minority rights provided in Lausanne are illusory, as they are often flouted. In any case, only Armenians, Greeks and Jews are eligible to establish their schools while other local non-Muslim minorities are excluded. Due to harassment, large numbers of such minorities were to emigrate. This state of affairs arose despite the fact that article 37 of Lausanne, taking into account articles 38 to 44, stipulated that:

... no law, no regulation, nor official action shall conflict or interfere with these stipulations, nor shall any law, regulation, nor official action prevail over them.

Article 142 of the Sèvres Treaty is conveniently missing. After all, the Lausanne Treaty is being concluded with an element, foundations of which are rooted within the aforementioned terrorist regime. Thus, extensive acts of misfeasance that require the application of justice – as recognised in numerous articles of the Sèvres Treaty – are absent in Lausanne. Consequently, the additional aspect of article 142 concerning the recovery of those who have been converted to Islam against their will is also absent.

Article 144 of the Sèvres Treaty is similarly excluded. It had stipulated the return of those who had survived the deportations to their homes, as well as the return of properties of exterminated and deported peoples confiscated by the government. The apprehension of those who had participated in massacres and the appointment of an arbitral commission by the League of Nations had been called for.

Articles 38 and 39 of the Lausanne Treaty cover the protection of Life and Liberty of all inhabitants and states that all persons are equal before the law. Also, no restriction is to be imposed on the free use by any Turkish national of any language in private intercourse, in commerce, religion or in the press. The above mentioned two articles are similar to the Sèvres' article 145, with one key exception.

In the Lausanne Treaty, the non-Muslim minorities are regularly separated from the rest of the population who are Muslims. There is not such separation in the Sèvres Treaty, therein all minorities possess the same rights, Christian or Muslim – as defined, for example, in article 145. In article 147 of Sèvres, all minorities as Turkish nationals – irrespective of race, religion or language – possess the right to establish charitable, religious and social institutions, schools for primary, secondary and higher instruction, with the right to use their own languages. In the Lausanne Treaty, such rights are only reserved to the non-Muslim minorities – vast majority of whom had already been eliminated. In this respect, article 40 of the Lausanne Treaty states:

Turkish nationals belonging to non-Muslim minorities shall enjoy the same treatment and security in law and in fact as other Turkish nationals. In particular, they shall have an equal right to establish, manage and control at their own expense, any charitable, religious and social institutions, any schools and other establishments for instructions and education, with the right to use their own language and to exercise their own religions freely therein.

Article 42 of Lausanne states:

As regards public instruction, the Turkish Government will grant in those towns and districts, where a considerable proportion of non-Moslem nationals are resident, adequate facilities for ensuring that in the primary schools the instruction shall be given to the children of such Turkish nationals through the medium of their own language.

The reality of the matter is that, according to Lausanne, Muslim minorities do not exist. Factually, however, their numbers are very large – best measured in tens of millions. Indeed, since the nineteenth century, large numbers of Muslims of most diverse origins have immigrated to Anatolia; especially from the north Caucasus and the Balkans. Their numbers

swelled significantly after the formation of the Republic. Moreover, within the *de-facto* frontiers of the Republic, there were also local Muslim minorities, such as, along the Black Sea coastline of Anatolia, in the mountainous south-east, and of course, along the southern frontier regions.

It is manifest that one of Lausanne's objectives has been to eliminate the cultures of the Muslim minorities – inclusive of their languages and national identities. This maleficent posture significantly undermined, and continues to undermine, their human rights. In this respect, ethics and morals in international law have been subverted – a development acknowledged well before the United Nations' treaties and their protocols were established. Subsequently, article II(e) of the UN's Genocide Convention of 1948 was breached in 1950, when Turkey appended its signature as a habitual offender. It relates to national, ethnical, racial and religious groups and ***forcibly transferring children of the group to another group***. Because the Muslim minorities are barred – enforced by the military and the police, fortified by the courts – from establishing their own schools, their children have been, and continue to be, transferred against their will, and the will of their parents, to the central group embossed with Turkism. Additionally, those countries that have been supporting the Anatolian regime militarily – with or without treaty obligations – or unreservedly, can find their positions compromised, because article III(e) of the Genocide Convention takes into account ***Complicity in Genocide***. They can only be advised not to incur further liability – as far as this UN instrument is concerned. In some respects, it has been such external servile cooperation that has helped to maintain significant levels of malfeasance in the country. The knowledge of such amazing levels of Anatolian malfeasance has been in the public domain for decades. Accordingly, it is also necessary to take into account the ***United Nations' Convention on the Rights of the Child***, concluded in 1989, as it is also breached in 1990 when Turkey appended its signature as a habitual offender. Instrument's Article 8/1 stipulates:

States Parties undertake to respect the right of the child to preserve his or her identity, including nationality, name and family relations as recognized by law without unlawful interference.

Article 30 states:

In those States in which ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities or persons of indigenous origin exists, a child belonging to such a minority or who is indigenous shall not be denied the right, in community with other of his or her group, to enjoy his or her culture, to profess and practise his or her own religion, or to use his or her language.

A supplementary issue has been the sectarian divisions among Muslims. Approximately one third of the population do not belong to the dominant Sunni Islam, but religious instruction in schools, when provided, is the Sunni doctrine.

There has been a subtle state oriented coercion to convert a sectarian minority to Sunni Islam. Variations among the sects are wide. In Europe, no such state oriented coercion exists concerning any Christian denomination.

This state of affairs breaches Article 18 of UN's well disseminated treaty: ***Universal Declaration of Human Rights*** and profoundly undermines morally the United Nations' Declaration regarding the ***Elimination of all Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination based on Religion or Belief***, dated November 25, 1981. Article 1/1 states:

Everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. This right shall include freedom to have a religion or whatever belief of his choice...

Article 2/1 states:

No one shall be subject to discrimination by any state, institution, group of persons, or person on grounds of religion or other beliefs.

Article 5/2 states:

Every child shall enjoy the right to have access to education in the matter of religion or belief in accordance with wishes of his parents...

Article 3 states that, breaching the Covenant will be classified as:

... disavowal of the principle of the Charter of the United Nations, and shall be condemned as a violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights...

The Lausanne Treaty also totally fails to mention Kurdistan as well as the Assyrian-Chaldean Christians. Consequently, Sèvres Treaty's article 62 is missing. According to Lausanne such nationalities do not exist. The Christians were not permitted to return to their ancestral lands. Such extremist postures are strictly illicit and colonialist and require the appropriate corrections.

Smyrna/Izmir and its Anatolian hinterland – as a region with a significant Greek population – also disappear from the map, as the Sèvres Treaty's articles 65 to 83 are absent. In a separate convention of the Lausanne Treaty, section VI stipulates the exchange of populations but not involving Greeks of Istanbul/Constantinople and the Muslims of Western Thrace in Greece. A section of the first paragraph of Article I reads:

...there shall take place a compulsory exchange of Turkish nationals of the Greek Orthodox religion established in Turkish territory, and of Greek nationals of the Muslim religion established in Greek territory.

The above-mentioned article was implemented – it has not been challenged. Dictates of Anatolian Turkism succeeded because the Allies and Russia failed to assist the Greeks effectively. The Aegean coastline of Anatolia was depopulated of its original population. Smyrna had already been destroyed in an amazing holocaust. It is the end of Europe in Anatolia.

As expected, Armenia is also missing from Lausanne – Sèvres Treaty's articles 88 to 93 are absent. Most importantly, however, Western Armenia's boundaries with Anatolia and northern Kurdistan are delimited by President Woodrow Wilson's arbitration of November 22, 1920. Its delimited frontier came to be known as the Wilson Line. Taking all aspects into account, Wilson's arbitration – as an appointment of the international community – is strictly correct and fair. In international law, arbitrations are binding.

At this point, it is appropriate to note that the Pontic Greeks – who have been inflicted with Genocide during the Compleitive period – would have had their survivors protected in the Black Sea region of Armenia as delimited by the above-mentioned Arbitration.

As anticipated, the Lausanne Treaty was unable to define a number of borders. Article 3 of its territorial clauses includes the bilateral Franco-Turkish agreement of October 1921. France, as the mandatory power representing Syria, surrendered to the Anatolian regime a large section of northern Syria, thus altering the Sèvres Treaty frontier of that country detrimentally. Syria was unable to mount a difference. Further east, the frontier extending to Persia/Iran borders directly upon the frontier of Iraq, as Kurdistan is no longer mentioned. That frontier was to be finalised between the Anatolian regime and Britain, the latter being the mandatory power over Iraq. In a further disparity, the Lausanne Treaty fails to define Armenia's frontiers with Anatolia. The 1921 Moscow treaty could not be mentioned as it is null and void. Moreover, Georgia's frontiers could not be cited, because according to Wilson's arbitration, as well as the Sèvres Treaty, Georgia does not possess a frontier with Anatolia. In the west, Georgia only possesses a frontier with Western Armenia.

The Lausanne Treaty's illicit stance adopted towards Armenia, even in historic terms, is out of focus. After all, Armenia is not a newly concocted country: the Armenian nation possesses the long standing historic title over the Plateau of Armenia. That title predates the Medieval period significantly as its foundations are embedded in the BC era. Its past, since the days of the Forum Romanum is well recorded.

As expansionists, Ottomans only gained possession of Western Armenia in the sixteenth century. From that period, the Armenian nation's current historic title over its country possesses time scale superiority - compared to the current foreign occupiers and their claims – of approximately 2000 years. That figure encompasses the European historic psychology. However, if one takes into account a non-European historic base – for example: Babylonian clay maps – then it is necessary to add a further five hundred years. Indeed, in such historic terms the current destructions and occupations – of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries – are almost yesterday.

It is clear that on numerous counts, the Lausanne Treaty lacks ethics and morals. Similarly, it lacks good faith. Legal principles of good faith, based on moral principles, revert to Roman law and Roman jurists. In legal theory, good faith is of key importance. Its basic rule *pacta sunt servanda* is a fundamental principle in international law and in legal infrastructures generally. Honesty, fairness and reasonableness are directly related, and reflect legal rules of good faith. Among such values, the Lausanne Treaty is a malignity.

An additional aspect involves the doctrine in international law that can render a treaty null and void if it is deemed contrary to morality. This was based upon the principle that a treaty cannot override natural law. The theory of natural law reverts to the Roman period: essence of the theory is that the law is derived from justice. This aspect of international law – within a recomposed format – has gained some standing and is currently classified as *ius cogens*.

At the time of Lausanne's concoction, the aforementioned international norm – as a just objective – was not any different to article 53 of the Law of Treaties, signed in 1969 in Vienna:

A treaty is void if, at the time of its conclusion, it conflicts with a peremptory norm of general international law.

The Lausanne Treaty remains a product of a flawed diplomatic engagement and has been a licence for the promotion of sanguinary state malfeasance. In this respect, encyclopaedic levels of human right violations – published internationally – continue to be a phenomenon. The treaty is abuse of process and out of step with international norms – past and present. It possesses serious jurisprudential failures, when compared to the first multilateral Peace Treaty of Sèvres, and cannot be regarded as the final act. Sèvres' non-violent intent remains paramount. As expected, Lausanne was unable to attain the League of Nations' covenant as its exordium. The aforementioned aspects of 'moralism' – as a methodology of international law – possess extensive foundations. Currently, however, Lausanne finds itself within a circumspect position – in a system of international law – dominated by 'positivism'. It is unreasonable to downgrade moralist aspects to dangerous levels.

It is most obvious that a set of issues have not been resolved. There are limitations as to how long such illicit abnormalities can be masqueraded as normalities. A way forward can take into account factors stipulated in the Sèvres Treaty that have been bypassed illegitimately in Lausanne. The Republic of Turkey is the successor state to the Ottoman Empire; hence, it is primarily an issue of state responsibility. Indeed, the destruction of the Armenians by the perpetrator has been collective and national. State responsibility is not a new principle. It existed well before it was stipulated in article IX of the UN's Genocide Convention of 1948. The 'final solution' psychology of the Armenian case must also be taken into account. Although historical aspects have some relevance, yet the issue is predominantly legal, political and sociological – LP&S.

Armenia's destruction possesses interconnected multifarious characteristics. Firstly, there is the principle of Armenia recovering its occupied territories – inclusive of Western Armenia – thus, ending foreign claims permanently. After all, the Genocidal destructions' primary objective has been to acquire Armenia's territories. Secondly, return of Armenians to their lands, inclusive of those who have been converted to Islam by force and would now wish to revert to their original identity – otherwise they will be inflicted with permanent loss of national identity. Armenians call such inflictions – *chermag chart* – white massacre. The third point is compensation, which can finance most of the necessary reconstruction. Germany's revised reparation payments regarding the Great War were 112 billion gold marks, amounting to 39,970 tons of gold, which has been paid. Reconstruction of Armenia will also require a significant amount.

Indeed, if the pre-destruction Armenian population is taken into account, plus the rate of population increase in the region, then the current Armenian population of Western Armenia and Anatolia, jointly, should be close to the eight million mark. Greater Europe is under no obligation to accept the Genocidal destruction of the Armenians and the occupation of their country as the final act. In the past, other regions of the European Civilisation have been lost and recovered. In order to avoid repetition, the recovery process and the reconstruction should be exemplary. However, a reasonable timespan for the procedure is necessary.

The type of rapid territorial and demographic alterations conducted by the Allies – at the end of the Second World War – in Central Europe are now unsuitable. In peace time, such issues may be solved when encompassed incrementally within a strictly controlled project and completed within a timescale measured in decades. It is imperative for Europe to keep all its options open.

On the other hand, such an undertaking can only gather momentum, if the usual distorting and xenophobic dictates emanating from Anatolian Turkism and its associates are countered decisively. It will be unwise to fall into the same trap twice. Even so, progress can be strenuous; as such extremist regimes are able to maintain assertive malevolent policies upon the international stage: firstly by establishing police states, thus silencing the oppressed internally; and secondly, they are able to obtain direct external support by joining inter-state alliances. Such alliances help to camouflage malfeasance successfully; thus periodically international law and moral values are degraded significantly. Malignant states bordering onto the European Cultural Frontiers remain most detrimental to Europe's interests. Any regime based on the ideology of Turkism falls within this category. In this respect, 'deep state terrorism' emanating from the latter – now well understood internationally – remains an additional security risk. In Anatolia, major restructuring is a necessity.

EUROPE: PROGRESSIVE HORIZONS

Manifestly, Europe is faced with numerous problems: its overall global position is on the wane. Some EU states – in no distant past – were great powers but now, they are merely shadows of their former selves. Moreover, EU's geopolitical position remains most confined. Only the Cultural Frontiers of Europe – in their Greater Europe format – can provide the superior geography and demography that can raise Europe to its merited global position. Such cultural frontiers stretch eastwards from Western Europe to Vladivostok; thus – in addition to its prominent Atlantic coastline in the west – a key Pacific outlook thrives in the east. In the south, through the western Caucasus, the intercontinental cultural frontiers reach Armenia. Beyond that point there is only one influential non-European country between Armenia, and the Gulf, as well as a key Indian Ocean outlook. The said land route conveniently eliminates the geographic confinement induced by the Mediterranean. Thus, an indirect, yet workable oceanic outreach is established [Armenia and Europe: Cartographic Perspectives](#). Such a development may also eradicate politicised frictions in the region.

Possibilities for lineal land links by road, pipeline and power transmission-lines between Europe and such key regions are of significant importance and beneficial to all concerned. In the future, the security of long maritime routes, relevant to Europe, may become unsustainable. During this century, developments in the Gulf, India, east Africa and a commercially southwards advancing China will transform the Indian Ocean region into a major hub. Only a powerful Armenia can provide a direct continental European outreach, and possibly help to shield Europe from a clash of civilisations in its region. Long standing enemies of Europe, of course, have realised the strategic importance that Armenia is gaining. Hence, the greater levels of pressure brought upon it by its already hostile neighbours situated at its western and eastern frontiers.

Europe, on the other hand, is considerably divided to promote any major joint outlook regarding its long term vital interests. Its disjointed policies continue to sap its potency. The EU, to its peril has failed to assist decisively the European states with strategic importance. Moreover, preferences and large funds have been lavished upon its long standing foes and competitors. Consequently, it is now only a matter of time before its Cultural Frontiers in the south – continental or maritime, within *de facto* or *de jure* delimitations – are breached. North America is not confronted with such perils. Latter's interests – due to geopolitical realities – have begun to diverge from those of Europe. Such hazardous factors can be countered, firstly, by establishing reasonable levels of European integration – encompassing all its cultural

frontiers. Secondly, by providing funds with strategic ramifications. Thirdly, by founding significant EU controlled and financed economic projects. Thus, not only establishing rapid levels of economic progress, but also helping to check the declining population trends in the endangered strategic zones. The combination of such avenues may be the only prudent way forward. Europe's all-encompassing Civilisation remains its primary asset.



SHIELDS OF EUROPE: A PAST AND A FUTURE

An all-European defence strategy – ending disunity permanently – is becoming a necessity. Maintaining the European Cultural Frontiers with the outside world will require further integration and resources. Vast global economic, political and sociological developments of this century, never witnessed in history, continue to affect Europe most adversely. Consequently, a collective psychological shield may now be appropriate. Within the European Cultural Frontiers, each European nation can be depicted as a cultural shield – inclusive of its language and traditions – but only the stratified European Civilisation's primacy possesses the capacity to eliminate fragmentation permanently and establish an all-European psychology. European Civilisation, of course, also possesses significant zones, forged as nation-states, well beyond Greater Europe's Cultural Frontiers. North America remains the most outstanding example.

The appropriate dissemination of the stratified European Civilisation, as a convergent discipline, enveloped with a flexible doctrinaire composition will enhance Europe from within and help to ameliorate internal frictions. In the past, such a policy was unnecessary but now, its lack has created a void. External adversaries of the European Civilisation remain the primary profiteers of its disjointed projection, a projection that draws the assertiveness of its adversaries, thus escalating friction between itself and other civilisations. Moreover, despite Globalisation, key non-European ideologies have decided to remain separate – in some cases strictly. Failure to implement the aforementioned enhancement will place sections of Greater Europe's intercontinental demography – as defined by its Cultural Frontiers – as well as Western Europe's unity at risk. Such fundamental failures will confirm the existence of a propensity that can be defined as the 'enemy within'. When such an internal adversary is harboured – advertently or inadvertently – the external increscent foes and possibly their internal associates cannot be halted effectively.