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ABSTRACT

The Armenian genocide of 1915–1918 was the first of the 20th century, and yet many countries—including the perpetrator, Turkey—fail to acknowledge this systematic and intentional massacre of the Armenian people as genocide. My research aims to understand how the Canadian mainstream news media represented the victims during the 1915–1918 Armenian genocide, and to explore Canada’s recognition of that genocide between 2004 and 2006. Specifically, I look at how the events of the Armenian genocide are represented by the same agenda-setting media outlet (the *Globe and Mail*) in completely different ways at distinct points in time. In this case, the events of the genocide do not change, but changing political and economic relationships adversely affect the amount and quality of coverage.
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I strongly believe that it is our responsibility to bring truth to the grave injustices that continue to affect mankind. It is my hope that by studying the media representation of the Armenian genocide in Canada, we can begin to look for ways in which to offer closure to Armenian victims and inspire positive change in genocide policy and activism.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The Armenian genocide of 1915–1918 was the first of the 20th century, and yet many countries—including the perpetrator, Turkey—fail to acknowledge the systematic and intentional massacre of the Armenian people as genocide. Turkey’s denial of the genocide and its domestic laws that prohibit reference to the events of 1915 to 1918 as “genocide” have sparked heated debates in both academia and politics. These are occasionally covered in Canada’s mainstream media, but while many Western academics call for acknowledgement of the genocide and justice for the Armenian people, most countries appear to value their current politico-economic relationship with Turkey more than their moral obligation to the victims. As a result, there is little public outcry to hold Turkey accountable for the events. These considerations raise the following question: Given the debate in political and academic spheres, why is there so little public outrage regarding this injustice?

I would argue that the lack of public outcry is rooted in the politicization of genocide, such that media outlets fail to cover this topic adequately. Official international recognition, which might include demands for Turkey to acknowledge its responsibility, apologize for its actions, and provide reparations to the Armenian community, could jeopardize countries’ political and economic relationship with Turkey. The Canadian government took a moral stand in 2004, and officially recognized that the Armenian massacres of 1915 were, in fact, genocide. The question that remains, however, is why Canada took this step so long after the events.

My research aims to understand how the Canadian mainstream news media represented the victims during the 1915 Armenian genocide, and to explore Canada’s
recognition of that genocide in 2004. I aim to explicate the disparity between what I believe to be an adequate representation of victims in a media population from 1915-1918 and a lack of media coverage and the misrepresentation of these same victims in a population from 2004-2006. In this way, I intend to raise awareness of the grave injustice perpetrated by the Canadian mainstream news media, specifically the *Globe and Mail*, against Armenian survivors, trivializing Canada’s acknowledgement of the genocide and emphasizing Turkish denial.

I will attempt to answer the following research questions: How does the newspaper coverage of the Armenian genocide in the *Globe*, from 1915 to 1918, and the *Globe and Mail*, from 2004 to 2006, portray the victims of the Armenian genocide? Using this mainstream newspaper coverage, particularly in terms of the portrayal of the affected Armenians as “worthy” or “unworthy” victims, I will test Herman and Chomsky’s Propaganda Model (PM).

**Overview of the Armenian Genocide**

Armenia has experienced invasions and foreign rule throughout its history, largely due to its central geographic location between the East and the West. The Armenian massacres of 1894–1896 are particularly noteworthy; however, Armenia managed to survive these invasions, conquests, and massacres and maintain its distinct cultural identity (Balakian, 2003; Shirinian, 1999). It was not until the Armenian genocide, which took place in the context of World War I, that the Armenian people were deliberately massacred in an intentional and premeditated attempt to eliminate their culture and create a pro-Turkish state (Shirinian, 1999).
Armenians in the Ottoman Empire

In the 14th century, the Ottoman Empire (Turkey) began to control the Armenian population, then a small minority Christian group. At this time, Constantinople comprised a large and continually expanding Armenian community; in order to deal with the diverse population, the Turks created a millet system that organized non-Muslim people into small communities. This allowed the Armenians to maintain their unique traditions and religion within their private lives (Braude, 1982), but it was also hierarchical, institutionalizing the unequal treatment of the Armenians (Suny, 1998), disallowing them from serving in most government posts, and requiring them to wear different colours to show they were not Muslim (Carter, 1982).

The promotion of an institutionalized second-class citizenry can often lead to further discrimination or violence: The denial of institutional protection is “one of the foremost facts affording persecution in a socio-political system” (Dadrian, 2003, p. 15). The political, economic, and cultural suppression of the Armenians, and their resultant lack of institutional protection from violent acts within the Ottoman Empire, paved the way for the genocide of the early 20th century.

Armenians and Europe

In the 19th century, many of the European powers and Russia had self-interest in the political and geographical future of the Ottoman Empire (Quataert, 2000). Russia, Britain, and France were all motivated by territorial control, access to the sea, and economic viability (Kirakossian, 2004). Despite these motivations, each of these countries had vested interests in reform, and the Ottoman Empire met those demands by insisting on equality among Muslim and non-Muslim citizens. This push led to a
proclamation in 1839 and the Constitution of 1876, which both emphasized equality regardless of religious affiliation (Davison, 1954). Still, equality was never attained, and some argue that the declarations were used as “weapons of diplomacy in times of international crisis, and not solely as programs for domestic reform” (Davison, 1954, p. 850).

In the 1880s, an Armenian revolution began. The Ottoman Empire feared the Armenians’ growing independence movement, increasing economic power, and expanding relationships with diasporas, which allowed them to seek help from other countries (Jones, 2006). To ensure that Armenians would fail to gain independence, the Kurds and Turks massacred Armenians throughout the Ottoman Empire, particularly in Anatolia, from 1894 to 1896 (Duguid, 1973). In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the Young Turk movement, also known as the Committee of Union and Progress, gained momentum and eventually obtained control of the Ottoman Empire. Although originally supported by the Armenian population, its leaders eventually fought against equality among all subjects, effectively excluding Armenians from gaining equality.

**The Armenian Genocide**

The year 1914 brought about small-scale and deliberate massacres of the Armenian population. Armenians were also deported to remote areas as the oppressors prepared for a larger initiative. By late 1914, Turkish government officials were told to monitor prominent members of the Armenian political parties and intellectual community; Armenian soldiers in the Ottoman army were considered suspect and thus disarmed (Akcam, 2006). The deliberate attempt to destroy both the Armenian population and its cultural identity began on April 24, 1915, when Ottoman authorities arrested and
subsequently tortured and killed roughly 250 Armenian intellectuals and community leaders (Balakian, 2003; Shirinian, 1999). By May 1915, and for the next year, Armenian men and women were separated. The men were the first to be killed through mass burnings, death marches, deportation, drowning, and suffocation; women, children, and the elderly typically endured rape, and died as a result of deportation, and starvation (Adalian, 1997; Akcam, 2006). Deported survivors lived in dire conditions in resettlement camps and faced starvation, disease, lack of shelter, lack of sanitation, and continued deportation (Lewy, 2005).

No official date marks the cessation of the Armenian genocide, although the mass killings terminated in 1918, around the end of World War I. Determining the exact number of Armenians killed is difficult for numerous reasons, including Armenian relocation, conversion to Islam, deaths due to injuries caused during the genocide, and researcher bias (many Turkish scholars provide lower figures than that of their European counterparts). A comprehensive study by Sarkis Karajian places the figure at over two million; various Turkish historians estimate the number of deaths to be as low as, or lower than 800,000. Most academics, however, estimate the figure to be between 1.2 and 1.5 million (Dadrian, 1999; Karajian, 1978).

Perhaps one of the defining features of the Armenian genocide—and which certainly marks it as unique in relation to other genocides of the 20th century—is the continued Turkish denial that it ever occurred (Jones, 2006). Despite thousands of survivor testimonies and eyewitness accounts, the official line adopted by modern Turkey is still that Armenians in the border regions of the country engaged in violent acts in
order to impede the Turkish war effort, leaving the Ottoman officials with no choice but to intervene.

**Armenians and Canada**

The survivors of the Armenian genocide were “dispersed from their homes and forced to begin new lives in foreign host countries all over the world even as they were still terrorized by what they [had] just endured” (Shirinian, 1990, pp. 1, 26–27). Despite being practicing Christians, the Canadian government classified the Armenian populations as “Asiatic” until 1952; as such, they were not desirable immigrants (Shirinian, 1999, p. 13). Canada placed a $200 head tax on all immigrants of Asiatic origin, greatly affecting the ability of many Armenians to enter the country, and created a “continuous-journey regulation,” which meant that Armenians had to travel directly from their homelands—this was nearly impossible at this time, as Armenians had been displaced throughout the entirety of Europe (Shirinian, 1999, p. 16). Armenian Canadians established the Canadian–Armenian Congress in 1948 to bring displaced Armenians to Canada and also to convince the government that Armenians should not be classified as Asiatic. Despite these hardships, Armenians formed a diaspora in Canada, one that remains today.

In addition to its misrepresentation of the Armenian people, Canada, like most other countries, largely ignored the Armenian plea for official recognition for over 80 years. Although various Canadian political parties—including the Liberals, New Democratic Party (NDP), and what became known as the Progressive Conservative and Conservative parties—paid some attention to the Armenian genocide in the 1980s and 1990s, every time a new government was elected, it brushed the issue aside. Armenia was
a Soviet Socialist Republic until 1991; the issue was largely avoided in the mainstream media to maintain a close relationship with Canada’s North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) ally, Turkey (Shirinian, 1999). In 1980, the Legislature of Ontario passed a unanimous resolution stating that April 24 would be designated an annual day of remembrance for the Armenian community.

Canada officially recognized the Armenian genocide by passing Bill M-380 in 2004. Part of this bill stated that the “House acknowledges the Armenian genocide of 1915 and condemns this act as a crime against humanity” (cited in Moore, 2006, p. A5; see Appendix B). The Armenian genocide is not the only genocide the government of Canada has passed: the Canadian parliament adopted the Srebrenica genocide resolution (M-416) recognizing the genocide that happened in Srebrenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina, in 1995 (“Canadian parliament unanimously,” 2010). Prime Minister Stephen Harper made a public statement about the recognition of the Armenian genocide in 2006, leading to Turkey recalling its ambassador from Ottawa and pulling out of an international air exercise at Canadian Forces Base Cold Lake.

In the nearly 100 years since the Armenian genocide, the political and economic relationships both between Canada and Turkey and between Canada and Armenia have changed. During World War I, the Ottoman Empire (Turkey) was an enemy of the West, while Christian Armenia was an ally. After the Armenian genocide, Turkey initiated attempts to mend its relationship with the West, while Armenia became a republic of the Soviet Union—an enemy of the West. Of course, Russia was an ally to the West, briefly during and immediately after WW2.
In the early 1990s, Armenia gained independence from the Soviet Union and has since taken steps to become an EU member country, thereby aligning itself with the West once again. However, Armenia is not a member of NATO and still hosts one of the largest Russian military bases, Russian 102nd Military Base. In contrast, the United States now has one of its largest external military bases, Incirlik Air Base, located in Turkey. Turkey’s relationship with the West truly began after World War II, however, and was strengthened by the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, because it was one of the few West-friendly countries left in the Middle East. What is more, Turkey is a member of NATO.

Today, both countries are allies of the West, but Turkey’s relationship is far more important, both politically and economically, than that of Armenia. For example, at the time of the 2004 Canadian acknowledgment of the Armenian genocide, Turkey was in talks with Bombardier—which has a plant in Thunder Bay, Ontario, Canada—to build a subway system worth $117 million. The threats of Turkish officials in 2004 to pull out of the Bombardier contract due to Canada’s decision to acknowledge the genocide indicate that the Canadian-Turkish economic relationship is far more valuable than that of Armenia, which cannot afford to outsource contracts for millions of dollars to Canada. In fact, according to Forbes magazine, the Armenian economy is the world’s second weakest (Fisher, 2011). Therefore, Turkey is much more valuable politically and economically to corporate US and Canada, than is Armenia.

**Significance/Rationale of the Research**

There is extensive literature focusing on genocide studies, and particularly the Armenian genocide; my study contributes to this body of research in several key ways.
First, I provide a uniquely Canadian perspective, which has largely been left out of the discussion of the Armenian genocide. Second, elites have the power to influence information, and therefore determine which victims are considered to be worthy or unworthy; this thesis attempts to shine a light on this injustice. Additionally, and perhaps most importantly from a theoretical perspective, although I am using a framework that has been employed on many occasions, I compare depictions of the same event in two different periods. Specifically, I look at how the events of the Armenian genocide can be represented by the same agenda-setting media outlet in completely different ways at distinct points in time. The events of the genocide do not change, but the changing political relationships affect the amount and quality of coverage, in this case adversely. Moreover, I illuminate how the impact of the politicization of the Armenian genocide promoted the continued Turkish denial, placed political importance over humanitarian importance, and set an example whereby denial would result in the avoidance of all responsibility for genocidal crimes.

Although Turkish acknowledgement of the genocide seems highly unlikely, there is still hope that with continued international acknowledgment, this may someday be possible. It is crucial that the mainstream media properly represent massacres and acts of genocide before, during, and after conflict in order to properly inform the public and hold the perpetrators accountable. Although if past media coverage of genocides, excluding the Holocaust which was adequate, is an indication of future coverage, this is highly unlikely. It is imperative that the international community support the Armenian fight for recognition and set a humanitarian standard that stands above all political and corporate agendas to ensure that genocide of any kind will not be tolerated, and that perpetrators
will be punished. Perhaps more importantly, however, acknowledgment can help the victims of the genocide—who have formed diasporas throughout Europe, the Middle East, and North America—to achieve true citizenship in their new homes, citizenship that some believe can only really be obtained through their country’s acknowledgement of what brought them there in the first place.

Both the international community and academia need to work toward a better understanding of the concept of genocide, as well as its predictors, in order to help prevent these atrocities from continuing to occur. It is my hope that by studying the media representation of the Armenian genocide in Canada, we can begin to look for ways in which to offer closure to Armenian victims and inspire positive change in genocide policy and activism.

**Genocide Studies**

The word “genocide” is relatively recent, having been introduced in 1944 by Raphael Lemkin to describe the crimes against the Armenians and against the Jewish population in Europe during World War II. The definition used in the political realm is Lemkin’s original one, which is why Prime Minister Harper employed it when he recognized the Armenian genocide on behalf of Canada. While there is a rationale for using different definitions, Lemkin’s traditional definition will be referenced here.

**The Definition of Genocide**

After the war, Raphael Lemkin spent several years attempting to convince the newly formed United Nations to pass a law against genocide. In 1948, the 55 delegates in the UN assembly voted unanimously to approve the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, which was defined as:
Any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such: (a) Killing members of the group; (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group. (Frey, 2009, pp. 12–13)

This definition became embedded in international law in 1951. Its primary intent was to hold perpetrators accountable for their acts—not necessarily to understand, explain, or prevent genocide. Most researchers use this definition, but there are disagreements concerning whether it should be commonly quoted in research or relegated to political and legal systems (Alvarez, 2010; Andreopoulos, 1994; Dufour, 2001; Frey, 2009; Goldhagen, 2009; Kuper, 1981; Shaw, 2007; Winter, 2003).

Dufour (2001) argued that by using a definition as a guide for the conviction of perpetrators, researchers walk a “thin line between the realms of politic, punishment, and intellectual objectivation” (p. 10); their research becomes exposed to political pressures and influences and used as a means of defending the perpetrators of mass murder rather than the victims. The debate about the definition of genocide will likely continue for years, largely because of its “centrality of legal conceptualization at the ‘hard’ political end of genocide studies, and the political capital that groups and states invest in claiming or denying the applicability of the term to cases of particular concern to them” (Bloxham & Moses, 2010, p. 7).
The study of genocide is also highly politicized. Labelling a group as a perpetrator is extremely controversial and likely to cause severe economic, political, and humanitarian complications, which is why there is hesitation when it comes to classifying systematic attempts to eradicate an ethnic group as genocide (Dufour, 2001). Although some scholars adamantly oppose using any definition other than that of the Convention, many others are pushing for a new definition that can be used in academic circles (Andreopoulos, 1994; Dufour, 2001; Frey, 2009; Kuper, 1981; Shaw, 2007; Valentino, 2004; Winter, 2003).

**Genocide Studies Discipline**

In the nearly seventy years since the concept of genocide was first presented, a discipline with a substantial amount of literature has been created and continues to grow (Bloxham & Moses, 2010). There are now journals dedicated to genocide studies, increased dedication to the study of genocide in universities across the world, more international attention to the subject, and a substantial amount of literature in case law, jurisprudence, international relations, human rights investigations and activism, and gender and queer studies (Bloxham & Moses, 2010; Jones, 2004). Thus, the literature is scattered among disciplines and is often highly contested; however, genocide studies is growing and gaining traction in the academic realm.

What has blossomed from this exploration is a field that is largely founded in comparative research: genocides are often compared to one another, and used as case studies to prove larger points about racism and democratization (Andreopoulos, 1994; Bloxham & Moses, 2010; Fein, 1993). Still, this is not the only focus of genocide studies; another strain of research aims to use a more contextual approach, with the goal of
connecting the events of genocide and national histories to transnational and international processes (Bloxham & Moses, 2010).

Both of the aforementioned approaches to studying genocide, along with the field more broadly, are offspring of Holocaust studies, and this creates contention in the discipline (Bloxham & Moses, 2010). There is a tendency for all genocides to be compared to the Holocaust, which involved a very large-scale, systematic, well-orchestrated method of killing and is at the forefront of the West’s mindset when discussing genocide. The vast majority of genocide literature looks at the Holocaust, and Western governments and the mass media continue to use the Holocaust as the “model genocide.” However, to compare other genocides—many of which are smaller in scale and less systematic—to the Holocaust suggests that any atrocity of lesser magnitude is not worthy of being identified as genocide. Even many larger-scale genocides, such as that of the American Indigenous populations, are still deemed less significant when compared with the Holocaust.

Studying one genocide in relation to another cannot focus on size and methods of killing alone. The Holocaust represents such horrors in our minds that nothing else can possibly match it, and this is a shortcoming of comparative studies. Still, the comparative approach does serve a purpose, particularly when studying key components of genocide to determine ways of preventing such atrocities from recurring.

Another consequence of the Holocaust model in genocide studies has been an overemphasis on the “role of narrow political ideology in genocide,” which has been established by putting the Holocaust in a class of “ideological genocides” (Bloxham & Moses, 2010, p. 4). Ideological genocides have been distinguished from more allegedly
utilitarian genocides, like those that occurred throughout European imperial expansion, where the genocide itself is seen merely as collateral damage, not a systematic attempt to eradicate a people; this allows the American Indigenous genocide, for example, to be ignored, and the people viewed as “practical obstacles to be removed” (Bloxham & Moses, 2010, p. 4). This is problematical in that it demonstrates that Holocaust and genocide studies’ scholars use the same Eurocentric indifference\(^1\) that has characterized Western attitudes toward indigenous peoples for centuries (Bloxham & Moses, 2010). In order to fully understand and study genocide, researchers cannot use a Eurocentric mindset: all victims and all perpetrators should be studied similarly and treated equally.

The study of genocide and the way in which it is understood and discussed in contemporary society is also complicated by the distinctly modern world order. As described in *The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies*, this is “manifested most obviously in occasional third party interventions, but more consistently and characteristically by partisan political and economic pressures that can be inflammatory as well as pacificatory, has been hailed as [a] potential panacea to genocide” (Bloxham & Moses, 2010, pp. 12–13). When looking at the relationship between the world order and genocide, we seek to “problematize the prospect of the international community as benevolent policeman, intervening in genocidal situations and punishing perpetrators” (Bloxham & Moses, 2010, pp. 12–13). If there is a consensus that the act of genocide contradicts or challenges American values, for instance, then we also need to

\(^1\) Some academics believe that there is a tendency to treat genocide differently when the atrocities are committed by the West. For example, the genocide of American indigenous peoples is not considered as such by some academics because it was part of European expansion. Bloxham and Moses (2010) argue that this inconsistency in defining such atrocities is problematical.
acknowledge that it has consistently adhered to American interests. The expansion of the United States of America occurred at the expense of indigenous people, and there are numerous examples of American support for regimes engaged in genocide or “politicide” in countries in Latin America throughout the 20th century (Bloxham & Moses, 2010; Herman & Chomsky, 1988; Jones, 2004; Chomsky, 2002). Furthermore, international institutions tend to reflect the interests of the US and the majority of Western states. Institutions such as the UN have the ability and authority to intervene in genocide and punish the perpetrators of such atrocities (Bloxham & Moses, 2010; Jones, 2004; Smith, 2004). However, the notion of humanitarian intervention can and has been manipulated for the interests of the powerful: Powerful states can use genocidal intent, when they choose, to infringe on the sovereignty of weaker states, with or without total international support (Goldhagen, 2009; Smith, 2004). Perhaps more importantly, these states can ignore genocidal intent when their self-interests are not furthered by intervention, standing by while thousands are killed. This self-serving authority and protection of states’ own interests, as occurred in Guatemala, East Timor, and Nicaragua, is extremely problematic.

There is a degree of hypocrisy in Western countries’ portrayal of themselves as humanitarian interventionists and leaders of democracy, as this is only true when the interests of the West are being served and when crimes are committed outside of such countries’ borders. Democracy and humanitarian standards do not exist when the crimes are committed within these countries, as was the case with the indigenous people in the United States. Adam Jones (2004) refers to this hypocrisy as democrisy, which he defines as “the stain of hypocrisy that attaches to regimes that are avowedly democratic in
character, that allow comparative freedom and immunity from naked state violence domestically, but that initiate or participate in atrocious actions beyond their borders” (p. 9). Other academics, like Edward S. Herman, have cited numerous examples of and outrage at this same hypocrisy. What it comes down to is that Western countries need to acknowledge that they are to blame, in part, for genocide and other crimes against humanity that occur outside their borders when they do nothing to stop those atrocities, and at times fuel such conflicts (Jones, 2004). One example of the United States’ complicity is Indonesia’s invasion of East Timor in 1975, as the United States armed the Indonesian forces, which killed between 200,000–300,000 East Timorese (Winter, 2002).

For those who believe in the West’s role as a civilizing force, a belief stemming from a Eurocentric mindset, there is no room for hypocrisy, because democracy must exist at home. The idea of the West fueling or committing such atrocities at home or beyond its borders is simply impossible. Suggesting that the West has committed such atrocities, and continues to do so, is viewed as “intemperate or ungrateful at best, dangerous and extremist at worst” (Jones, 2004, p. 11). The result of such democrisy is a culture that ignores or explains away the atrocities committed by the West and its allies, disregarding its own accountability in these crimes.

**Relevant Elements of Genocide Studies**

Although there are numerous approaches to studying genocides, three of the most important elements as they relate to analyzing the newspaper coverage of the Armenian genocide are intent, memory, and religion.
Intent

Intent is a key component of genocide studies, as it underlies the vast majority of the definitions of “genocide.” The concept of intent is contentious in the field; some argue that too much time and literature focus on attempting to establish, understand, and define this concept. Others maintain that without intent, genocide (as it is understood) cannot occur, and that the intent to destroy an entire group of people gives the event the label of genocide (Alvarez, 2010; Bloxham & Moses, 2010; Frey, 2009; Greenawalt, 1999; Hovannisian, 1999a; Shaw, 2007).

The concept of intent is also intensely debated in the context of the UN’s definition of genocide. The most widely accepted understanding of genocide, advanced by Greenawalt (1999), is that the perpetrator has a specific intent to target “victims on the basis of their group identity with a deliberate desire to inflict destruction upon the group itself” (p. 7). However, this understanding is bound to international law, and therefore political agendas, and does not necessarily provide the best definition and understanding for scholars attempting to better grasp the concept of intent in a genocidal framework.

Many genocide scholars have distanced themselves from the Convention’s notion of intent, instead using the variation of “motivation/intent” as a way to classify genocides, whether they are carried out to settle ethnic, religious, or racial differences (as was the case with the Armenian genocide), terrorize the population of a recently acquired land (including ancient/medieval instances of genocide), acquire or increase wealth (including the killings in Mexico and Peru in the 16th century), or enforce political ideology (including Cambodia in the 1970s) (Frey, 2009). Other scholars contend that
intentionality is an excellent starting point for the study of genocide, but cannot be used as an overall framework for understanding the concept (Shaw, 2007).

One of the fundamental problems with the concept of intent in the Convention’s definition is that it is very difficult to prove and easy to deny. This is precisely the case with the Armenian genocide of 1915: “As the central characteristic of genocide is the calculated, intentional decimation of the targeted group, refuting the factor of intent is foremost in the denier’s belief” (Hovannisian, 1999, p. 203). One of the most common arguments made by deniers of the Armenian genocide is that the intent was not to kill Armenians as a group; rather, it was to relocate them (Hovannisian, 1999). In this manner, the concept of intent can be restrictive, as it might be applied only to those mass murders that either the perpetrators admit to or that the international community, including the United Nations, deems worthy of the classification of genocide. In the coverage of the Armenian genocide in the *Globe and Mail* from 2004–2006, intent plays a large role; in these articles, lack of intent is often cited as a fundamental reason for Turkish denial.

**Memory of Genocide**

Memory is a prominent framework used to study genocide, although its treatment varies substantially depending on the theorist and the genocide being examined. Because the field of genocide studies is so deeply rooted in survivor testimonies, many scholars who use the framework of memory argue that it plays a fundamental role in one’s sense of self and one’s ability to move forward. Memories of genocide can shape the politics of countries and yield a profound effect on individuals, whether making them more able to reconcile with enemies or more likely to cause war (Barkan, 2007).
Historical memory also plays a fundamental role in the way in which contemporary events are interpreted (Miller, 1999). Schutz argues that events in and of themselves never possess meaning; rather, meaning is based on two elements “operating in constant dialectic: the sedimentation of past experiences and one’s intentionality toward the future” (as cited in Miller, 1999, p. 187). For victims of genocide, the trauma becomes part of who they are and cannot be forgotten; thus, their memories of genocide influence their contemporary choices.

Barkan (2007) uses the framework of memory to discuss its effect on the political spectrum, and argues that through memory, conflict resolution—and perhaps even reconciliation—can occur. From a collective memory of genocide, both the perpetrators and the victims may create a space that is constructed largely through the acknowledgement of responsibility (Barkan, 2007). Barkan (2007) contends that, based on collective memory and through collaboration, Turkish and Armenian historians can “construct a memory that respects the victims, shows empathy for the suffering, rejects denial, points to the responsible individuals and government crimes, [and] does not indict the Turkish nation, and certainly not today’s Turkish people—for the Genocide” (pp. 389–390).

The framework of memory takes on many forms within the study of the Armenian genocide and can assist in offering reconciliation and potentially facilitate moving forward. Perhaps more importantly in this case, however, is that memory tends to be a delegitimizing tactic used against the Armenians by Turkish officials. This will be discussed in more detail in the chapters that follow.
Religion

A prominent aspect of this approach argues that religion is a construct and that its naturalization—in the case of the Armenian genocide, in the division between Muslim and Christian—is a type of weapon used in the struggle to legitimize power (Astorian, 1999). In order to bring about a division between Muslims and non-Muslims, Turkey created a hierarchical millet system. This system, as previously noted, required Christians to wear specific clothing so that they could be identified as non-Muslims, and did not allow Christians to hold certain government or academic positions. Therefore, the millet system institutionalized the unequal treatment of the Armenians within the public sector of the Ottoman Empire (Suny, 1998). By defining the Armenians as non-Muslim, the Ottoman Turks essentially created a binary division between Muslim and non-Muslim constructs. The terminology, propaganda, and oppressive laws were all ways in which the Turkish government naturalized such a division (Astorian, 1999; Smith, 2002).

Binary constructs are not specific to the Armenian genocide; the study of religion is typically used as a framework for understanding 20th century genocides, particularly the Holocaust, and a key component of this is looking at the way in which divisions between religions are naturalized (Smith, 2002). Through such polarization, perpetrators are able to dehumanize victims and justify their slaughter, which is precisely what occurred in the Ottoman Empire’s millet system because Armenians were considered to be less human than their Muslim counterparts (Astorian, 1999).

A recurring theme throughout this study’s first population of articles, published in the Globe from 1915–1918, is a commentary on the reasoning concerning the Turkish
massacres of the Armenian people. Religion is commonly mentioned in these articles; in particular, there is a running discussion of the Armenian people’s Christianity.

**Armenian Genocide Studies**

Literature pertaining to the Armenian genocide is often rooted in the testimony of first-generation survivors and the comparative approach. It tends to offer specific accounts, and is more a compilation of testimonies and documentation than a framework. Still, as the discipline develops, more academic research exploring official documents and press coverage is emerging. Armenian genocide literature was introduced by Hagop Oshagan, who promoted the segregation of genocide literature from other literature, arguing that it merited a methodology and genre all its own (Peroomian, 1999). Today, Armenian genocide literature is understood to “encompass that unique body of artistic creations triggered by a traumatic, unprecedented collective experience in the history of the Armenian people” (Peroomian, 1999, p. 175). Recurring themes in this approach include self-criticism or internalization of catastrophe, the inability or unwillingness to grasp the reality of the events, the image of the Turk, the manifestation of self-defence, and the role and duality of God (Peroomian, 1999). These themes grapple with the victims and survivors’ perceptions of the events, along with the impact they had on both first- and future-generation survivors (Peroomian, 1999). What is derived from this literature is typically a historical account of the events from the viewpoint of survivors, which helps to establish an understanding of the Armenian genocide and the full impact of the atrocity.
The Representation of Genocide

There is ample academic research that describes how genocide and other acts of terrorism are politicized by the media and political leaders to reinforce official agendas. Herman and Chomsky represent the forefront of this research, with specific case studies from their PM, but other academics like Anthony DiMaggio, Jeffrey Klaehn, and Adam Jones have also delved into this topic. Still, there is no consistent humanitarian standard for ensuring that victims of both enemy and friendly state violence receive the same coverage. According to DiMaggio (2009), “U.S. media coverage is highly propagandistic, creating a polarization between various groups depending on the specific context in which the repression takes place” (p. 111). Similar to the West’s self-serving approach in its intervention and engagement with countries committing genocide, the Western media tend to align themselves, and thus media coverage, with government and corporate interests.

A stark difference can be seen in the attitudes of news coverage in The New York Times, Newsweek, CBS, and Time when it comes to religious leaders murdered in Soviet-dominated countries like Poland as opposed to those murdered in US-allied capitalist states in Latin America (DiMaggio, 2009). When the Polish Secret Police murdered priest Jerzy Popieluszko, this received far more coverage in these news outlets than did dozens of religious figures who were killed in Latin American countries by US-allied forces in the 1960s–1980s (DiMaggio, 2009). According to Herman and Chomsky, “the act of violence and its effects on Popieluszko were presented in such a way as to generate the maximum emotional impact on readers. The act was vicious and deserved the presentation it received. The acts against the unworthy victims were also vicious, but they
were treated differently” (Herman & Chomsky, 1988, p. 43; see also DiMaggio, 2009, p. 85). Thus, it is apparent that the media typically align themselves with the interests of government and institutions, which generally means highlighting some victims (those Herman and Chomsky characterize as worthy victims) while ignoring others.

The example of the genocide in East Timor can be used to illustrate a problematic non-response to human rights violations in the international arena. Although Indonesia acquired most of its military equipment from the United States, Canadian governments also authorized the export of civilian and military goods to Indonesia in the 1970s and 1980s, despite Canada’s own import and export policy, which prohibits the sale of military goods to countries that are engaging in hostilities or have a history of violating the human rights of its citizens (Klaehn, 2005). During Indonesia’s illegal occupation of East Timor in 1975–1999, over 18,000 East Timorese were killed and more than 80,000 died as a result of the occupation (starvation and illness; Dunn, 1997). The worst of the atrocities occurred during the late 1970s, with similar numbers of casualties to the Pol Pot massacres in Cambodia. The difference is that it was not clear how to stop the massacres in Cambodia, whereas all the West had to do to stop the massacres in East Timor was to stop supporting the Indonesian violence through military export, the American administration, and the silence of the media (Chomsky, 2002).

Researching the coverage of East Timor from 1975–1980, Klaehn found that the Globe and Mail affirmed rather than challenged the actions and policies of the Canadian government, and failed to adequately cover the events of the genocide and Canada’s involvement in the region (Klaehn, 2005). Similarly, in the United States, the mass media coverage of East Timor was rather high before the 1975 invasion, declined shortly after
it, and came to a screeching halt by 1978, with zero reporting being done on the subject in the United States at this time (Chomsky, 2002). US interests lay in a large offshore oil field in East Timor’s territorial waters; the US had had no success in negotiating with Portugal for this region, and knew that East Timor’s independence would make it even more challenging. However, Indonesia was a US ally, which meant that Indonesian occupation would result in the US gaining access to the oil field. US extraction of Timorese oil began in 1991 (Chomsky, 2002). Based on this coverage of East Timor, it can be concluded that “the interrelations of state and corporate capitalism and the corporate media effectively circumvented fundamental democratic processes” (Klaehn, 2005, p. 153).

Similar to the genocide in East Timor, the US government supported and inspired coups in Latin America, including Guatemala, in the 1960s–1980s. The United States funded and provided military arms to the government in Guatemala; these were used to kill some 100,000 people between 1978 and 1985 (Herman & Chomsky, 1988). This US support of the genocide in Guatemala is largely unknown because countries like Guatemala and Indonesia—in fact some of the most terror-filled regimes of the 20th century—were “redefined as progressive, as ‘embedded democrats,’ as ‘caught between extremes’ of left (the popular and guerrilla opposition) and right (the paramilitaries and death squads, somehow divorced from the regimes that constituted and directed them)” (Jones, 2004, p. 14). Essentially, the US redefined these regimes to fit with its own ideological stance, to service its own interests. Although accurate information about the massacres in Guatemala was presented by institutions like the UN at the time, the US media coverage did not accurately portray them (Herman & Chomsky, 1988).
Meanwhile, atrocities that were committed at the hands of the Soviet Union—at times less severe—were covered heavily in the US media. Such coverage was extremely critical of communism (Jones, 2004). Testimonials and accounts of the violence in the 1970s and 1980s by survivors and eyewitnesses like Nobel Peace Prize winner Rigoberta Menchú began to emerge in the mid-1980s, but the US government and the media still did not respond to the genocide in Guatemala or attempt to cover the massacres adequately.

Based on these case studies of the mass media representation of violence and genocide, one could justifiably conclude that the media do not fairly and equally cover all victims of genocide and acts against humanity (DiMaggio, 2009).

**The Representation of the Armenian Genocide in the Mass Media**

Coverage of the Armenian genocide in the mass media is unique in that there is on-going discussion as to whether the events of 1915 can be described as genocide, and the framing of the events depends largely on the particular newspaper’s and/or country’s stance on the issue. For example, in the US Congress in 2007, the Democrats introduced a resolution recognizing the Armenian genocide, but *The New York Times* neglected to publish articles/editorials about this. When there was coverage, it suggested that the resolution was ill advised or counterproductive (DiMaggio, 2009). Anthony DiMaggio (2009) highlighted this disparity in a critical examination of how the victims of the Armenian genocide were portrayed in the media in the United States as compared to how the Srebrenica genocide, which took place during the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina from April 1992 to November 1995, was represented. The Armenian genocide killed between 1 million and 1.5 million people, while the Srebrenica genocide killed 8,000;
however, the treatments of these two genocides in the mass media and by the US government are disproportional to the scale of the atrocity. DiMaggio found that the mainstream media and the political leaders in the United States were quick to label the Srebrenica massacres as genocide and covered them heavily. In contrast, government officials and editorials were extremely critical of the recognition of the Armenian genocide, labelling it as irresponsible and poorly timed. Indeed, although the death toll of the Armenian genocide was somewhere between 125 and 180 times that of the Srebrenica genocide, the Armenians received little, more poorly placed, and more critical coverage. According to DiMaggio (2009), this was justified by the desire to maintain a strong political relationship with Turkey over the United States’ humanitarian obligation to the victims of this genocide.

Another prominent case study of the Armenian genocide has been done by Jessica Taylor who did a content analysis of the *Washington Post’s* coverage of the massacres of the Armenian people in the Ottoman Empire from 1915-1916. She focused on a qualitative content analysis, but quantitative analysis was the supportive analysis. She used the search terms “Armenia” and “Armenian” and studied the articles, identifying five main categories: description, international action, aid, subordinate reference, and location (Taylor, 2009). She then identified common themes and analyzed the articles for elements such as sources, frequency of categories, and placement of articles (Taylor, 2009). *The Washington Post*, similar to *The New York Times*, reported on the Armenian massacres almost daily for over a year. According to Taylor’s content analysis, the American people were well informed about the Armenian genocide, with graphic depictions of the systematic atrocities committed against the Armenian people (Taylor,
2009). Due to the lack of formal intervention by the United States to stop the atrocities, and political pressure not to go to war with Turkey, the question regarding Turkish responsibility was, however, put on hold until the end of the war (Taylor, 2009). Despite the Washington Post’s attention to the Armenian cause, the political and economic interests with the region outweighed the United States’ commitment to the Armenian victims: “The outpouring of sympathy and responsibility provoked and recounted in the media coverage was limited to humanitarian efforts and failed to extend to political protection of Armenian independence” (Taylor, 2009, p. 124). With nearly a century having passed, the Armenian cause has yet to receive official recognition of the genocide that was so heavily covered by The Washington Post between 1915 and 1916.
CHAPTER 2
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

Theoretical/Conceptual Framework: Herman and Chomsky’s Propaganda Model

In theory, a democracy cannot function effectively without a well-informed public. The electorate must have access to information on current and past domestic and international events, popular opinion, and government policies and agendas in order to make informed and responsible decisions. Theoretically, therefore, the media play a fundamental role in a functioning democracy; without the media, there would be no intermediary institution to analyze the information presented by the most powerful people in society or to provide coverage that reflects the best interests of society as a whole.

A democratic media should be made up of relatively unbiased and independent entities that present the most relevant, timely, and objective reporting possible, and do not merely reflect the views of the wealthy and powerful. The current media situation in Canada and around much of the globe, however, is based on ownership conglomerates that are controlled and influenced by the richest and most powerful political and economic elites. In Canada, the vast majority of media are owned by five companies: Bell Media, Rogers Communications, Shaw Communications, Astral Media, and Quebecor; the Canadian government owns the public network, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. The Thomson family—the wealthiest family in Canada—owns eighty-five percent of the Globe and Mail, while Bell Canada Enterprises (Bell Media) owns fifteen percent (“David Thomson and Family”). According to Herman and Chomsky (1988), this type of control and influence allows powerful societal actors to “fix the premises of discourse, to decide what the general populace is allowed to see, hear, and think about, and to
‘manage’ public opinion by regular propaganda campaigns” (p. 1). The information disseminated by our media, therefore, reflects the ideologies and agendas of elite figures in society, and not necessarily the unbiased “truth.” As a result, the citizenry’s view of the media system and the reality of how it actually operates may be at odds with one another.

In their PM, as presented in *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*, Herman and Chomsky argue that “Elite media interlock with other institutional sectors in ownership, management and social circles, effectively circumventing their ability to remain analytically detached from other dominant institutional sectors” (1988, p. 1). If the media are connected to structures of ownership, for example, then it is very difficult to critique injustices perpetrated by this structure or challenge the dominant perspectives taken by the media. The result is self-censorship by journalists and newsroom workers. The PM, however, also emphasizes that this filtering of news by economic and political elites is naturalized to the point that “media news people, frequently operating with complete integrity and goodwill, are able to convince themselves that they choose and interpret the news ‘objectively’ and on the basis of professional news values” (Herman & Chomsky, 1988, p. 2). The actual journalists are not necessarily to blame for flawed coverage; rather, this coverage is a direct result of economic elites who control the dissemination of information.

The PM seeks to analyze media performance, and suggests that the way in which the media perform is directly related to political and market forces. The dominant political and corporate elites share many of the same interests, which media performance will likely serve. The PM predicts that news discourse will feature:
(1) The promotion of ideologically serviceable themes and system-supportive dis-information; (2) a low volume of news coverage devoted to reporting on “unworthy victims”; (3) dominance of official discourse; and (4) a very tight, controlled range of “permitted opinion” and debate on central topics. (Klaehn, 2002, p. 206)

Although the American and Canadian media are multifaceted—local newspapers are distinct from national newspapers—this critical discourse analysis will be focused on what is typically called “agenda-setting” media. As defined by Chomsky, agenda-setting media typically include the “major media outlets that end up setting a basic framework that other smaller media units more or less have to adapt to” (Chomsky, 2002, p. 14). For example, if local newspapers want to cover national or international news, they will likely lack the resources to send foreign correspondents to gather information; thus, they will have to adapt to the framework of the major media outlets. This results in similar information being presented in similar formats to citizens across the country, even if they are reading local newspapers and not those considered national outlets.

Herman and Chomsky’s PM has been consistently misunderstood and ignored in discussions and debates concerning mass media. For example, the PM does not postulate that media function to circulate propaganda; it does, however, describe the “forces that cause the mass media to play a propaganda role” (Herman & Chomsky, 1988, pp. xi–xii). Ignoring the PM in debates about the function of mass media is actually a prediction of the PM:

One prediction of the model is that it will be effectively excluded from discussion, for it questions the factual assumption that is most serviceable
to the interests of established power: namely, that the media are
cantankerous, perhaps excessively so. However well-confirmed the model
may be, then, it is inadmissible, and, the model predicts, should remain
outside the spectrum of debate over the media. Note that the model has a
rather disconcerting feature. Plainly, it is either valid or invalid. If invalid,
it may be dismissed; if valid, it will be dismissed (Chomsky, 1989, p. 11).
The PM has largely been left out of discussions and debates about how media function,
including academic discussions, confirming the PM’s own prediction (Robertson, 2011;
Mullen and Klaehn, 2010). Chomsky argued that there is a very good reason for
excluding the PM from debate: “discussing the ‘Propaganda Model’ would itself be
dysfunctional to the institutions” (Chomsky, 2002, p. 17). Although there are
mischaracterizations and critiques of the PM, it is a useful critical approach for media
analysis in that it aims to understand and explain the patterns of media behaviour and the
impact of market forces on media coverage (Klaehn, 2003).

Herman and Chomsky (1988) contended that the PM “traces the routes by which
money and power are able to filter out the news fit to print, marginalize dissent, and
allow the government and dominant private interests to get their message across to the
public” (p. 2). The five main news “filters” are as follows: (a) size, ownership, and profit
orientation; (b) advertising; (c) sourcing of news; (d) flak; and (e) anti-communism
(Herman & Chomsky, 1988). In addition to these filters, the model also emphasizes “the
importance of delineating the absence of historical context in news reporting and treats as
significant the degree to which news is isolated from prior and subsequent events”
(Klaehn, 2003, p. 12). Accounting for this historical context in the coverage, I believe
there should be a focus on one particular filter of the PM in my analysis: sourcing of news.

The PM predicts that there is a reliance by the media on information, in the form of news sources provided by the government, business, and experts supported by these institutions (Herman & Chomsky, 1988; Herman & Chomsky, 2002). There are not enough resources or reporters available to cover all news, so news agencies normally concentrate on places where news typically occurs: government agencies, police stations, and corporations. These are usually recognized as credible by the public, reinforcing the image that mass media are objective and accurate. These “routine news sources” create content that is accessible for news agencies and release this to correspond with news deadlines, giving them privileged access, unlike “non-routine news sources,” which have to fight for access and may be ignored by news agencies (Herman & Chomsky, 1988, p. 22). The PM also predicts that the use of critical and non-routine news sources may be avoided because they might be less available—there is a higher cost associated with them, and primary sources may be offended by their claims (Herman & Chomsky, 1988). The experts who are referenced in articles in the mass media are an extremely important element of sourcing; however, the source of the article, the author or the news agency that released it, is also significant.

Sourcing is the most relevant filter of the PM in this analysis, because the types and number of sources found in the articles provide a clear understanding of how the coverage is framed. Furthermore, identifying the sourced individual or group provides valuable information about the article’s content. For example, a Turkish author may write an opinion column from a different perspective than an Armenian author would. It is also
important to note the groups of people who are not sourced, an identification which provides valuable information about which opinions or groups of people are not being represented. Additionally, analyzing whether one source speaks on behalf of, or in the interest of another provides an opportunity to look at which groups are viewed as being more credible than others. For these reasons, news sourcing is a crucial element of this analysis. Although size, ownership, profit orientation, advertising, flak, and anti-communism are important filters, they do not address the research question examined in this thesis. An analysis of size, ownership, and profit orientation would require an extensive study of the Globe and Mail’s operations and functions from 1915 to today. Likewise, a discussion on advertising would require a broad examination of the advertising industry and the Globe and Mail’s advertising policies, neither of which addresses the research question directly. Although flak was considered seriously, the only form of genuine flak in the Globe and Mail was in the form of letters to the editors. Ten letters to the editors were identified, and the positive and negative responses were split evenly. Similarly, the anti-communism filter would require a detailed discussion of communism that is not particularly relevant to this analysis. In addition to sourcing of news, a more focused and readily applicable approach to my research is Herman and Chomsky’s discussion of “worthy”/“unworthy” victims.

“Worthy”/“Unworthy” Victims

The PM postulates that the media serve elite political interests, and that one way they do so is by presenting victims and perpetrators so as to evoke a desired emotional response: sympathy for the victims and anger toward the perpetrators (Klaehn, 2002). Depending on the international context of the event, the media draw attention away from
certain stories and place more emphasis on others. In this manner, news stories do not always portray victims in the same way. Some are deemed “worthy” victims, while others are “unworthy.” The PM contends that the mainstream media will portray “people abused in enemy states as worthy victims, whereas those treated with equal or greater severity by its own government or clients will be unworthy” (Herman & Chomsky, 1988, p. 37). The qualitative and quantitative disparities in the way these victims are treated mean that worthy victims will receive more coverage, more prominence, and more humanistic treatment, while their unworthy counterparts will receive less coverage, poorer placement, less detail, minimal humanization, and coverage that will not excite or enrage (DiMaggio, 2009; Herman & Chomsky, 1988; Klaehn, 2002; Klaehn, 2005).

The PM also suggests that in the coverage of unworthy victims in news reporting, the historical context will be absent and events will appear to be isolated; news coverage involving unworthy victims will not include a discussion of how the event relates to prior or subsequent events (Klaehn, 2005). Overall, the propaganda approach to media coverage suggests “a systematic and highly political dichotomization in news coverage based on serviceability to important domestic power interests” (Herman & Chomsky, 1988, p. 35). This model, employed by Herman and Chomsky, Klaehn, and other scholars, has effectively delineated why certain victims receive more coverage than others.

**Critical Discourse Analysis as a Methodological Approach**

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) attempts to study discourse in the social world, focusing primarily on how social and political domination is produced (and often reproduced) through discourse. According to van Dijk (2009), it is an approach that
focuses on “social problems, and especially on the role of discourse in the production and reproduction of power abuse or domination” (p. 96). It centres on issues of power, domination, ideology, and hegemony, as well as historical components, which are particularly useful in understanding texts in their proper context.

In the context of the Armenian genocide, CDA allows for an analysis of the historical and political relationships between Turkey and Canada, and of the way in which Armenians were viewed by both of these countries, in order to better comprehend the coverage—particularly the way in which the victims were portrayed. Texts can be written with specific meanings and ideologies, with the aim of expressing certain messages to an audience; this is often the case in newspaper coverage. CDA can deconstruct these techniques in an attempt to analyze the embedded meanings beyond the words, calling “attention to power imbalances, social inequalities, non-democratic practices, and other injustices in hopes of spurring readers to corrective action” (Huckin, 1997). With this in mind, the results of CDA should not be taken at face value, for interpretation of the texts is influenced by many historical conditions.

According to Huckin (1997), the “context is meant to include not only the immediate environment in which a text is produced and interpreted, but also the larger societal context including its relevant cultural, political, social, historical, and other facets.” Analyzing newspaper coverage of the Armenian genocide, therefore, produces a better understanding of political and historical situations as they relate to Canada, Turkey, and the Armenian people. Huckin argued that there are two integral steps in performing a CDA of texts. First, the researcher should take on the active role of a typical reader, which is a non-critical approach, and “try to experience being manipulated themselves
before taking a more critical view…they should try to simulate how an intended reader might read and react to a given text” (Huckin, 2002, p. 5). The second step adds a critical component, whereby the researcher takes a “step back” and analyzes both the text and his/her initial reaction to it (Huckin, 2002, p. 5). CDA is an approach to studying texts, not a systematic method; the researcher must use his/her best judgment as to which components should be used to interpret and analyze the text (Huckin, 2002).

CDA also has limitations. Bryan Poole made the following criticisms of CDA: (a) the term “discourse” is defined very differently depending on the scholar and can be interpreted, inappropriately, as language; (b) there is no indication as to the number of possible discourses; (c) the theoretical commitments of CDA depend on a number of influences, without any coherent whole; (d) there is no discussion regarding the ability of readers to interpret the text in different ways; (e) CDA adopts a deterministic view of the effects of texts on readers; and (f) CDA does not use psycholinguistic evidence sufficiently (Poole, 2010). Further, Pedro Santander Molina (2009) argues that CDA must be differentiated from textual linguistics, and to do so, it is necessary to study the methodological and theoretical elements of linguistics as they relate to the text as a whole, which leaves much room for bias.

Though some academics, such as Bryan Poole, criticize CDA, this approach allows the researcher to look critically at texts and analyze the meanings and power structures embedded in them. Nevertheless, it is imperative for researchers to note any of their pre-existing assumptions or beliefs before beginning the research, because the best guard against bias is transparency. In this study, the texts were approached with a historical understanding of the Armenian genocide, but with no bias toward the types of
coverage that should be found. The aim was to view the texts as a typical reader, while still maintaining a critical approach to the quality of the information. I have no personal connection to the Armenian genocide, but rather attempted to understand how the Armenian genocide has been represented in the *Globe and Mail* in order to contribute to the academic discussion surrounding Turkey’s denial of the Armenian genocide.

Huckin’s approach to CDA provides a strong foundation, with clear terms and definitions, which can be employed along with transparency to guard against researcher bias.

Several approaches will be used to analyze coverage of the Armenian genocide in two populations, one from the *Globe* in 1915–1918, and the other from the *Globe and Mail* in 2004–2006. The analysis will look at the texts as a whole, on a sentence level, and at the level of specific words and phrases. Although most critical discourse analysts select one or two of these levels, all three will be used here to perform an extensive examination that looks for larger societal meanings while still paying attention to techniques such as framing and omission, as well as connotation, as defined below.

**Framing**

The first technique for criticizing the texts as a whole is *framing*, which refers to how the content of a text is presented (Huckin, 1997), and looks at the perspective of the writer and whether a slant (i.e., perspective) is present: “To be coherent, a text cannot simply be a collection of details; rather, it must try to pull these details together into some sort of unified whole” (Huckin, 1997).
Foregrounding and Backgrounding

Closely related to the technique of framing are the concepts of foregrounding and backgrounding, which deal primarily with the notion that particular concepts are emphasized while others are de-emphasized. Huckin referred to the top-down orientation of news reports as an example of these techniques: “Sentences occurring early in the report will be foregrounded, while those occurring later will be backgrounded” (Huckin, 1997). Omission, a technique whereby the author of the text intentionally leaves out certain components of, or perspectives on, the story, is an extreme form of backgrounding; it “is often the most potent aspect of textualization, because if the writer does not mention something, it often does not even enter the reader’s mind and thus is not subjected to his or her scrutiny. It is difficult to raise questions about something that is not even there” (Huckin, 1997). In the following chapters, particular attention will be paid to the terminology not used to describe and define the Armenian genocide.

Transitivity

Perhaps one of the most crucial techniques that will be used in this research is a focus on the agent-patient relationship in sentences, which is a component of transitivity. Huckin (1997) argues that in textual descriptions, “certain persons are consistently depicted as initiating actions (and thus [perhaps] exerting power) while others are depicted as being (often passive) recipients of those actions.” Looking specifically at the coverage of Canada’s acknowledgement of the Armenian genocide in 2004–2006, it can be asked: How was the Armenian population in Canada represented? Were Armenians the recipients of the actions of the Canadian government, or were they seen as people who had been fighting for recognition for nearly a century?
Another important element at the sentence level is the deletion or omission of agents, which typically occurs through the use of passive verbs and nominalization (Huckin, 1997). For example, it can be asked whether the headlines focus on the victims or the perpetrators in the coverage from 1915–1918. Do the headlines read “100,000 Armenians Die” or “Turks Killed 100,000 Armenians”?

**Connotations**

The final level of CDA, which looks at words and phrases, includes an analysis of connotations. According to Huckin (1997), “Connotations derive from the frequent use of a word or phrase in a particular type of context.” Additionally, a connotation may be used only once and still be considered valid. It is here that the terminology used to describe and define the massacres of the Armenian people is analyzed to determine the frequency and intended context of the terms used.

**Parameters and Scope of the Research**

**Time Frame**

The two time frames for this research are January 1, 1915 to December 31, 1918, comprising the first population, and January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2006, representing the second. I have selected the first time frame in order to analyze the Canadian media coverage of the Armenian genocide in the *Globe* during and directly after the genocide (1915–1918). The mass killings stopped in 1918, just prior to the end of World War I. Thus, I will analyze newspaper coverage until December 31, 1918. The second time frame was selected to gather information about Canada’s recognition of the Armenian genocide in 2004, as well as Prime Minister Stephen Harper’s official statement regarding this in 2006.
The time period of 1990–1992 was also given serious consideration. On August 23, 1990, Armenia declared its sovereignty from the Soviet Union; full independence was achieved on September 21, 1991. This is a significant period because, in theory, Armenia breaking away from the Soviet Union could positively change the political relationship between Canada and Armenia. However, this event does not directly pertain to Canada and Canadian–Armenian survivors in the same way that official recognition does. Additionally, in 1980, the Legislature of Ontario passed a unanimous resolution stating that April 24 would be designated an annual day of remembrance for the Armenian community. Though this is significant, it was not country-wide official recognition. Rather, it is a day of remembrance. Thus, I believe that 1915–1918 and 2004–2006 are the most significant periods with regard to the Armenian genocide as it relates to Canada because they mark (a) the genocide itself and (b) official recognition.

*The Globe/The Globe and Mail*

I will reference the *Globe’s* coverage of the Armenian genocide from 1915 to 1918, and the *Globe and Mail’s* coverage from 2004 to 2006. The *Globe* was founded in 1844, and by 1853 it had a readership of 6,000. In 1888, it was purchased by the Jaffray family, which ran it until 1936, during which time the *Globe* declared itself to be “Canada’s national newspaper” (*Globe and Mail*). In 1936, the newspaper was purchased by George McCullagh, who merged the *Globe* with the newspaper the *Mail and Empire*, forming the *Globe and Mail* (*Globe and Mail*).

I chose to study newspaper coverage from the *Globe and Mail* because, in recent times, it has maintained editions in six cities and a weekly readership of 2.5 million people (*Globe and Mail*). As an agenda-setting mainstream periodical, it disseminates
information to one of the largest newspaper audiences in Canada; information contained within it is therefore representative of what many newspaper consumers are likely to encounter. The *Globe and Mail* is widely regarded as Canada’s newspaper of record, equivalent to the *New York Times* in the United States. It is Canada’s most prestigious daily newspaper and is regarded as the only truly national daily. It also has a reputation for having the best foreign news coverage in Canada relative to other papers such as the *Toronto Star*. It is therefore an agenda setter for other Canadian daily papers and news media.

Throughout most of its history, the *Globe/the Globe and Mail* tended to be closely aligned with what is now called the Conservative Party of Canada. Before its merger with *The Mail and Empire*, it was associated with Canada’s elite, representing the financial and academic communities of Toronto. After this point, the *Globe and Mail* took on a largely conservative viewpoint. Since the early 1980s, the paper tended to support the Progressive Conservative Party/the Conservative Party.

**Terminology and Search Terms**

Determining the search terms necessary to locate articles that discuss the Armenian genocide in two time periods that are nearly 90 years apart was a difficult task. As previously noted, the term *genocide* was not introduced until 1948. Now a widely recognized term used to describe the events of 1915–1918, it cannot be applied retroactively to the coverage.

When Johannes Lepsius, a German missionary; J.B. Jackson, the American consul in Aleppo, Syria; and Henry Morgenthau, the American ambassador in Istanbul wrote separately about the Armenian genocide in 1915 and 1916, they were defining exactly
what the term genocide now means. For example, Jackson wrote that these atrocities were “nothing less than the extermination of the Armenian race” (Weitz, 2003, p. 1). Although they did not use the term, the writings of these men described genocide:

   The word did not exist yet, but both of them [Lepsius and Jackson] knew that they were witnessing something even worse than the pogromlike violence that had occurred earlier against the Armenians. What they could not have known, of course, was that the genocide of the Armenians…displayed so many of the characteristics that would be replicated at other times and in other places around the globe. (Weitz, 2003, p. 1)

Common terms used to describe the genocidal events at the time were “tragedy,” “massacres,” “atrocities,” and “a crime without a name.” Today, calling the event a tragedy or massacres when countries such as Canada, France, and Switzerland recognize it as genocide, delegitimizes the victims and sends a clear message of uncertainty and doubt. For this reason, not using the term genocide, or using techniques such as quotation marks to suggest that the term is contested, will be discussed in detail in relation to the second set of news items. Such a discussion will be absent in the assessment of the first set because the term genocide did not exist.

Because of the difference in terminology, the search term “Armenian genocide” could not be used for the Globe’s coverage from 1915 to 1918 and the Globe and Mail’s coverage from 2004 to 2006. Although the term massacre was most commonly used in 1915, it is not alone a valid search term because it was not the only word used to define the atrocities in the earlier coverage. Furthermore, due to the continued Turkish denial of
the genocide, much newspaper coverage discussing it in the later set does not actually refer to the events as genocide; rather, it uses terms such as “massacres” and “tragedy.” Therefore, in order to gather an exhaustive research sample, I used two broad search terms: “Armenia” and “Armenian.”

**Accurate/Inaccurate Coverage**

At times, the analysis will discuss accurate coverage or inaccurate coverage. Accuracy is determined by an evaluation of the coverage in relation to relevant research, which is discussed throughout the historical analysis or literature review. Accurate coverage is that which aligns with the historical analysis provided and which has been quoted by dozens of Western academics. Moreover, accurate coverage is that which aligns with the previous studies discussed in the literature review, particularly Jessica Taylor’s study of the Armenian genocide in the *Washington Post* between 1915 and 1916 as well as Anthony DiMaggio’s study of the Democratic Party’s resolution recognizing the Armenian genocide in the *New York Times* in 2007.
CHAPTER 3  
CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS  
OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE: 1915–1918

The search terms “Armenia” and “Armenian” in the historical database of the Globe and Mail returned 345 items published between 1915 and 1918. Of these, 271 articles were excluded from the analysis, because they were advertisements or descriptions of events that were not directly related to the massacres (typically of strategic manoeuvres that took place in World War I). Eighty-three hard news articles, opinion columns, and editorials discussed the massacres of the Armenian people.

Using Huckin’s approach, the items were first read uncritically in order to gain a general understanding of the material and to experience the articles as a typical reader would have experienced them. Next, a CDA was performed by categorizing the articles into four broad themes, which were based on the content discussed in the text: 1) the massacres, 2) holding the Ottoman Empire responsible, 3) religion, and 4) the West’s involvement in preventing the massacres. At times, the articles delved into more than one theme, which was noted. Next, the articles were critically analyzed through a focus on framing, foregrounding, and backgrounding, which included omission, transitivity, connotations, and news sources. With a sample size of 83 items, examples from each item could not be used without repetition. Therefore, several articles from each theme were selected to represent the whole sample. All exceptions were noted.

**Framing**

The vast majority of articles are news stories, opinion columns, and editorials that frame the massacres of the Armenian people as horrific. Here, the terminology and
descriptors used to illustrate the massacres of the Armenian people paint a clear picture of horrific atrocity, torture, and unspeakable acts of genocide. For example, the article “Thousands of Armenians Perishing in Caucasia, the Chairman of the Armenian National Defence Committee” (1915) states that Turkish actions against the Armenians are “deplorable,” and that Armenians are “dying from cold and hunger.” In “Turks Disorganized by Recent Defeats” (1915) the special telegraph dispatched to the Globe reports that the Turkish troops massacred the entire male population of four villages and that they “pillaged and destroyed a number of shops, and hanged several Armenian merchants.”

Shortly after the Armenian genocide is said to have begun in April 1915, and for a full year following this, the descriptions of the massacres becomes even more detailed. An article in the War Summary section of the Globe dated August 3, 1915 read that “9,000 men, women and children have been massacred,” and that “mutilated bodies now strew the banks of the Tigris” (“War Summary: It Is About Time that Turkish Misrule Came to an End,” 1915). In the article “Unspeakable Cruelty Practised by Turks” (1915) extremely graphic language is used to describe an instance of Turkish violence: “the miserable Armenian men, women and children were almost all burned alive…Only four escaped, one of whom related the story.” In the article “Graduate of Knox on Turkish Horrors” (1915), Rev. E. O. Eshoo gives his first-hand account of the massacres in Armenia:

My mother and sister…fled and found refuge in a Mohammedan house. My sister reached the city, but while my mother was riding to the city on a donkey lent to her she was met by Kurds, who robbed her and beat her so that she died from the
shock a few days afterwards. The daughter of one of my brothers died from fear, and the wife of another (the doctor) died in captivity. My aunt was killed outright in her bed, her head and breast being crushed with heavy stones. My uncle and his son (a Nestorian preacher) were both killed. One of them—I do not know which—had the skin taken from his body while he was yet alive. Two of his daughters, three of his grand-daughters and his daughter-in-law were taken into slavery.

The article “Unspeakable Cruelty Lot of Armenians” (1915) includes first-hand accounts of various atrocities, one of which, “‘Useless Lot’ Drowned,” is particularly vivid:

On June 25 [1915] the Turks surrounded the town of Bitlis and cut its communication with neighbouring Armenian villages. Then most of the able-bodied men were taken away from their women by domiciliary visits. During the following few days all the men under arrest were shot outside the town and buried in deep trenches dug by the victims themselves. The young women and children were distributed among the rabble. The remainder, the “useless lot” were driven to the south and believed to have been drowned in the Tigris.

These articles framed the massacres as an intentional and deliberate attempt at eliminating Armenians and their culture. For example, in the article “Massacre by Turks is Spreading Fast” (1915), the crimes against the Armenian population are said to have “increased both in number and in degree of atrocity,” while there are “wholesale massacres and wholesale deportations [sic], which were carried out under the guise of enforced evacuation.” Each of these articles thoroughly discusses the Turkish massacres
of Armenians and employs language that frames the severity of the atrocities and urgent situation of the Armenian people.

**Foregrounding and Backgrounding**

The deliberateness of the massacres is foregrounded throughout the articles in the *Globe*. An example of this is found in the article “Armenia: The Unspeakable Tragedy” (1915), which begins: “There is not in all history anything to match the deliberate, systematic, and utterly unthinkable fiendishness of the campaign waged by the Turkish Government against the whole Armenian race.” Moreover, the article “Leave No Armenian Alive, Turk Policy” (1918) states that the Turks have a “deliberate purpose to wipe out the native population.” In “Terrible Massacres of the Armenians” (1915), the events are described as “worse than anything ever before,” while in “Unspeakable Cruelty Practised by Turks” (1915), they are depicted as “methods employed by the Turks in their policy of exterminating Armenians.” Even further, the Armenian massacres are explained as a “plan for extirpating Christianity by killing off Christians of the Armenian race” (“Cup of Turkey’s Iniquity Full,” 1915). The death tolls are also foregrounded, with an emphasis on numbers in the headlines and in the early paragraphs of many of the articles. Such headlines include the following: “Million Armenians Wiped Out by Turks” (1915), “Only 200,000 Armenian Inhabitants of Turkey Now Remain in Country” (1915), and “Only 16 Living Instead of 40,000” (1916). The intent of Turkish government officials to eradicate the entire Armenian race is repeatedly illustrated in the 83 articles in the first set of news coverage by foregrounding of Armenians as victims and emphasizing the death tolls of the Armenian population at the hands of Turkish officials.
The Globe’s coverage of the Armenian massacres also foregrounded that the Armenian victims were Christian and the Turkish perpetrators were Muslim. In almost half of the newspaper articles between 1915 and 1918, the fact that Armenians are Christians is discussed. For example, “Massacre by Turks is Spreading Fast” (1915) reads “Christians being killed in Armenia and on the Persian border,” and in the August 3, 1915 War Summary, the actions of British troops aimed at “saving some part of the Christians of Armenia from their bloodthirsty foes” are discussed (“War Summary: It Is About Time that Turkish Misrule Came to an End,” 1915). Seven articles claim that the Turkish massacres of the Armenian people are directly related to religious affiliations: “Armenia: The Unspeakable Tragedy,” “Massacre by Turks is Spreading Fast,” “The Cup of Turkey’s Iniquity Full,” “The Turk Must Go,” “War Summary: August 3, 1915,” “The Armenian Relief Fund,” and “Turk Troops in Erzerum”. For example, in “The Cup of Turkey’s Iniquity Full” (1915), the slaughter of Christian Armenians is discussed in detail:

The continued slaughter of the Armenians is not the outcome of frenzied passion, but a plan for extirpating Christianity by killing off Christians of the Armenian race. All over eastern and northern Asia Minor and Armenia the Christian population is being deliberately exterminated, with accompaniments so diabolical that one may find their parallel only in the fate of the men, women, and children in the Belgian towns captured by the Germans a year ago.

Moreover, there is also one article that delves into the history of Armenian Christianity, providing an account of Armenia’s history as context for the rest of the Globe’s coverage. “Armenia: The unspeakable tragedy” (1915) includes the following statement:
And so a people of worthy history, a nation whose records cover thirty countries, whose Christian civilization runs back to A.D. 301, the first nation to adopt Christianity as its national religion—this race and nation are being exterminated out of their ancestral home under conditions for which barbarism has no precedent, and there is no nation anywhere in all the world with the will and the power to bid the murderer of innocence to hold his bloody hand.

Foregrounding the conflict’s religious component was a strategic tactic used by the governments, missionary groups, and mass media of the day to make the Armenian victims seem worthy of appropriate coverage. Portraying these victims as worthy—based, in part, on their religious background—reflects a pro-Christianity anti-Muslim bias in the coverage. Although the Ottoman Empire—long an enemy of the West—was the perpetrator of the genocide, emphasizing that the victims held religious beliefs similar to those in the West was nevertheless seen as important; this perceived sympathy with the Armenians would have made the crimes of the Ottoman Empire seem much more objectionable and appalling to the Western public.

Many articles also foregrounded the German-Turkish relationship, explaining that Ottoman officials were trained and encouraged by Germany in the massacres of the Armenians because Germany wanted access to the central geographic location of Armenia, or that Germany had incited the massacres and did nothing to stop them. For example, the article “Terrible Massacres of the Armenians” (1915) states that the “Germans permitted and encouraged such horrors.” This emphasis on Germany’s partial accountability for the massacres, though historically accurate, is strategic and political. It emphasizes that the West is a moral leader of democracy, and that its enemies are
perpetrators of horrific crimes on innocent populations requiring the West’s intervention and support.

Allied opposition to the massacres of Armenians was often foregrounded in the *Globe* in 1915–1918. In fact, the newspaper dedicated six articles to various government policies and statements, and several other articles discussed the role of the United States and Britain very briefly. The Allied forces of Britain, Russia, and France made statements about holding the Turks “personally responsible,” and these statements and the role of these countries, particularly Britain, in attempting to stop and hold Ottoman officials responsible for the genocide are largely foregrounded throughout the majority of the news articles. An example of this is in the article “Armenians Massacred in Hundred Villages” (1915), which reports that “The allied Governments publically state that they will hold all members of the Ottoman Government and their implemented agents personally responsible for these outrages.” The August 8, 1916 War Summary comments that “Turkey does not at all understand that he is a murderer already condemned to pay the supreme penalty for his slaughter of the Armenian people” (“War Summary: The Report that the Turkish Ministry has Resigned,” 1916).

Several articles from December 1916 to May 1917 discuss how Canada, Britain, and the US were casting the Ottoman Empire out of Europe, and the French and US governments were not allowing new Ottoman ambassadors because of the Armenian atrocities, in addition to other human rights violations. Although these articles are factual, the United States and Canada actually did very little to stop the massacres. Aid groups, particularly Christian missionary organizations, raised quite a bit of money for and awareness of the Armenian massacres, but the United States did not enact any policy or
formally ask the Ottoman government to stop committing the massacres until February 19, 1916, nearly a year after the genocide began (“Pres. Wilson Warns the Turk Murderers,” 1916). In fact, the one article in the Globe about US protestation of the massacres in 1915 states that the US would do everything in its power to bring peace to the region and stop the “alleged atrocities” (“Ask Wilson to Protest Against Armenian Massacre,” 1915). The coverage leading up to and immediately following this article is extremely critical of the Ottoman government and explains in great detail the atrocities against the Armenian population, but when the role of the United States is questioned, suddenly the events are qualified as being “alleged.” This is one of the only articles deviating from the typical coverage; however, it is certainly worth noting the compliance of the Globe in being critical of the enemy state, but contradicting itself when the interests or involvement of the United States is questioned.

In the same vein, there seems to be a general contradiction in the coverage of the events in Armenia where the West is concerned. Although the actual massacres are described truthfully, almost all of the coverage of the West’s involvement in the region is positive, despite Western countries’ relative inaction with regard to actually putting any pressure on Germany or the Ottoman Empire to stop massacring the Armenians. In this sense, the lack of involvement by the West in intervening is actually backgrounded throughout the coverage. For example, “The Cup of Turkey’s Iniquity Full” (1915) reads that the “allied powers are not in a position to stop the massacres for which Germany must accept in history her full measure of responsibility,” while “Turks Murder Without Mercy” (1918) discusses how Germany was the only country able to stop the Armenian massacres, but that it has not said a word. As a British Colony, Canada entered the First
World War with Britain in 1914 and played an important role in the war. However, Britain and Canada did not intervene in the Armenian massacres of 1915 despite their knowledge of the killings (they spoke out against the atrocities, but they did not threaten military intervention). The United States did not enter the war until April 1917; therefore, in 1915, offering a threat of military presence in the region would have been challenging, although not impossible. Because of this lack of intervention, the foregrounding of allied opposition to the massacres in the news coverage is problematical. Such foregrounding may have led readers of the Globe to believe that the West was attempting to stop the atrocities when, in fact, the allied opposition was not intervening at all.

However, there is still coverage challenging the West’s lack of involvement in the cessation of the genocide: “the only other nation, the nation whose hand is free, is the United States of America. And in that great democracy the people have been generous with their money to feed the starving Armenians, but the government has not yet lifted its hand to strike the arch-assassin” (“Armenia: The Unspeakable Tragedy,” 1915). Thus, despite some deviations from the typical coverage of the events of the Armenian genocide, there is still some mild criticism of the West’s lack of involvement in attempting to stop the massacres.

**Transitivity**

Analysis of the articles through the agent-patient framework makes it apparent that the Turkish government is more powerful than the Armenian victims. For example, in the Globe’s article “Turks Again Active on Caucasian Front” (1915), responsibility for the Armenian massacres is placed on the Turkish leadership, while the article “Kurds Massacre Armenian People” (1915), reads that “Further information of the Turkish
atrocities in Armenia received to-day [sic] shows that the Kurds in the region of Bitlis have massacred most of the Armenian population in that district.” Similarly, another article discusses how the Turkish people, at the demand of their government leaders, were responsible for deporting thousands of Armenians: “Tens of thousands, probably hundreds of thousands, have been deported by Turks on road [sic] hundreds of miles to Western Anatolia under conditions amounting to slow extermination” (“Terrible Massacres of the Armenians,” 1915). These sentences indicate that the Turkish government was responsible for the massacres of the Armenian civilians.

The headlines of numerous articles also further the agent-patient relationship; they clearly illustrated the perpetrators as being the Turks and the victims as the Armenians, and characterized the killings as horrific, deliberate, and unprecedented. For example, several of the headlines are as follows: “Armenians Massacred in Hundred Villages: Allied Governments Will Hold Turk Government Members Personally Responsible,” “Massacre by Turks Is Spreading Fast,” “Unspeakable Cruelty Practised by Turks: Armenian Massacres Just as Barbarous as in the Olden Days,” “Terrible Tales Told of Turkish Massacres,” “Entire College Staff Slaughtered by Turks,” “Million Armenians Wiped Out By Turks: Only 200,000 Armenian Inhabitants of Turkey Now Remain in Country,” and “Unspeakable Cruelty Lot of Armenians: Massacres of Unsurpassing Horror Committed by Turks.” From the agent-patient analysis of both the Globe’s articles and headlines, there is an obvious indication that the Turkish government is more powerful than the Armenians; the coverage seems to properly identify the victims and the perpetrators, placing responsibility appropriately on the Ottoman government.
There were very few exceptions to this coverage. However, there was an understandable tendency to place the responsibility on Germany as well, with several articles discussing how Germany’s influence allowed the Ottoman Empire to commit such atrocities. In the article, “Terrible Massacres of the Armenians” (1915), for example, the blame is placed on Germany for encouraging the atrocities, which, though true, construes the Turkish government as obedient followers, rather than organized perpetrators: “The Germans who are masters of the central Ottoman administration have to their everlasting shame not only permitted but rather encouraged these horrors.”

Focusing on Germany being partially to blame for the Armenian genocide aligns the Turkish perpetrators with Germany, with whom Britain and Canada were at war during World War I. The Canadian government was at war with Germany, and coverage that could depict the enemy as barbaric and inhumane further justified the war to the Canadian public—and certainly the Globe’s readership. Despite this particular depiction, however, the majority of the articles clearly portrayed an agent-patient relationship, whereby the Armenians were victims and the Turkish government was the perpetrator.

On this level, there is also an agent-patient relationship between Allied forces and the Ottoman Empire; the Allied forces had power over the Ottoman Empire. A lot of the coverage focuses on Britain, France, Russia, and the United States calling on the Ottoman Empire to cease its massacre of the Armenian people—although when this occurred, it was generally informal—stating that these countries will hold Turkish officials responsible. For example, it is stated that “The British Government with the Governments of France and Russia, declare that for the past month the Kurds of the Turkish population of Armenian have been massacring Armenians” and “The United States Government
today dispatched a formal protest to Turkey against a continuation of atrocities against the Armenians” (“Ask Wilson to protest against Armenian massacre,” 1915; “Pres. Wilson warns the Turk murderers,” 1916). This, again, points out the tendency for the Globe and the Western governments to pay lip service to the massacres of the Armenian people, without actually intervening or sending aid. There was one article where a formal request was sent by the American government to stop the atrocities. It reads: “The United States Government today dispatched a formal protest to Turkey against a continuation of atrocities against the Armenians” (“Pres. Wilson warns the Turk murderers”, 1916).

Connotations

The most common words used to describe the massacres of the Armenian people in this set of news items are “atrocities,” “massacres,” and “tragedy.” Ten of the 68 article headlines (nine articles were in the War Summary section and six were in the Comments and Notes section so they did not have headlines) include the term “massacres” and three use the term “atrocities.” “Exodus” is used in one headline, as is “slaughtered.” More severely, “unspeakable cruelty” is used twice in headlines, “unspeakable tragedy” and “unspeakable barbarism” are both used once, and “Turk murderers” is used four times. The term “massacres” is accompanied by adjectives such as “systematic” and “deliberate,” carrying connotations similar to the term “genocide” today. At least one of these terms is used somewhere in the content of every single newspaper article, opinion column, and editorial that the Globe printed about the Armenian genocide between 1915 and 1918.
Sources

Another significant component of this analysis and a common feature found throughout the coverage is the *Globe’s* use of sources, both those cited in the articles and the sources of the articles themselves. There are very few articles that cite Armenian survivors directly; the vast majority interview Christian missionary groups, Armenian special interest groups such as the Cultural Committee of Armenian Relief, and the Armenian National Defense Committee. Armenian survivors that were interviewed were typically well-respected members of the community, such as Rev. E. O. Eshoo. Other prominent sources included Viscount Bryce—a British academic, jurist, historian, and liberal politician—and Mr. Porter, a *Globe* correspondent. Although these agencies and prominent figures portray Armenians’ voice accurately, it would have benefited the coverage to have included the voices of Armenian survivors themselves. The legitimacy of the massacres needed to be confirmed by trusted members of the West, which is, of course, extremely problematic. The legitimacy of the articles should not be based on trusted, Western voices; instead, it should be based on first-hand accounts of the atrocities by the victims themselves. However, as the PM predicts, sources such as government officials (Viscount Bryce), missionary groups, and religious and academic leaders (Rev. E. O. Eshoo) are recognized as credible, which reinforces the belief that the mass media are credible and objective. However, it is also necessary to consider that Armenian survivors would have been harder to find, which would have raised production costs. Furthermore, primary sources such as the US and Canadian governments, who were not intervening in the massacres, may have been offended by the statements made by Armenian survivors. Perhaps most problematic is that the Armenian genocide was
considered a newsworthy and valid event in Western media when conveyed by accepted and trusted sources, a perception which ultimately silenced the Armenian community. Moreover, articles provided by the governments of Canada, the United States, or Britain were obviously uncritical of their own lack of support and involvement. The only truly critical coverage about the government’s lack of involvement in stopping the Armenian massacres was produced by Viscount Bryce. Other common sources of articles were special cable dispatch agencies and the Canadian Press Dispatch. These services tended to provide more accurate coverage than that of the government agencies.

**Summary of Analysis**

Despite several small deviances from the *Globe*’s typical coverage of the massacres of the Armenian people between 1915 and 1918, when compared to the research done by most Western historians and academics, the coverage is fairly accurate and representative of the events of this atrocity. For example, the findings of this study align with those of Jessica Taylor’s on the coverage of the Armenian genocide in the *Washington Post*. Therefore, the findings of this study can be said to conform to what other Western academics have deemed historically accurate. Additionally, the events represented in the *Globe* between 1915 and 1918 align with the historical work outlined earlier in this paper. Many hard news articles discussed the deportation of Armenians and their marches to resettlement camps, as well as mass drownings and burnings. This historical information aligns with the work presented by numerous scholars such as Guenter Lewy, Taner Akcam, Lorne Shirinian, and Peter Balakian.

The *Globe* aligned itself with the political interests of the Canadian government and the government’s allies, particularly Britain and the United States. Canada fought
against Germany and the Ottoman Empire in the First World War, and both the Canadian and British governments spoke out against the massacres of the Armenian people. Although the United States did not enter the war until 1917, it publically denounced the atrocities suffered by the Armenian people at the hands of the Ottoman Empire in 1915 and 1916. If the Globe’s coverage fits within the PM, it should have provided humanistic and prominent coverage of the Armenian victims while evoking feelings of sympathy for the victims and feelings of anger for the perpetrator.

Out of 83 articles, the majority were hard news articles or war summaries. Nearly all of the articles were placed\(^2\) near the top of the page and the front of the paper. The articles often included historical information about the events, and the victims were treated humanely, with detailed accounts of their sufferings. The articles were framed in a way that clearly conveyed the Ottoman Empire’s responsibility for the atrocities suffered by the Armenian population. This framing was achieved through detailed descriptions of the massacres, headlines that emphasized the atrocities at the hands of the Ottoman Empire, the agent-patient relationship that focused on Turkey’s power over the Armenians, and descriptions that implied the massacres were both deliberate and systematic. There were also descriptions of women, children, and the elderly as being helpless and scared. Moreover, the death toll of the Armenian victims and the Christianity of the Armenian community were foregrounded, which encouraged further sympathy for the victims and anger toward the perpetrators.

\(^2\) Throughout this paper, good placement is that which meets the following criteria: being placed in the news section, near the top of the page, or at the front of the paper. Poor placement, however, refers to placement near the bottom of the page, near the editorial or opinion columns, or near unrelated advertisements or photos.
There were several exceptions to the *Globe*’s historically accurate portrayal of the Armenian genocide and its humanistic treatment of the victims. For example, the *Globe* foregrounded the allied opposition’s (Britain’s, Canada’s, and the US’s) disapproval of the Armenian genocide and backgrounded their lack of intervention. This depiction was exacerbated by the use of sources that were rarely critical of the West’s lack of intervention. Quotes from Armenian victims and survivors were also lacking. Although such reportage is expected, given that it would have been challenging and perhaps costly to locate and interview Armenian survivors, the silencing of the Armenian community and the vast number of sources that spoke on behalf of Armenians is problematical, given that the genocide was newsworthy and valid in Western media when it was conveyed by accepted and trusted sources from within the Western community.

Overall, the sample aligned with the PM in the sense that the *Globe* provided historically accurate coverage of the Armenian genocide and that it represented the victims fairly. There was ample coverage of the events, articles about the massacres were placed in prominent places in the newspaper, and the victims were treated humanely, with descriptions of the massacres and the perpetrators and with the victims being identified. Overall, the *Globe* aligned itself with the Canadian government, which was reflected by the coverage.
CHAPTER 4
CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

The search terms “Armenia” and “Armenian” returned 135 results from the period between 2004–2006 from the historical database of the *Globe and Mail*. Of these, 102 articles were excluded, because they discussed and criticized films, novels, or oil in the Middle East, which were not relevant to the focus of this paper. Thirty-three articles discussed Canada’s recognition of the Armenian genocide. Of these, 5 were hard news, 5 were opinion pieces, 7 were editorials, 10 were letters to the editor, and 6 were reviews.

Following Huckin’s approach, the items were first read uncritically in order to gain a general understanding of the material and to experience the articles as a typical reader. Next, a CDA was performed by categorizing the articles into four broad themes, which were based on the content discussed in the text: 1) the Turkish outcry, 2) descriptions of the Armenian genocide or genocide terminology, 3) freedom of speech in Turkey, and 4) the Canadian government’s recognition of the genocide. At times, the articles delved into more than one theme, which was noted. Next, the articles were critically analyzed through a focus on framing, foregrounding, and backgrounding, which included omission, transitivity, connotations, and news sourcing. With a population of only five hard news articles, these articles have been cited multiple times in different sections of this chapter.

**Framing**

Most articles, including opinion columns and editorials, frame Turkish outcry as justified and Canadian recognition as ill-timed or unwise. Coverage discussing Turkey’s
objection to Canada’s acknowledgment is generally placed at the top of the page in the news section or the comment section; the headlines clearly promote the negative political consequences of recognition over the moral stand of Canada’s recognition. Some examples of article, opinion column, and editorial headlines include the following: “Harper Chases Ethnic Vote with Air-India Inquiry,” “Turks Recall Envoy After Harper’s Remark,” “Angry Turks Withdraw from Military Exercise,” “Turkish PM Tried to Head off Harper’s ‘Genocide’ Statement,” and “The Latest Instalment of Victim Politics, Canadian-style” (Simpson, 2006, p. A19; Moore, 2006; Laghi, 2006, p. A4; Laghi, 2006, p. A7; Simpson, 2006, p. A21). In addition to these headlines, articles that discuss Prime Minister Harper’s statement about the recognition frame the story as though Harper alone recognized the genocide, as if a bill recognizing the Armenian genocide had not been passed unanimously two years before. This makes it seem less significant and representative of Canada’s position. Moreover, Turkish outcry is emphasized throughout nearly all of the coverage of Harper’s 2006 statement. For example, in “Turks Recall Envoy over Harper’s Remark,” Oliver Moore (2006) writes:

Turkey’s ambassador to Ottawa has been recalled after Prime Minister Stephen Harper referred to the mass killing of Armenians nearly a century ago as genocide. The Turkish government…insists that the deaths were the result of war and civil strife…Whether the killings were a genocide is a touchy subject for Turkey, which has lobbied in countries around the world against recognition. Yesterday, official communication from the government in Ankara characterized the Armenian claims as “direct attacks against the Turkish nation’s identity and history.”
There is no discussion in any of the coverage about the positive impact of recognition for Canada, or more specifically, the Armenian community.

As the PM asserts, there are always deviations from typical coverage. Articles that are critical of Turkish policy are typically placed in poor locations in the newspaper. Nevertheless, four articles discuss prominent Turkish authors/publishers who were criminally charged for speaking out about the genocide, although the term *genocide* is not explicitly used in these discussions. For example, in one of the cases discussed in the *Globe and Mail*, “Family Diary Ignites Distant Passions,” journalist Levon Sevunts uses the word genocide generally, but not to characterize the crimes committed against the Armenian people. The article starts with adequate coverage of the issue: “Mr. Zarakolu’s [the Turkish publisher] legal troubles began because Turkey officially denies that the massacres and deportations of the Armenian population of Ottoman Turkey during the First World War constituted genocide. That puts Turkey at odds with the majority of genocide scholars, as well as more than 20 parliaments, including Canada’s” (Sevunts, 2005). However, the perspective then shifts, referring to the events as the Armenian question: “The Armenian question has been a taboo protected by Draconian censorship laws in Turkey” (Sevunts, 2005). Despite being quite liberal in his critique of Turkey’s censorship policy, Sevunts does not once refer to the Armenian genocide as such. That a Canadian article about a Turkish scholar being charged for “insulting Turkishness” because he refuses to deny the Armenian genocide would not actually use the term *genocide* in relation to atrocities that Canada has recognized as such is extremely hypocritical. Although the coverage of these cases tends to be critical of Turkish censorship laws, the authors charged are also at times framed as being radical. For
example, Zarakolu was described as having a “track record of defying Turkish authorities” and the article went on to discuss how Zarakolu has been imprisoned for three years and that his publishing house has been firebombed by right-wing activists (Sevunts, 2005). There was an emphasis on the number of times the charged authors and publishers had previously been charged with “insulting Turkishness” and their views were considered to be quite radical even though they are actually aligned with those of most Western scholars who study the Armenian genocide.

**Foregrounding and Backgrounding**

The articles foreground references to Turkish scholars and Turkish outrage at Canada’s official recognition of the Armenian genocide. Most articles begin by discussing the Turkish response without focusing on Canada’s humanitarian stand. For example, “Turks Recall Envoy over Harper’s Remark” begins with the news that “Turkey’s ambassador to Ottawa has been recalled after Prime Minister Stephen Harper referred to the mass killings of Armenians nearly a century ago as genocide” (Moore, 2006), while the *Globe and Mail* article “Turkish PM Tried to Head Off Harper’s ‘Genocide’ Statement” discusses how the Turkish PM tried to discuss the issue rationally, not characterizing the killings of Armenians in the early 1990s as genocide, but that when Harper officially recognized the Armenian genocide, the Turkish government had to pull out of an international military air exercise (Laghi, 2006, p. A7). Another article by the same author begins by discussing how the Turkish government pulled out of the military air exercise in “protest against Prime Minister Stephen Harper’s characterization of a mass killing of Armenians as a genocide, escalating an already testy diplomatic spat” (2006, p. A4). By foregrounding Turkish leaders’ responses and the Turkish outcry, the
story is shifted to the political and economic ramifications of the recognition of genocide, rather than to Harper’s statement, or the reasons for such an acknowledgement.

Through analysis of these articles, it becomes evident that the majority of the coverage backgrounds any information about the Armenian genocide itself. There are no discussions of the atrocities or explanations as to why the Turkish government wanted to eliminate the Armenian population; the historical components of the genocide and the Armenian fight for recognition are largely de-emphasized. The opinion column titled “Harper Chasing Ethnic Vote with Air-India Inquiry” criticizes the prime minister for recognizing the genocide and includes no information about the genocide or the Armenian fight for recognition (Simpson, 2006); it is important to note that Jeffrey Simpson is widely viewed as the preeminent national Canadian political commentator. Similarly, the only information about the historical components of the Armenian genocide present in the article “Angry Turks Withdraw from Military Exercise” is located at the end of the hard news article, is misleading, and ignores all explanations of Turkish denial: “Turkey’s criticism of the characterization of the Armenian deaths as genocide is long-standing and consistent” (Laghi, 2006, p. A4). The Globe and Mail only wrote five hard news articles about official recognition, each of them focusing on the Turkish outcry, with little to no historical context. Excluding the historical analysis makes it much easier to frame Canada’s recognition of genocide as irresponsible or ill timed.

Of the 33 articles analyzed in this population, not one hard news article, opinion column, or editorial covers the passing of Bill M-380 in 2004 (see Appendix B). Furthermore, no news coverage, opinion column, or editorial directly covers Prime Minister Harper’s official statement; rather, the only hard news coverage of this
statement has to do with the Turkish outcry. In fact, one of the fundamental forms of backgrounding found in the *Globe and Mail’s* coverage of Canada’s recognition of the Armenian genocide from 2004 to 2006 is this omission of any coverage of Bill M-380 in 2004 or Prime Minister Harper’s statement in 2006. These two milestones in the Armenian fight for justice are entirely ignored in the *Globe and Mail*; this is at odds with the *Globe’s* in-depth coverage of the massacres between 1915 and 1918.

Religion is omitted entirely in the *Globe and Mail’s* coverage of the Canadian government’s official recognition of the Armenian genocide. After the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 on the World Trade Center in New York, and the subsequent wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, Turkey was one of Canada and the United States’ few allies in the Middle East. This relationship became both a political and economic necessity for the West. Given the considerable amount of mainstream media coverage and political discussion regarding 9-11, one would expect the Muslim/non-Muslim divide to be a newsworthy component of official recognition. However, despite Turkey being a largely Muslim country and Armenia being Christian, Turkey’s political relationship with Canada and the United States is far more important than that of Armenia’s, even after Armenia achieved independence from the Soviet Union. In this regard, it is not unusual that religion be left out of the historical and political elements of the *Globe and Mail’s* coverage of official recognition.

Considering the abundance of critical coverage of the Canadian government’s recognition in the *Globe and Mail*, one would anticipate a strong reaction from the Armenian community, but in reality, letters to the editor in support of Turkish denial were far more critical of all coverage, than those who wrote in support of recognition. For
example, one letter to the editor read: “When you expect Turkey to confront its past, wouldn’t it be fair to expect Armenia to confront its own past, too?”, while another read “It is unfortunate that, all too often, only the incriminating version of the tragic events of 1915 are taken to represent this relationship [Turkish-Armenian relationship]…Some accuse Turks of being ‘denialists’ and try to discredit any non-Turkish scholars, should they dare question the validity of Armenian claims” (Torunoglu, 2005; Tezel, 2006). Similarly, another letter to editor reads: “Given the near monopoly that the Armenian view enjoys in the public sphere, I am not surprised at the amount of bias we occasionally face regarding the Armenian claim of genocide…equating Turkey’s past with the “genocidal past” of “most of Europe” is in dire need of correction. The Ottomans were among the most tolerant empires in history” (Erman, 2006). Despite the negative, and sometimes historically inaccurate, comments about the Armenian genocide, there were some positive and historically accurate comments as well. For example, one letter to the editor read: “The only accounts that denied the genocide were by Turks, who claimed variously that the deaths were caused by the chaos of the First World War and by Armenian political actions. What seems to be difficult for Turks to understand is that the motivations (fear of political opponents, for example) do not constitute an acceptable reason for committing genocide” (Marchak, 2006). Additionally, one letter to the editor actually praised the Canadian government’s recognition by stating that it was “highly principled” (Balabanian, 2006). The letters to the editor in the Globe and Mail are both critical of and in support of recognition and the Armenian genocide.
Transitivity

The agent–patient relationship in the majority of these articles is twofold: Turkey over Prime Minister Steven Harper and Harper over the Armenian victims. Turkey is represented as a powerful political force that Canada has upset; it recalled its ambassador and pulled out of air exercises, leaving Canada’s recognition of the Armenian genocide as the reason for the damaged economic and political relationship between the countries. This action is exemplified in the article “Turks Recall Envoy over Harper’s Remark”:

“The embassy threatened that Mr. Harper’s decision would ‘adversely affect the relations between Turkey and Canada.’ That prediction came true with the withdrawal of Mr. Erman, announced yesterday” (Moore, 2006). Similarly, in “Angry Turks Withdraw from Military Exercise,” it is Canada’s Prime Minister’s fault that Turkey pulled out of an air exercise because Turkey did not agree with the official recognition of the genocide (Laghi, 2006, p. A4). The damaged relationship could not be due to Turkey’s continued human rights violations and genocide denial, to which many Western countries, including Canada, are opposed. For example, Turkey has continued to violate the human rights of its citizens, and it is still illegal in Turkey to speak of the Armenian genocide, which violates the West’s alleged dedication to freedom of speech. Prominent authors, scholars, and publishers have been charged with insulting “Turkishness” for doing so; such individuals can face up to three years in prison for writing about the genocide, which was the case with prominent author Orhan Pamuk in 2005. Turkey also tries to limit international scholarship and political recognition of the Armenian genocide by threatening to end its political, economic and military relationships with countries that challenge Turkey’s denial. The political consequences of official recognition of the
genocide are highlighted far more often than the discussion of the importance of this recognition for the Armenian community. In fact, no *Globe* article discusses the Canadian–Armenian diaspora’s fight for recognition.

In the same vein, there is also a deletion of agents in the case of the Turkish perpetrators: nominalization of terms such as “massacres” and “mass killings” occurs throughout the articles, with no accountability being placed on those who committed the massacres or mention of why they did so. For example, in the article “Turks Recall Envoy over Harper’s Remark,” no reference is given to who killed the Armenian people: “Turkey’s ambassador to Ottawa has been recalled after Prime Minister Stephen Harper referred to the mass killings of the Armenians as a genocide” (Moore, 2006). Similar examples of this deletion of agents can be found in the following two sentences: “Prime Minister Stephen Harper’s characterization of a mass killing of Armenians as a genocide, escalating an already testy diplomatic spat” and “The Prime Minister of Turkey sent Stephen Harper a letter last month asking him to not characterize the mass killings of the Armenians in the early 1900s as a genocide and instead support an academic inquiry into the matter” (Laghi, 2006, p. A4; Laghi, 2006, p. A7). While these comments appear in articles discussing the Turkish outcry, there is little discussion of Turkish denial or the Armenian fight for recognition, and certainly no direct responsibility placed on Turkey.

**Connotations**

The term “Armenian genocide” appears in six letters to the editor, seven opinion pieces, and one hard news article. However, most of these items are still critical of Canada’s recognition of the massacres as such. For example, the editorial “Considering Turkey as an EU Member” (2005) states that “Only this year, when Armenians were
commemorating the 90th anniversary of the 1915 genocide, Turkey’s government was sticking to its hear-no-evil, speak-no-evil version of the event.” The article goes on to say that despite this injustice, and many others, “the point is that Turkey is changing” and should become a member of the EU. Thus, it is somewhat critical of Turkish denial, but only momentarily, and denial—along with other human rights violations—is not seen as justification for exclusion from the EU. “Turks Recall Envoy over Harper’s Remark” states that “Mr. Harper declared last month, on behalf of the government of Canada, that Armenians had suffered a genocide at the hands of Turkey during and after the First World War” (Moore, 2006). Directly prior to this statement, the article discusses how it is a “touchy subject” for Turkey and highly contested; it then states, “It was a position the previous Liberal government had refused to support” (Moore, 2006). Although the article uses the appropriate term, “genocide,” it makes it quite clear that Stephen Harper alone made the statement, although it was on “behalf of the government of Canada,” since this position was opposed by the Liberal Party several months earlier.

The vast majority of the terminology used throughout this population evoked feelings of uncertainty and delegitimized the Armenian victims by avoiding the use of the term “genocide” and by overusing less powerful terms. For example, the “Armenian question” is referenced in two articles (“For Turkey’s Sake, Stop Snowing Orhan Pamuk” and “Family Diary Ignites Distant Passions”), “painful episodes” in one (“Family Diary Ignites Distant Passions”), “Armenian massacres” in three (“A Writer Fights the War on Words,” “Europe Should Keep Its Promise to Turkey,” and “Admitting Turkey to the Club Will Give Europe the Edge”), and “mass killings as genocide” in four (“Turks Recall Envoy over Harper’s Remark,” “Angry Turks Withdraw from Military Exercise,”
“Turkish PM Tried to Head Off Harper’s ‘Genocide’ Statement,” and “Considering Turkey as an EU Member”). “‘Genocide’” is used in quotation marks in three articles (“Harper Chasing Ethnic Vote with Air-India Inquiry,” “The Latest Instalment of Victim Politics, Canadian-style,” and “Turkish PM Tried to Head Off Harper’s ‘Genocide’ Statement”), “Armenian deaths” in one (“Angry Turks Withdraw from Military Exercise”), and “Armenian claim of genocide” in one (“Turks Recall Envoy over Harper’s Remark”). The term “genocide” carries significant negative connotations; it is typically viewed as the most horrific, large-scale crime possible, and countries labelled as perpetrators are rarely able to disassociate themselves from the term (Germany and the Holocaust is a prime example). Therefore, it is not surprising that the Turkish government would not want to be connected to the term, and the newspaper coverage of Canada’s recognition reflects this. Although the Canadian government has officially recognized the Armenian genocide, the *Globe and Mail* rarely uses the language employed by its own government to describe the Armenian genocide.

The use of the term in quotation marks shows uncertainty as to its applicability, and gives the impression that it is too harsh for the crimes being discussed, thereby delegitimizing the victims. For example, the headline of one news article reads: “Turkish PM Tried to Head Off Harper’s ‘Genocide’ Statement” (Laghi, 2006); another article, “The Latest Instalment of Victim Politics, Canadian-style” states: “the government, after all, has made it an abiding objective to play ethnic politics just as the other parties do. They are recognizing the Armenian ‘genocide’ of the First World War” (Simpson, 2006, p. A21). Both of these examples clearly indicate that Harper’s statement and the Armenian genocide more generally are contested, and that despite Canada’s formal
recognition, the *Globe and Mail*’s readership should question whether the massacres of the Armenian people actually can be characterized as such. Putting the term in quotation marks can also be viewed as an insinuation, because the author could deny that he/she was trying to establish this uncertainty, although to a critical eye this intention is quite clear.

Though the term Armenian genocide is rarely used, and when it is, techniques such as quotation marks are typically used to discredit it, there is one example of good coverage in the *Globe and Mail*. The editorial “Turkey Muzzles Speech” states: “The genocide is, as Mr. Pamuk says, a historical fact, well established in diplomatic reports and news dispatches at the time…and affirmed since then by independent historians” (“Turkey muzzles speech”, 2005). Though this coverage is rare, it is important to note that this editorial provided an explanation as to why the term genocide should be used and went on to discuss the Turkish laws that limit freedom of speech. However, it does not seek recognition of the events and discussed the Armenian genocide in the context of freedom of speech: the famous author Orhan Pamuk was charged with insulting Turkishness, which made a discussion of the Armenian genocide relevant again. The urgency of the editorial is not to hold Turkey responsible or encourage international recognition, it is about a famous author whose right to speak freely is being challenged.

Official acknowledgment through both the bill and Harper’s statement flew under the radar in the *Globe and Mail* until there was Turkish protest, which provided an opportunity to criticize the statement, declaring it to be poorly timed and irresponsible. Particular words and phrases are used to help support this claim. For example, in “Harper Chasing Ethnic Vote with Air-India Inquiry,” Jeffrey Simpson (2006) uses the term
“wisely” to frame Canada’s recognition of the Armenian genocide as irresponsible: “The previous Liberal government had wisely refused to support this campaign” (p. A19). In the following example, Moore uses more assertive and powerful terms to discuss Turkish denial than he did for the discussion of the Armenians: “The Turkish government, which insists that the deaths were the result of war and civil strife” can be compared to “Yesterday, official communication from the government in Ankara characterized the Armenian claims as ‘direct attacks against the Turkish nation’s identity and history’” (Moore, 2006).

When analyzing these examples, which are representative of the overall coverage of the recognition in the *Globe and Mail*, it is evident that the words/phrases used to assist in the unfavourable framing of Canada’s recognition of the Armenian genocide. In a country where the official policy recognizes that the massacres of 1915–1918 indeed constituted genocide, the *Globe and Mail* still used language that evokes a very different impression.

**Sources**

The choice and placement of sources in the articles also favour the Turkish outcry over Canada’s official recognition. Sources that discussed Turkish outcry were cited more than five times as often as those that favoured official recognition. There was only part of one statement from Stephen Harper (which was left out of the media when it was originally released) and one quotation from then NDP leader Jack Layton and Conservative MP Jason Kenney in favour of recognition, in all of the 33 articles, opinion columns, editorials, and letters to the editor. These quotations from government figures, however, do not justify or explain why recognition was a positive thing; there is
absolutely no Canadian government commentary about the political falling out with Turkey. In fact, the hard news articles omit any real discussion of the positive components of recognition, and if support for the recognition is cited, it appears in the concluding paragraphs. For example, in the second and third paragraphs of “Angry Turks Withdraw from Military Exercise,” Brian Laghi (2006) writes that

Officials with the Turkish embassy confirmed yesterday that a half dozen Turkish jet fighters, as well as support aircraft that were supposed to take part in the exercise May 17 to June 24 in Alberta, have been withdrawn. The move comes after the Turkish government recalled its ambassador, Aydemir Erman, to Ankara for discussions. “I think one can draw that conclusion,” said one official, when asked whether the decision flowed from Mr. Harper’s remarks. “This seems to be related to the not-so-good period of relations we are going through.”

Similarly, the article “Turkish PM Tried to Head Off Harper’s ‘Genocide’ Statement” begins by discussing how the Turkish Prime Minister tried to discuss Canadian official recognition with Stephen Harper rationally before the statement and then highlights the political consequences of the recognition. The third paragraph cites the Turkish PM’s letter to Harper, saying “that a push by the Armenian community to have the mass killing of Armenians recognized as a genocide has clouded Turkish-Canadian relations” (Laghi, 2006, p. A7). Not a single article in the Globe and Mail during this period leads with a Western or Armenian scholar, or discusses the milestone and humanitarian progress that official recognition represented. When the letters to the editor are examined closely, the positive responses about recognition can be seen to come from the Armenian community, while the negative responses come from the Turkish community. The sources are clearly
identified in the letters to the editor, and the authors’ last names are often featured, which are Armenian or Turkish (“Torunoglu” and “Tezel” are Turkish, while “Balabanian” is Armenian, for example).

Perhaps even more problematical is that the Armenian community in Canada and the world is also left silent, with no quotations from Armenian survivors or social groups. The Armenian voice is entirely absent from the conversation. This omission is not surprising according to the PM, however, for the spectrum of opinions is bounded by the agreement of powerful elites, such as those of the state and not necessarily the government of the day or individual governmental policies. Readers of the Globe did not receive a range of perceptions and opinions, but rather, only the perspective that aligns with the political and economic needs of the state. As depicted in the articles, Armenians did not play an active role in achieving recognition; they were simply the recipient of recognition through Bill M-380 and Harper’s statement. Moreover, the continued international fight for recognition is left uncovered, and Turkish denial is not confronted.

**Summary**

Despite rare exceptions, the *Globe and Mail*’s 2004 to 2006 coverage of the Armenian genocide aligned itself with the political and economic relationships valued by the corporate state by portraying Armenian victims as unworthy. Such alignment is similar to the findings of case studies carried out by Noam Chomsky, Jeffrey Klaehn, and Anthony DiMaggio. For example, the findings of this study align with Anthony DiMaggio’s study on the *New York Times*’ coverage of the 2007 Democrat Party’s’ resolution to recognize the Armenian genocide, which he compared to how the Srebrenica genocide victims were represented. Therefore, the findings of this study can
be said to conform to other Western academics’ findings when using the PM to study Western media.

The *Globe and Mail* aligned itself with the political and economic interests of the Canadian government and its allies, particularly the United States. Despite the fact that Armenia is no longer part of the Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada and the United States have a strong political and economic relationship with its NATO member ally, Turkey. As previously noted, the Turkish–Canadian relationship is extremely important politically and economically. Despite Canada’s official recognition of the Armenian genocide, the government did not publicize its stance, provide commentary, or offer an official stance on the Turkish outcry to this recognition. Instead, the Canadian government was silent after its official statement on the recognition of the Armenian genocide. This silence suggests that the Canadian government values its economic and political relationship with Turkey more than its moral decision to recognize the Armenian massacres, and that it was not willing to jeopardize this relationship by antagonizing Turkey through publication of its recognition. Moreover, according to the PM, Western mainstream media typically align themselves with the corporate state, not necessarily to the government of the day’s policies or resolutions, which in this case is an official statement of genocide recognition. Therefore, it is not surprising that the Canadian government officially recognized the Armenian massacre while the *Globe and Mail* aligned itself with the corporate state’s fundamental political and economic relationship with Turkey. If the *Globe and Mail*’s coverage fit within the PM, it would have provided minimal coverage of the government’s official recognition of the massacre, placed the articles in poor
locations in the newspaper, and provided less detailed coverage with no historical context and minimal humanization of the victims.

According to the PM, little coverage is devoted to reporting on unworthy victims, which was the case in this population. For example, there were only five hard news pieces about official recognition and the only articles that received prominent placement were those that focused on Turkey’s outcry. On one occasion, a historical analysis was provided, but in the other 32 articles, historical information about the Armenian genocide was omitted. Additionally, the Armenian voice was completely absent, with no Armenian sources or organizations being cited. Instead, the articles focused on Turkey’s outcry, thus delegitimizing the victims. The victims were not treated humanely; instead, they were discarded from the dialogue, and their past suffering and anguish was denied or discredited in all except one article.

The PM also predicts that the media will draw away from certain stories and place more significance on other stories. In this sample, official recognition of the genocide should have been the primary focus, but instead, the focus shifted to Turkey’s outcry. This shift was done to avoid antagonizing Turkey; it was achieved by foregrounding the Turkish outcry, backgrounding the historical information about the Armenian genocide, omitting Bill M-380 and Harper’s official statement, creating an agent–patient relationship where Turkey is more powerful than the Canadian government and Harper is more powerful than the Armenians, not placing responsibility on Turkey for the Armenian genocide, and neglecting the proper use of the term “Armenian genocide.” Overall, the Globe and Mail’s coverage of the Canadian government’s recognition of the Armenian genocide aligned with the PM. Though there were several deviations, as the
PM predicted, they did not counteract the misinformation, avoidance of the topic of genocide recognition, lack of historical background, and exclusion of the Armenian voice.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION: THE CASE OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Between 1915 and 1918, the Armenian genocide tested Canada and the Western world’s commitments to humanitarian standards and democracy. The Globe’s coverage treated the victims as worthy, but still largely avoided the topic of the lack of Western military and political involvement in putting an end to the atrocities. Due to continued Turkish denial, this commitment by Western societies to recognize the events of 1915–1918 as genocide has not disappeared, despite its lack of contemporary Western media attention. In 2004, the Canadian government unanimously voted in favour of a bill that would ultimately recognize the massacres of the Armenian people at the hands of the Ottoman Empire, and in 2006, Prime Minister Stephen Harper publicly stated that Canada recognized this atrocity as genocide. The Canadian government paid lip service to the Armenian victims, but did very little to publicize its recognition of the genocide or to provide counterarguments to the Turkish outcry. The Globe and Mail aligned itself with the corporate state and did very little to inform its readership of Canada’s acknowledgment of the Armenian genocide, and, in fact, it shifted the focus of the story from official recognition to the Turkish outcry, treating the victims as unworthy.

According to the PM, victims of enemy states are treated as worthy victims and, therefore, receive more coverage, more prominence, and more humanistic treatment. Conforming to the PM, the Globe treated the Armenian victims as worthy in the 1915–1918 population of news articles. The massacres of the Armenian people received widespread attention in the mass media across the US between 1915 and 1916, as shown by scholars such as Jessica Taylor, who studied the portrayal of the Armenian genocide.
in the *Washington Post*. In accordance with the previous study’s findings, the present study of the *Globe*’s coverage of Armenian victims between 1915 and 1918 shows that the Canadian public, and certainly the *Globe*’s readership, was well informed about the Armenian genocide.

The *Globe* published 83 articles about the Armenian massacres, almost all of which were hard news articles placed in prominent positions. The *Globe*’s coverage foregrounded detailed descriptions of the death marches and deportations as well as the mass burning and drowning of Armenian civilians. There is also discussion of the slaughter of women and children as well as of Armenia being a land fought over by Russia and Germany for economic and territorial reasons, which have all been discussed by academics such as Guenter Lewy, Taner Akcam, Lorne Shirinian, and Peter Balakian. As such, the *Globe*’s coverage portrayed the Armenians—who were labelled as good Christians—humanely, foregrounding the suffering of the Armenian victims, and emphasizing the multiple promises made by the allied forces to hold the Turkish perpetrators responsible.

There are certainly elements strategically used to garner a particular reaction from the audience in this coverage. It can be said, therefore, that the coverage exhibits elements of propaganda, as all information does to an extent. For example, religion is a key example of the pro-Christian and anti-Muslim bias in the coverage, which encouraged feelings of sympathy for the victims and anger toward the perpetrators. In addition, the foregrounding of German involvement in the genocide would certainly evoke feelings of anger toward the perpetrators. However, the coverage accurately reports the events of the genocide, and although these elements can be said to be
propagandistic, they are also true: The Armenian victims were a minority Christian group being killed largely because of their religion, and Germany encouraged and stood by while the massacres occurred. All information can be said to be propagandistic in some ways, but the information presented in this set of coverage does clearly and truthfully outline the events of the Armenian genocide.

This coverage also reveals clear alignment with the Eurocentric viewpoint discussed by Bloxham and Moses (2010), in that it portrayed the West as a civilizing authority, able to go in and save the Armenian victims. At no point, however, was there any political threat of military intervention to alleviate the suffering of the Armenian people by either Canada or the United States, and this lack of military force allowed the genocide to continue for many years. This lack of intervention, which undoubtedly contributed to the deaths of thousands of Armenians, and the guilt associated with this knowledge, played a part in loosening the immigration laws in Canada, allowing 100 Armenian orphans to gain residency. However, a year after the end of World War I, the momentum regarding the punishment of the Turkish government and military officials faded. The political relationships between the West and Turkey grew stronger, while those with Armenia were attenuated after it became part of the Soviet Union in 1922; the memory of the graphic descriptions of slaughter grew fainter, resulting in a rapid decline in support for the Armenian people. Although the Globe’s coverage, in addition to historical analyses and other scholarship, is proof that the massacres were covered accurately, there was never well-orchestrated, mass political pressure put on the governments of the West to insist on intervention at the time.
In comparison, the PM contends that victims of Canada and its allies would be treated as unworthy victims in Western media, resulting in less coverage, poor placement, less detail, and minimal humanization. As noted, the strong economic and political relationship with Turkey far outweighs that of Canada’s relationship with Armenia. Moreover, despite the Canadian government formally recognizing the Armenian genocide, it was simply lip service paid by the government of the day to the Armenian victims and did not reflect the desires of all Canadian political parties or the corporate state. The *Globe and Mail*, conforming to the PM, therefore aligned itself with the state once again and treated the Armenian victims as unworthy in the 2004–2006 population.

Of the 33 articles in the *Globe and Mail*, Canadian recognition of the Armenian genocide in 2004 and the public statement by Harper that followed in 2006 received no coverage. In fact, there were a total of only five news articles, all of which foregrounded the Turkish outcry and successfully backgrounded the official genocide recognition. The vast majority of articles were placed in poor locations in the newspaper and the Armenian voice was completely left out of the coverage; there was absolutely no discussion of the feelings of the Armenian diaspora in Canada or of their fight for recognition. This omission is the ultimate form of backgrounding, as their opinions and struggles were avoided entirely. The readers of the *Globe and Mail* did not receive a range of perceptions and opinions, but rather, as the PM contends, only the perspective that aligns with the political and economic needs of the state.

Canadians, and definitely the readership of the *Globe and Mail* between 2004 and 2006, were made extremely aware of the negative political consequences of the recognition, without receiving a historical overview or details about the genocide or its
official recognition. By excluding the historical analysis, the articles framed Canada’s recognition as irresponsible and ill timed, because the event was isolated from the previous coverage of the massacres. The previous coverage from 1915–1918 by the Globe presented a clear picture that these crimes were a systematic and deliberate attempt at eliminating the Armenian people. Allied governments were all joining forces and calling for Turkey to be held accountable for the grave atrocities it was committing against the Armenian people. However, as the years passed, the memory faded, and Turkey became a vital ally of the West. The West and the Globe and Mail began to allow Turkey to deny the atrocities the world had both witnessed and publically condemned nearly a century beforehand. In this way, time was used as a delegitimizing tactic, which in the coverage between 2004 and 2006 allowed the Turkish outcry and denial to be foregrounded and the Armenian voice to be excluded.

Similarly to the omission of historical information, there was absolutely no mention of the religious components of the Armenian genocide in this set of coverage, which is at odds with the foregrounding of religion between 1915 and 1918. Religion was used by the Ottoman Empire as a type of weapon to secure power over the Armenian people, a way in which to justify their slaughter. This self-justification was covered accurately in the Globe and was a strategic tactic used to make the Armenian victims seem worthy of appropriate coverage. By emphasizing that the victims held similar religious beliefs to those in the West, the crimes seemed much more objectionable and appalling to the Western public, reflecting the pro-Christian anti-Muslim bias revealed in the coverage. However, this bias would operate adversely in the second set of coverage: Christian victims at the hands of Muslim perpetrators would evoke strong feelings from
the West. According to the PM, coverage of unworthy victims should not excite or engage the audience, so the avoidance of religion in the second set of coverage can be understood as a strategy to ensure only the desired response is elicited.

Another common theme in genocide studies and a highly contested concept in defining genocide is intent, which is more difficult to trace back to the Armenian genocide, given that the term “genocide” did not yet exist. However, the *Globe’s* coverage between 1915 and 1918 clearly foregrounded that the massacres of the Armenian people were a systematic and intentional attempt on behalf of the Ottoman Empire to eliminate the Armenian population and this people’s cultural identity. A comparison of the UN’s definition of genocide with the *Globe’s* reporting about the Armenian massacres makes clear that the coverage of the massacres fits within the framework of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. For example, the articles discuss the deliberate and intentional attempt by the Ottoman Empire to destroy the Armenians, with seven articles linking the slaughter directly to their Christian roots. Such killings were conveyed clearly and descriptively in the reporting. Death marches, the burning of entire towns and homes, and the theft of businesses and land is discussed in the *Globe’s* coverage. There was also coverage of children being taken and raised by Muslim families. Although there was no discussion of the Ottoman Empire imposing any means intended to prevent the birth of Armenian children, there was evidence of pregnant mothers being killed as well as children being drowned and burned. Thus, keeping in mind that the primary intent of this definition was to hold perpetrators accountable for their acts and that the *Globe’s* coverage showed multiple examples of how the massacres of the Armenian people fit within this definition
of genocide, why did the *Globe and Mail* not cover the official recognition of the genocide?

Countries can ignore genocidal intent when their intervention would not serve their self-interests, standing by while thousands are killed (as discussed by Goldhagen (2009) and Smith (2004)). Examples include Guatemala, East Timor, and Nicaragua. The same can be said about Western media attention in the case of the Armenian genocide coverage between 2004 and 2006. Despite the Canadian government paying lip service to the Armenian victims, the *Globe and Mail* did not cover the recognition of the Armenian genocide, in favour of not hurting the political and economic relationship with the perpetrator. In this way, the *Globe and Mail*, and the Canadian corporate state, may be seen as ignoring the humanitarian obligation to hold perpetrators responsible for genocide because of political or economic self-interest. Despite the *Globe’s* 1915–1918 coverage clearly fitting within the UN’s definition of genocide that was introduced years later—the definition employed by its own government to recognize the genocide nearly a century later—the coverage of recognition still aligned with the economic and political benefit of the country, and not the coverage of the same agenda-setting media years earlier.

Moreover, Canada, while acknowledging the genocide, made no statement about its role in allowing the genocide to continue by not intervening in 1915, despite having ample knowledge of the events. Contributing to what Adam Jones (2004) wrote about democracy, the Canadian government’s lack of involvement in intervening in the Armenian genocide and its subsequent lip service paid in the form of an acknowledgment of that genocide, without any historical discussion or acknowledgement of its role in the Armenian genocide, is hypocritical.
Overall, the two milestones of Canadian recognition of the genocide were largely ignored in the *Globe and Mail* from 2004 to 2006, contrasting with the *Globe’s* detailed coverage of the massacres between 1915 and 1918. The PM, while utilizing CDA methodology, provided a framework to study this coverage, whereby the findings discovered that the same victims were treated completely differently based on the political and economic relationships of the countries at the time. Therefore, the PM’s discussion of worthy and unworthy victims not only acts as a framework to study different victims of enemy states versus ally clients, but also can be used to look at the same event and the same set of victims in two different time periods. The findings of this study clearly indicate that victims of genocide are determined worthy or unworthy based on the economic and political relationships between countries, and not on a consistent humanitarian standard.

The findings of this study can, therefore, contribute to genocide studies literature by assisting in the broadening of the scope of the literature to include a focus on communication and media. Realizing that the PM can be used to look at the same set of victims and perpetrators at different periods in time contributes to the view that the mainstream media and Western governments employ a Eurocentric lens, whereby genocide intervention is reliant on the economic needs of the state. Moreover, genocide acknowledgement is also reliant on the economic and political relationships between countries, raising the question of how the UN’s definition of genocide can be considered universal when countries such as Canada and the United States do not employ it to hold perpetrators accountable. Allowing Turkey to deny the Armenian genocide, when the very term “genocide” was created in part because of the atrocities committed against the
Armenian people, is a grave injustice to the victims. The findings of this research will contribute to future research conducted in genocide studies and they provide a better understanding of the PM, allowing this framework to be applied to the same set of victims and perpetrators, at different periods in time.
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Ms. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will be the first time members will be able to vote on this important matter, although it is the fourth time a similar motion has been introduced in this House.

I was therefore surprised to find in my mail a letter from the Minister of Foreign Affairs and International Trade addressed to MPs and encouraging us not to vote in favour of this private member's motion. I was, frankly, somewhat shocked and dismayed, particularly since this is one of the ministers of this government who claims to attach a great deal of importance to what members think and want. I was surprised for that reason.

Yet, after reading his letter, my second reaction was to be pleased he had sent it to us, and I will tell you why. In his third paragraph he says the following.

The established government policy was set out in a statement in this House in June 1999 in favour of reconciliation: “We remember the calamity afflicted on the Armenian people in 1915. This tragedy was committed with the intent to destroy a national group in which hundreds of thousands of Armenians were subject to atrocities which included massive deportations and massacres—”

Who has not read the definition of genocide in the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide? All components of that definition are clearly recalled in the minister's statement. According to the definition, genocide is “an act committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group.” That is what we have just heard from the mouth of the minister, or rather from his pen.

I would like to repeat the motion, for which I congratulate my colleague for Laval Centre. What does it say? It reads:

That this House acknowledge the Armenian genocide of 1915 and condemn this act as a crime against humanity.

There are some new elements, some recent events, that make it possible for us to be even more clearly in favour of this motion.

The first of these is the recent ruling by the appeals section of the International Tribunal in the Hague, relating to the defence of Mr. Krstic, who, hon. members will recall, felt that responsibility for the deaths of
seven to eight thousand Muslims in July of 1995 was not sufficient reason to term this genocide. The appeal court clearly certified that this defence was invalid and recognized that this was genocide.

I believe we all understand the importance of this ruling, which the experts feel broadens the concept of genocide.

Another piece of news is quite interesting. The New York Times, a widely respected newspaper, has recently changed its guidelines for reporters and editorial writers. I do not have it in French, because it is the New York Times, so I will read it in English:

--“after careful study of scholarly definitions of ‘genocide,’ we have decided to accept the term irreferences to the Turks’ mass destruction of Armenians in and around 1915”...the expression 'Armenian genocide' may be used freely and should not be qualified with phrasing like ‘what Armenians call,’ etc”.

That is one more important element, and I can add that the Boston Globe did the same thing a year ago.

Now there are questions to be raised. Why not recognize that the 1999 declaration by the Minister of Foreign Affairs is equivalent to saying, “There was a genocide”? Why not recognize it? It has the same definition.

Why would this threaten relations between Turkey and Canada, and relations between Turkish-Canadian citizens and other Canadians? I can say—this is not the best argument—that the threat has been made everywhere but never executed, while many assemblies in many countries, which have been named repeatedly, have passed such a resolution.

How does this motion attack Turkey? The word “Turkey” is not spoken, in contrast to the motion that was proposed in the United States House of Representatives. The word “Turkey” is not seen here.

Can we not remember that Mustapha Kemal, who founded the Turkish republic in 1923—the genocide we are discussing took place in 1915—repeatedly, dozens of times, condemned the massacres? They were not hidden away in a closet. Many times, he called them heinous acts and called for the guilty parties to be punished.

The Republic of Turkey was not formed until 1923. Turks now and then could have said, “It was the Ottoman empire. It was a moment of crisis. We feel for the Armenians and acknowledge that they were victims of genocide”. Why do otherwise?

I want to add that, if the word “genocide” is not mentioned before 1948, it is because it was not used for this purpose. I even looked in my old Larousse dictionary, the first edition of which was published in 1932—interesting tidbit for a historian—and under “genocide” it states, “The word used by Holocaust deniers”.

In my opinion, there is no good reason to vote against the motion before the House tomorrow. I have already repeated the definition given by the Minister of Foreign Affairs. All we will need to say is, “what is called the Armenian genocide”.

The Quebec National Assembly and many other legislatures across Canada, as well as the Senate, have passed this motion couched in the harshest of terms. However, is this not necessary recognition for the descendants of these men and women whose suffering was great and attested to at the time by numerous witnesses? There is plenty of evidence.
How could voting in favour of this motion delay the rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey? Recognizing the Shoah certainly did not prevent an extraordinary rapprochement between Europe and Germany.

The future cannot be built on a hidden past. The future, in this case, depends on the respectful admission of the facts, so considered by those who have studied this issue.

With regard to the reconciliation, the future needs to be considered once the past has been put to rest.

**Hon. Dan McTeague (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, clearly, I must have the consent of my colleague who introduced the motion to pass the following amendment. I am going to read it in English.

I request unanimous consent to amend the motion by substituting it with the following: That this House remember the calamity afflicted on the Armenian people in 1915. This tragedy was committed with the intent to destroy a national group in which hundreds of thousands of Armenians were subject to atrocities, which included massive deportations and massacres. May the memory of this period contribute to healing wounds, as well as to reconciliation of our present day nations and communities, and remind us all of our collective duty to work together toward world peace.

**Ms. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I guess it is up to me to accept or refuse. I would like say that there are two official languages in this Parliament. I would also like to say that I find it unacceptable that this amendment was not prepared in French and English given the absolutely extraordinary translation resources available to the government and the hon. members.

Nonetheless, I understood it very well. I am sorry, but, with or without a translation, I cannot include this amendment in my motion.

**Mr. Bélair (The Deputy Chair):** I believe the problem has just been resolved.

**Hon. Eleni Bakopanos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development (Social Economy), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is truly a great honour for me today to speak once again in this House in support of this important motion put forward by my colleague.

I must admit that I am very happy about how much progress the Armenian cause has made since I have been in this House.

I have always been pleased to speak in favour of motions that have been presented in the House of Commons urging parliamentarians to recognize the Armenian genocide because I truly believe that we must all seek to do good by recognizing a wrong and speaking against it.

More important, however, I chose to speak today because I wish to assure the survivors of the Armenian genocide, who I have personally met in Montreal and in my constituency, that I want to ensure that they leave this life knowing that people like we parliamentarians in the House of Commons are fighting for recognition and closure to the horrors they lived and witnessed firsthand and that have haunted them all their lives. I have looked into their eyes and they are only asking for us to acknowledge what happened and to call it by its rightful name, the Armenian genocide.

We want to assure them that the Turkish government will recognize the Armenian genocide and other atrocities and move toward reconciliation, which we all want in the future.
The 20th century has seen two world wars and numerous historical conflicts. In spite of this, crimes against humanity are not a thing of the past but continue to be daily occurrences in too many countries, countries which routinely practice torture, slavery, and the massive deportation of their civilian population.

Everyday, we witness the persecution of minorities on the basis of their political opinion, race or religion.

To this day, these unacceptable acts of inhumanity continue, despite the fact that the Geneva convention condemns such actions. Even though the international community has admitted that these acts should not be practised, we are still a long way from achieving this goal. Present events attest to similar acts and cry out for our vigilance.

The Nuremberg war crimes tribunal, designed specifically to prosecute high ranking Nazis for the atrocities that had occurred during World War II, tried for the first time those guilty of committing crimes against humanity. These crimes were defined in article 6 of the London charter and included murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation and other inhumane acts committed against any civilian population before or during the war or persecution on political, racial and religious grounds.

While not all criminals have been tried, the international community recognizes the holocaust and commemorates it every year, as we did in Canada last week, so that everyone around the world will remember this tragedy to ensure that it will never occur again. Regardless of this, we still live in a world where ethnic cleansing is practised, the most recent examples being the former republics of Yugoslavia and Rwanda.

While these atrocities are some examples of crimes committed against humanity, there are unfortunately many others, both past and present. Some are well known; others, such as the Asia Minor catastrophe of 1922, are not so well known.

At the end of the first world war, close to two million Greeks were living in a region of Asia Minor on the west coast of modern Turkey. Greeks had been living in that region for over 3,000 years. In 1922, these people, like the Armenians and other Turkish minorities, were the victims of the first ethnic cleansing operation of the 20th century.

The Armenian genocide, which took place around the time of the first world war, is perhaps the most vivid example of genocide as an instrument of national policy by the Ottoman Turks. What makes the Armenian genocide such a particular example is that, unlike the genocide of the Jewish people that took place during the second world war, the international community did not try the war criminals or even formally acknowledge that this massacre took place.

The United Nations convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide describes genocide as, “acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group”. Clearly, this definition applies in the case of the atrocities committed against the Armenians.

Because the UN convention was adopted in 1948, 30 years after the Armenian genocide, Armenians worldwide have sought from their respective governments formal acknowledgment of the crimes committed during World War I. Countries like France, Argentina, Greece, Russia, Sweden, Italy and Belgium have officially recognized the Armenian genocide.

On November 28, 2003, the Quebec national assembly passed a motion put forward by Yvan Bordeleau, my own representative there, declaring an Armenian genocide commemoration day. I greatly appreciate the efforts he has made in the 10 years we have been working together.
Thanks to our collective efforts in advancing the Armenian cause, we are reminding the international community that these types of tragic historical events cannot simply be forgotten or denied. It is my hope that the international community as a whole will take the necessary steps to condemn these horrible acts of inhumanity and recognize the atrocities committed by the Ottoman Turks for what they were: a genocide.

Many countries such as Italy, France and Israel, have adopted parliamentary decrees officially recognizing the Armenian genocide.

Why, people may ask, is it so important to recognize an event that occurred over 80 years ago? We must always remember that those who disregard history are condemned to repeat it. Let us just think about if the international community had reacted to this as it should have at the time. Would the atrocities of the second world war ever have taken place? Perhaps not.

During a debate in the House of Commons, the then secretary of state for central and eastern Europe and the Middle East reiterated the position of the Government of Canada, stating:

...we remember the calamity afflicted on the Armenian people in 1915. This tragedy was committed with the intent to destroy a national group in which hundreds of thousands of Armenians were subject to atrocities which included massive deportations and massacres. May the memory of this period contribute to healing wounds as well as to reconciliation of present day nations and communities and remind us all of our collective duty to work together toward world peace--

Although the federal government recognizes the genocide as a “calamity” and “tragedy”, many parliamentarians, including me, do not agree with this position and continue to work toward the recognition of the genocide.

I truly believe that by working together we can and will accomplish our goal of recognition of the Armenian genocide by the Government of Canada and eventually the government of Turkey. For this reason, I have been working closely with the Armenian community in Canada and with my colleagues from the House of Commons and the Senate to convince the Canadian government, my government, to recognize the Armenian genocide. I do it for those survivors and I do it for my constituents and all Canadians of Armenian origin.

Years of work and concerted efforts resulted in significant breakthroughs in 2002 for the Armenian cause, starting with the first ever Canadian parliamentary visit to Armenia in May 2002. I was honoured to have the opportunity to visit Armenia as a member of the delegation formed by the Canada-Armenia parliamentary friendship group. My colleague, the member of Parliament for Brampton Centre, who is a Canadian of Armenian origin born in Aleppo, Syria, has been the leading champion of this cause in the House. I want to congratulate him again.

This trip reinforced my already firm commitment to this cause, after having the opportunity to visit Yerevan, a museum commemorating the victims of the Armenian genocide, and to meet with several Armenian political representatives or colleagues. This parliamentary exchange was reciprocated, of course, by a visit to Canada last fall.

The Senate of Canada passed a motion on June 13, 2002, presented by my colleague and friend, the Hon. Shirley Maheu, calling on the Canadian government to officially recognize the word “genocide” rather than just calling the event “a crime against humanity” or “atrocity”, as was the case in a former resolution of the House of Commons.

Another very important step toward the recognition of the Armenian genocide came when the House of Commons Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade passed a historic motion on November 27, 2002, calling on the House of Commons to recognize the Armenian genocide.
The member for Brampton Centre presented this motion, which reads as follows:

That the committee invite the House of Commons to recognise the genocide of Armenians, which began at the turn of the last century, by the Ottoman Turks, during the First World War.

We have done other things over the years to bring this issue to the forefront and make our colleagues recognize the importance of bringing resolution to this issue.

I invite all members of Parliament to support this. I certainly will be voting for it. Also, I am very proud to have in my riding of Ahuntsic a monument to the Armenian genocide and in fact to all genocides. It was constructed by the City of Montreal. I urge all my colleagues to support this very honourable effort by the member, who unfortunately will be leaving us and this House. I encourage all our colleagues to let justice be done and recognize a wrong.

Mr. Stockwell Day (Okanagan—Coquihalla, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in addressing the question today it is first important that as we look at what this was and what took place, we are clear on what this was not. As a matter of fact, in regard to the motion today I would like to be clear in my view about what this is not. This motion is not a demand for reparations. This motion is not a demand for vengeance. As a matter of fact, it would decry vengeance and those wanting to somehow retaliate in any way.

When we look at horrific events throughout history, we recognize that we have to be part of a reconciliation process. If we look even at the second world war, I reflect on the fact that both my grandfathers served. One of my grandfathers was captured as a Hong Kong veteran and went through four years of torture. As a matter of fact, he never fully recovered from that torture and eventually died as a result of it. For that reason I never had the joy of meeting him, and yet I cannot be part of a process of ongoing vengeance and anger. I have to be part of a process that somehow moves on to reconciliation and to forgiveness.

This is not a demand for vengeance and retaliation. The motion is not a denunciation of the people of Turkey today or of the government of Turkey. I know there are sensitivities around this from those who represent that government.

In the report related to Muslim nations which the foreign affairs committee of the House just completed, we in fact give commendation in our recommendations to the government of Turkey today, saying that Canada should encourage the government of Turkey to be a voice of democracy and moderation within the Muslim world and to continue to implement its democratic and human rights reforms. We recognize that.

This republic developed after 1923 under Ataturk. Mustafa Kemal was his real name. He was renamed Ataturk, meaning father of the Turks. The Islamic caliphate at the time was abolished in 1923. A modern state began to develop, albeit a one-party state, but after the second world war developing into a two-party state and becoming, incidentally, the first and only Muslim nation to become a member of NATO.

There are many things to be congratulatory about in regard to this particular government today. As a matter of fact, one of our other recommendations is that their prime minister, Recip Erdogan, visit Canada and address Parliament to tell us, among other matters, about strengthening ties with countries of the Muslim world.

When I have discussions with the ambassador from Turkey, I try to allay concerns he would have that this is any kind of reflection upon those people and upon that government. It is not, but it is important that what happened be addressed. It must be addressed and it must be called what it was. We cannot look for euphemistic terms for something that was nothing other than genocide, as 126 holocaust scholars and historians have said.
In their verdict of March 7, 2000, they said:

The World War I Armenian genocide is an incontestable historical fact and accordingly we urge the governments of western democracies to likewise recognize it as such.

The international Association of Genocide Scholars on June 13, 1997, said that it:

reaffirms that the mass murder of Armenians in Turkey in 1915 is a case of genocide which conforms to the statutes of the United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide.

Professor Roger Smith is the professor of government at the College of William and Mary. He is a historian and past president of the Association of Genocide Scholars. He said:

Indeed, there is now a consensus among scholars that the Armenian genocide, which was the first large scale genocide in the 20th century, is the prototype of much of the genocide that has occurred since 1945. Some of the patterns found in the Armenian case have appeared again and again in the 20th century.

Various world leaders have spoken of this. Ronald Reagan, during his term as president of the United States, said, “Like the genocide of the Armenians before it”. He was referring to the genocide of the Armenians and the Holocaust. Gerald Ford, past president of the United States, also talked about it and in his words said, “with mixed emotions, we mark the 50th anniversary of the Turkish genocide of the Armenian people”. Winston Churchill recognized it and talked about that “infamous” time in history and Mustafa Kemal Ataturk himself recognized and commented on it.

Mustafa Arif, the Turkish interior minister of 1918-19, said:

Unfortunately, our wartime leaders, imbued with a spirit of brigandage, carried out the law of deportation in a manner that could surpass the proclivities of the most bloodthirsty bandits. They decided to exterminate the Armenians, and they did exterminate them.

He made an important point, going on to state:

This decision was taken by the Central Committee of the Young Turks and was implemented by the government...The atrocities committed against the Armenians reduced our country to a gigantic slaughterhouse.

Why then do we pursue this? This happened. It took place. We have heard in great detail about the atrocities that took place at the time, the death marches, the massacres, the rapes, and, in many cases, the forced conversion to Islam.

At the time these were the headlines of the day in the British and United States press. Books were written at the time. Books are still being written today. Our own Atom Egoyan, a Canadian, has made a movie about this. It is called Ararat. A recent New York Times best-seller is a book called The Burning Tigris, written by Peter Balakian.

This event has been detailed since those times, since the headlines of the day, and in great detail. It is interesting to note that there was an awareness then in the United States and around the world that this was happening. It actually led to a huge response. People were trying to send funds. People were trying to find ways of intervening.
But the intervention did not take place. I want to look at that fact. The world knew at the time. This was making headlines at the time. People were shocked at the time. Yet an intervention did not take place because there was a sense that it was happening within a sovereign state.

I would suggest that the importance of recognizing this genocide will also help us today to grapple with the question of when it is legitimate for peace-loving nations of the world to stop a genocide that is happening in another sovereign state. As much as we recognize the importance of nation states, is there a point at which there should be an intervention to stop a genocide?

We still grapple with that question. The world could not grapple successfully with the question in the killing fields of Cambodia. We have just recently seen the anniversary of what happened in Rwanda, a heartbreaking, shattering event that took place. Our own general was there trying to send out a warning that intervention was needed. Peace-loving nations still grapple with this difficult problem.

In the Sudan today, untold atrocities are taking place and we still struggle. Part of it has to do with the defining and the acceptance of the very fact that human beings at times—though we find this hard to accept—are capable of genocide. We find it hard to accept that groups of human beings could actually do this. I try to be optimistic about human nature and I ask these questions. How can these things happen? How could it have happened to the Armenians? How could these things happen to others?

We have just celebrated, if I may use that word, the anniversary of the most atrocious event ever in the 20th century or throughout history, and that is the Holocaust itself. Part of it is our lack of acceptance, our reluctance as human beings to accept that human beings could do this to one another, but we must accept it.

Accepting it equips us to identify it if it happens again in the course of human history and also impels us to action to possibly prevent it from happening again. That is why it is so important that this is recognized. That is why it must be called what it was, a genocide: to equip us and alert us to the fact that it can happen, that human beings can do these things to one another.

We need to stand as members of Parliament in this place and recognize this motion, not using euphemisms but using the word and calling it for what it was: a genocide. Perhaps then, when somebody sounds a future alarm, as the ambassador to Turkey in 1913, Henry Morgenthau, did when he sounded the alarm, we will listen. We will be aware that it has happened, we will be aware that it could happen again, and the incredible number of deaths, up to 1.5 million, will not have been in vain. Today, for those people who were massacred, for those people who were targeted for extermination, for their lives and their deaths, our calling it what it is can serve, hopefully, to honour what they went through but also to prevent future atrocities.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): I have a list of four members and a potential fifth who wish to speak on this matter. I know the Chair is not in a position to ask members to limit their remarks to five minutes each, but I would ask you to be as brief as possible. I will try to let as many hon. members as possible speak.

The hon. member for Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore.

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the House and all the people listening that if the House of Commons wants to deal with the issue, then let us have a vote on it now and move it forward.

I have information in front of me that the Ontario legislature was discussing this in 1980. The national assembly of Quebec was also discussing this in April 1980. The Progressive Conservative Party of Canada on July 23, 1984, stated, and I quote Mr. Stevens who said that “We will make representation to the General Assembly of the United Nations to recognize and condemn the Armenian genocide and to express abhorrence of such actions”.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): I have a list of four members and a potential fifth who wish to speak on this matter. I know the Chair is not in a position to ask members to limit their remarks to five minutes each, but I would ask you to be as brief as possible. I will try to let as many hon. members as possible speak.

The hon. member for Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore.

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the House and all the people listening that if the House of Commons wants to deal with the issue, then let us have a vote on it now and move it forward.

I have information in front of me that the Ontario legislature was discussing this in 1980. The national assembly of Quebec was also discussing this in April 1980. The Progressive Conservative Party of Canada on July 23, 1984, stated, and I quote Mr. Stevens who said that “We will make representation to the General Assembly of the United Nations to recognize and condemn the Armenian genocide and to express abhorrence of such actions”.
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The Liberal Party of Canada in 1984 abdicated setting aside a special day once a year in recognition of events such as the Armenian genocide. The NDP spoke about this in December 1989. It goes on and on.

Here we are in 2004 still speaking about it. Today, if people were not following the debate, they would be very confused about what is happening.

I have a letter from the ambassador of Turkey. In one of the paragraphs he states that the truth about what happened between Turks and Armenians is there in history for clear minds to study. The very fact that Armenians are so persistent to have the House adopt a motion to attest that the history was genocide is indeed a testimony that it was not.

I have a letter from the Armenian National Committee of Canada. It states “I am convinced of your response. You have always shown general understanding of the historical fact of the Armenian genocide. We ask that you give precious support for Motion No. 380”.

I have another letter from the Minister of Foreign Affairs that says we should be careful what we do. We have one side saying no; we have another side saying yes; and we have someone in the middle saying we should be careful what we do.

I have spoken to the hon. member from Brampton and I know that this debate must be a very emotional time for him, his family and his ancestry.

My wife's aunt is married to an Armenian in Sacramento, California. A few years ago I spoke to him about this very issue. He said he did not believe he would ever live to see the day when the current country of Turkey recognizes what happened back in 1915.

I say very clearly that we have to call this for what it was. It was a genocide--the mass slaughter of a bunch of wonderful people. They were killed for whatever reason. We can debate that until the cows come home, but they were murdered and slaughtered.

The fact is that nobody is blaming the current Turkish government for what happened in 1915. All we are doing in the House of Commons is recognizing that the tragic event took place. We are calling it very clearly what it was.

There was a poem written by Lorne Shirinian and Alan Whitehorn. I say this because this poem says a lot. I was born in Holland and my parents and oldest brother were liberated by Canadian sacrifices. At that time the Nazi regime of Germany did some terrible atrocities to the people of Europe and, for that matter, the Jewish people as well. We just had a day of remembrance for the Jewish holocaust.

When groups of people are out there in the world today being harassed, slaughtered, killed or in any way defamed because of their nationality, religion, ethnicity or whatever, then we as parliamentarians in Canada must stand up against that.

We must remember the genocide for the following poem:

We must remember.
Remember and learn.
Remember and tell.
But also remember and live.

The last line is the most important:

And some day, remember and forgive.
That little poem summarizes this entire debate. We offer recognition to the Armenian survivors. We probably do not have many of them left, but to the children who are here and know the stories of their ancestors we can say once and for all that we remember what happened so that we can prevent these types of atrocities from ever happening again.

No one in this House or anyone else who I have referred to is in any way insinuating that the Turkish government is responsible for what happened. We are just offering our assistance to the Turkish government and to the Armenian people to get together, bury the hatchet, as they say, and work toward a common and lasting peace so that some day we will remember and forgive.

**Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is kind of with a heavy heart that we are in this place today discussing very difficult, sad and tragic events that occurred back in 1915, the earlier part of the last century. Very troubling to me is the fact that we want to bring conflicts from abroad in a very calculated and deliberate manner into this place.

I have always had a bit of a concern about bringing some of the ethnic clashes in other parts of the world into this place, be it from Sierra Leone or wherever it happens to be. That we do it here without the careful kind of thought and attention we should is a somewhat troubling thing as well as the fact that it occurred so many years ago when there were things that occurred in history at that time that are in dispute. There are two different sides to it.

Also, what we tend to see here most often, and on this particular issue as it comes up time and again, is one side of it. Then we draw into the whole issue conflicts that the Greek people had with the Turks. We had a member today speaking from that perspective. We bring all of these conflicts into this present place. I do not think it is helpful. I do not think it is constructive or productive for this place. I think it would be much better for Armenian and Turkish people to be getting together and working through this. There were many lives lost on both sides, and that is to be regretted.

I have talked with individuals from the Turkish community who would like to meet with people from the Armenian community and in fact proposed this to an individual and asked if they could go on from here and heal respectively in regard to the losses and terrible tragic time back then. This individual was declined. I hope that is not reflective or symbolic of all Armenian people. I would hope it not to be true, but I know in this one case there was that invitation offered and there was just a flat refusal.

We need to go back very quickly in history to recognize that at that period in time there was the collapse of the Ottoman empire. Indeed, for all intents and purposes, it was an empire that was fairly benevolent. If we look at history one understands that they allowed a fair bit of local control throughout that vast empire. They sheltered the Jewish people. They provided refuge to them when the Jews were expelled en masse from Spain. It is a kind of cultural legacy that is much to be proud of. It contradicts to some degree the Armenian claims that the Turks had waged a war of total ethnic cleansing.

Of the multitude of ethnic groups which resided within the borders of the Ottoman empire, have any other people made claims of genocide as we have here to date? In fact, many of our Greek neighbours in Canada have told us that Ottomans had sheltered them from the conflicts that raged among the European Christians, Orthodox and Catholics at the time.

Stepping back in history it was a time when Russia, on the east and Great Britain were instigating one of the main ethnic groups of the Ottoman empire, the Armenians, to rise up against the Ottomans, in the eastern part of the empire. We were individuals who operated in a fairly violent fashion, Armenian terrorist gangs. Let us be honest. I am almost hesitant to go out on a limb when I say these things because I know that there could well be reprisals against people who speak. There have been within our own country. There were assassinations in our own country back in the 80s and in places around the world by Armenian terrorist gangs. That does not make me feel really comfortable, even here, speaking today on such a matter.
These Armenian terrorists back at that time intensified their actions. There were sporadic clashes between the Muslim and Armenian settlements in Turkey. Then when the Russian army invaded eastern Anatolia in 1915 those Armenian terrorist gangs, side by side with the Russian army, started launching systematic attacks against the Ottoman troops, but also against their civilian Muslim fellow countrymen. In addition to those attacks, the Armenian gangs also assisted the Russians by cutting supply lines of the Ottoman army, which was fighting with an invading force.

Under those circumstances the Ottoman government decided to relocate the Armenians who were living in that war theatre to other provinces in the empire. The rationale for that decision was two-fold: to prevent the inter-communal massacres, to keep these two conflicting communities apart, and to cut the support extended by those Armenian towns to the Russians.

During the period in discussion there were hostilities, famine, ailments, banditry and so on. It heavily affected all those communities in eastern Anatolia.

Innocent civilians lost their lives during that migration which took place under some very difficult winter conditions and those are the consequences of a war of unprecedented magnitude. But neither the distress of the Turks nor the Armenians should be solely singled out. It was a tragic and sad time in the course of history. These painful experiences were only part of the tragedy to which the whole of the Anatolian population was subjected.

I could go on a great length, but I do want to allow some time for other members. I am rather concerned when I hear genocide kind of statements that we have around the world. Generally we are going after somebody to prosecute them in the criminal courts in the international tribunals at the Hague or wherever. I am not exactly sure, even if this were to pass today, who we would be prosecuting or going after.

Another concern is when this is passed in other countries. It is interesting in noting the countries that have passed this; not the U.S., not the U.K., and not the United Nations. They have never passed a motion or resolution to this effect. Other countries may have had their own vested motions for doing so. In France, particularly, when as a result of passing a law somewhat to this effect, a lawsuit was brought against anybody who questioned that. A professor is now being sued because he differs with the Armenian perspective on this tragic time in history.

I am going to leave it there. I hope all members across the House, when they cast their ballot tomorrow, would recognize that often we have heard only one side of the story. There were Armenians trying to destabilize the empire at that time. They were collaborating with the orthodox Russians in the east. There were many tragic violent events occurring at the time. War is awful; war is ugly.

It is a mistake, though, at this time in history, so many years later, to be dragging that conflict here. We should leave those things to the historians to work out and to come to some agreement in terms of what the actual facts were. But there is not that clear agreement. The term genocide is far too strong a case to use in respect to what occurred—the tragic events that affect the Armenian community and likewise affect the Turkish community.

I rest my case and leave time for others at this point.

**Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I will start by thanking my colleague, the member for Laval Centre, for her initiative. There is something about this motion and the nature of the debate we are hearing that pleases me. I stayed for the first hour of debate in order to listen to my colleagues. I think our colleague is right to address the importance of historical rehabilitation. The motion we will be called to vote upon tomorrow is not in fact intended as any sort of accusation against anyone.
I have met with a number of members of the Turkish community, and I hope that the next time I travel it will be to Turkey. I know that the Turkish community includes some people who are just as peace-loving as the Armenians, the Quebeckers, the French, in fact anyone else living on this planet Earth.

It would, however, be a mistake not to want to recognize what happened during the years leading up to 1915 and in 1915 itself. This was a time for which the Turks of today have no need to feel responsible. We are well aware of their desire to engage in constructive and positive dialogue with the Armenians.

It was with the purpose of rehabilitating historical memory that Brian Mulroney apologized to the Japanese community. It was with the purpose of historic rehabilitation that the member for Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier and a senator from the other place, wrote a book on the commemoration of the Holocaust. It was in the name of this historical commemoration that the hon. member for Verchères—Les-Patriotes put forward a motion concerning the deportation of the Acadians. This does not mean that we want to rewrite history. It means that we want to take the time to remember that there was suffering and historical conditions that led to what we call a genocide.

The word “genocide” has a particular meaning in international law. It does not have the same meaning as “tragedy.” It certainly does not have the same meaning as “calamity,” the word the parliamentary secretary proposed. In this process of historical rehabilitation, we must remember and we must call things by their proper names.

Because we love peace, because we believe in a productive dialogue, because we value the Turkish community, I believe that tomorrow, all members of this House should do what Argentina, Belgium, Cyprus, France, Greece, Italy, Libya, Russia, Sweden, Switzerland, Uruguay, the Vatican and the European Parliament have done, which is to call for remembrance of the fact that 1.5 million Armenians lost their lives during a time of historical tension—the tension that prevailed at the beginning of the last century. We must remember that so as to avoid a similar event happening, and to make such an event impossible in the future.

I believe that the hon. member for Mercier, the Bloc Quebecois critic for foreign affairs, referred to this. It is even more important now, when the values of international solidarity and the concept of international justice have never been clearer. The United Nations was founded in San Francisco in 1945. In the Canadian delegation at San Francisco were two parliamentarians who served as Prime Minister of Canada, William Lyon Mackenzie King and Louis Stephen Saint Laurent.

**An hon. member:** Joe Clark

**Mr. Réal Ménard:** The former prime minister and right hon. member for Calgary was too young, of course, to have been a member of the delegation, but that does not detract at all from his great international credibility.

I want to say that, in 1945, when we adopted the Charter of the United Nations, the San Francisco bylaws included the idea of an international court of justice.

Closer to home, there is this idea of an international criminal court. How important is this and what does it mean to have such instruments if, as parliamentarians, on a more national scale, we are not able to recall the facts that must be recalled for what they are, without any complacency, but to be constructive?

I do not believe that, when the member for Laval Centre introduced her motion, she intended once again to make accusations, stigmatize communities and make people bear a historic weight that is not theirs to bear.
We are well aware that all the conditions are in place for the current Turkish government to distance itself from the events that occurred at the time of the Ottoman empire and when, as was mentioned, modern Turkey, later founded by Mustafa Kemal Pacha Atatürk in 1923, did not even exist yet.

Once again, it is in the name of this ideal for peace. It is because we believe it is possible to build dialogues that the facts must be recalled.

Yesterday, I attended the book launch for the member for Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier, who stressed the importance of remembering the Holocaust of 1945.

Does this mean that, by remembering the Holocaust, we think that the Germans are warmongers? Of course not. Does this mean that, when Brian Mulroney apologizes for the undeserved internment of certain members of the Japanese community, that Canadians are warmongers? Of course not.

We refuse, as parliamentarians, to cross that line. Some people are saying that, if we recognize the 1915 genocide, we will stigmatize groups. That is not our intention. That is not the intention of the member for Laval Centre. So, for all these reasons, tomorrow we must support the motion by the member for Laval Centre.

The Speaker: Because the hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve has finished his speech, the hon. member for Laval Centre now has the right to reply. She has five minutes.

Ms. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable emotion that I rise to close this second hour of debate on recognition of the Armenian genocide of 1915.

Part of the reason for that emotion is this opportunity to be able to share with you the respect I feel for the Armenian people and their remarkable tenacity in demanding recognition of this genocide, despite the pressure of often dubious socio-political imperatives. Their attachment to their identity and history is an example to us all.

On several occasions since 1993, the debate on the genocide of 1915 has been brought to the attention of the members of the House of Commons, yet only one debate has ever been sanctioned by a vote. It was on a motion by a Bloc Québécois member, Michel Daviault, on April 23, 1996, during an opposition day when the Bloc was the official opposition. The text of his motion was as follows:

That this House recognize, on the occasion of the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide that took place on April 24, 1915, the week of April 20 to 27 of each year as the week to commemorate man's inhumanity to man.

After much debate, the motion on which the House finally voted referred not to recognition of the Armenian genocide, but merely the Armenian tragedy. The support was unanimous. Some saw this as a step in the right direction, but others just saw it as better than nothing.

Since the beginning of the 37th Parliament, this is the fourth time we have had an opportunity to debate this important matter, and I am delighted that the vote on this motion takes place precisely during what is called, and I repeat the wording of the motion of April 23, 1996, “the week of man's inhumanity to man”. This is, in fact, the first time we will have the opportunity to take a clear stand by voting in favour of this recognition of history. By supporting Motion M-380, we will be adopting as our own this thought of Étienne Gilson on the meaning of history:

We do not study history to get rid of it but to save from nothingness all the past which, without history, would vanish into the void. We study history so that what, without it, would not even be the past any more, may be reborn to life in this unique present outside which nothing exists.
It is high time that this Parliament joined the many parliaments—and not minor ones—that have recognized the Armenian genocide, as has the Senate of Canada, which, on June 13, 2002, passed a motion by Senator Shirley Maheu recognizing the Armenian genocide. I am pleased to point out as well that in December 2003, the National Assembly of Quebec unanimously passed a bill proclaiming April 24 as Armenian Genocide Memorial Day.

How can we explain that a country like Canada, so proud of its values of compassion and justice, prefers to use a euphemism instead of having the courage to call a spade a spade?

The Armenian genocide was the first genocide of the 20th century, but unfortunately it was not the only one. A number of historians describe the 20th century as the century of genocide. If we consider the situation in Sudan at this moment, it appears that we have not finished learning from the past.

Now that the world has become a global village, it is important to recognize that we all share in the responsibilities. As Mr. Robert Kocharian, Prime Minister of the Republic of Armenia put it so well, on March 24, 1998:

The genocide was not the tragedy of the Armenian people alone, but a tragedy for all of humanity.

As I finish this brief speech, I would like to say how much I want to see this House show the courage of its convictions. On April 24 this year, the Armenian genocide will mark its 89th anniversary. As for myself, I will be leaving politics soon. Nothing could make me happier than if, before I finish my mandate, I could have contributed in my own way to presenting the Armenian people with the best gift of all: recognition of its history.

Émile Henriot wrote:
The dead live on in the memories of those they leave behind.
Each and every one of us has the duty to remember. Thank you for your support and for the solidarity you will show to the Armenian people in the vote on Motion M-380.

The Speaker: It being 6:56 p.m., the time provided for this debate has now expired. The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?
Some hon. members: Agreed.
Some hon. members: No.
The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.
Some hon. members: Yea.
The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.
Some hon. members: Nay.
The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.
And more than five members having risen:
The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 93 the division stands deferred until April 21, 2004, just before private members' business.

Source:

On April 21, 2004 the motion was carried.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.
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1916 Studebaker Cars
40 H.P. FOUR
$1,195
50 H.P. SIX
$1,395

—MORE POWER
Never before have such powerful cars been priced so low. The 4-cylinder car develops 40-46 horsepower. The 8-cylinder car has 50-55 horsepower.

—MORE ROOM
Both cars are roomier than ever. The bodies are deeper and longer in every way. They carry seven passengers in comfort—the auxiliary seats fold into hidden recesses in the floor.

—even HIGHER QUALITY
It shows in every detail of the car. Genuine hand-buffed leather—chrome-nickel and chrome-vanadium steel in the steering knuckle, gear shafts—25 color and finish operations—thirteen Tinneren bearings—and higher standards of accuracy in manufacturing and inspection.

—and LOWER PRICES
But Studebaker did not attempt to produce low-priced cars purely for the sake of a low price. Instead, Studebaker started in to build the best car that it could build. The price is low only because of largely increased production for the coming year, great factory resources, complete manufacture of the cars in Studebaker plants, and concentration on virtually one chassis.

And all that we ask is that you come in and see the cars—see how much more they give—and the quality that they offer. We honestly don’t believe that you can select a car without injustice to yourself if you don’t see them.

Other Studebaker Prices
40 H.P. TOURING ROADSTER $1,015
50 H.P. TOURING ROADSTER $1,250
Prices see P.O.R. with salesman.

STUDEBAKER
Built in Canada

York Motors, Limited
545 Yonge St., Toronto, Ont.

Hot Weather
Fatigue

not caused by the heat.

With digestion good and the appetite healthy, but weather season makes.

Grape-Nuts

is an ideal hot weather food.

It’s a body-building—digesting, lightening and easily digestible.

It’s made of whole wheat and beaten oats, adding those mineral salts found un-
THE SPIRIT OF THE PRESS

October 17, 1894

The spirit of the press is the life and soul of a free country. The press is the public's advocate, the government's checks, and the independent voice of the people. It is the guardian of freedom, the protector of democracy, and the defender of the people. The press is the conscience of society, the mirror of public opinion, and the advocate of justice. It is the servant of the people, the teacher of the young, the comforter of the dying, and the friend of the good. The press is the voice of the people, the watchman of the state, and the defender of the constitution. It is the champion of liberty, the champion of the poor, and the champion of the weak. The press is the voice of the people, the mouthpiece of the people, and the voice of the people. The press is the people's voice, the people's advocate, and the people's champion. The press is the people's voice, the people's advocate, and the people's champion.
SCOUT'S BIG FIDELITY DAY
OVER BUNDELL VALLEY

750 Boys Engage in Lively

TOURNOI: BULGARIANS
DECLARE FOR ALLIES

Mass Meeting, With Macedonians, Protests Against Action

In Paris, pro-French, anti-German demonstration was to

Be held Saturday afternoon in Sydney.
The Globe, Toronto, Thursday, October 14, 1915.

**BAPTISTS DISCUSS RURAL LIFE PROBLEMS**

(Episcopal Church House, Toronto, October 14, 1915)

A large number of Baptists, both men and women, were present at a meeting of the Baptist Association of Canada, held in the Canadian Baptist Church at Toronto last evening, to discuss the rural life problem. The meeting was opened by the Rev. Dr. James Reesor, who delivered an eloquent address on the subject. He spoke of the importance of rural life and the need for a better understanding of its problems by those in urban areas. The meeting was followed by a discussion in which several members of the association expressed their views on the subject. The meeting was adjourned at 10 p.m.

**WAR CAUSES CLEANSING IN FRENCH CABINET**

(Continued from Page 1)

In the closing of the war, the French government is facing a critical period. The financial situation is critical, and the government is taking steps to meet the situation. The French government has announced that it will suspend all non-essential expenditures and that it will reduce the size of the army. The government has also announced that it will increase taxes and that it will实行紧缩政策。The closure of the war is expected to cause a great deal of hardship for the French people. The government is taking steps to alleviate the situation, but it is expected that the French people will continue to suffer from the effects of the war for some time to come.

**THE WAR须NOTION PROBLEM**

The statement made by Mr. A. A. Wilson in regard to the war须notion problem was received with much interest by the Canadian government. Mr. Wilson stated that the war须notion problem must be solved if the war is to be ended. He said that the war须notion problem is one of the most important problems that must be solved if the war is to be ended. Mr. Wilson stated that the war须notion problem must be solved if the war is to be ended. He said that the war须notion problem is one of the most important problems that must be solved if the war is to be ended. Mr. Wilson stated that the war须notion problem must be solved if the war is to be ended. He said that the war须notion problem is one of the most important problems that must be solved if the war is to be ended.
THE GLOBE, TORONTO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1915.

HAMILTON HOTELMAN
BEFORE LICENSE BOARD

Drunkened Soldiers Said to Have Been Served at Royal

PROPRIETOR ASKS STAY

Tendemcy of Inspector T. H. Perel

—Citizens With Comment on outlook to Actors.
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called in for the 1st time during the year to be
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The city police also have been
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They said that the manager of
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A man is as old as his arteries. The walls of the arteries grow thick and hard through a constant high-price diet. Cut out heavy meats for a while and eat SHREDDED WHEAT. It will postpone old age and help you keep the buoyancy and vigor of youth. Contains all the bodybuilding material in the whole wheat grain in its most digestible form. It contains the bran coat — Nature's laxative for keeping the bowels healthy and active. Why not be "a youngster at fifty?"
The Breakfast Shapes the Day

Load the stomach up with a breakfast of rich, greasy food, and you clog both digestion and mind.

For real work—real efficiency—try a breakfast of Grape-Nuts with Cream and Oatmeal.
**BIG GUN FIGHTS ON WEST FRONT**

British Bombed Fox Poltava
North of Viren Canal

**WAR SUMMARY**

(Continued from Page 1, Col. 8 and 7.)

**The Undying Story**

**Between the Lines**

**NO ALTERNATIVE FOR ANY FREE MAN**

Premier Hughes, at Dinner in His Honor, Speaks on Meaning of the War

**GREAT BRITAIN READY FOR FOE SEA RAID**

Lord Redesdy Says the Army and Navy Are Impeccably Co-ordinated

**FOE PAYS HIGH PRICE FOR A SLIGHT GAIN**

(Estimated from Page 1, Col. 8.)

**BEAUTY DOCTOR TELLS SECRET**

Barbara's Beauty Hair Oil

**THE QUINNE**

“A PAIR OF SID”

 предусмотренными в статьях и других источниках. Это позволило бы сделать изображение более наглядным и понятным. В то же время, несмотря на сложности, созданные в процессе работы, в целом удалось добиться положительных результатов.
FREE CHURCHES URGE TEMPERANCE IN BRITAIN

(Continued from Page 1, Col. 6 and 7.)

troubles near Seppos, in Albania, taken by the Ger-
man army a month ago, and in the Champagne near Men-
ne-Champagne, which were captured three days ago.

DETACHED DETAILS are beginning to come in regarding the German losses in front of Ver-
dun. Prisoners recently taken say that the battalions
which have been reinforced have been held in the
front line for a long time, and that the French troops
have had it very hard. They have been reinforced with
high-explosive shells, and the German artillery has
been firing from a distance of two miles. The French
have been taking cover in shell-holes, and the Ger-
man shells have been falling as close as 200 yards.

ENDOWMENTS TO THE BRITISH INFIRMARY

Brussels, March 1.—The British Infirmary in Brus-
elles has been established in the city and is to be
opened soon. The endowment has been made by
the British government and by the British people.

CLYDE WORKERS ASK FOR WAGE INCREASE

Edinburgh, March 1.—The Clyde workers have
asked for an increase of wages. The demand has
been made upon the employers of the county of
Glasgow. The workers have stated that the wages
are insufficient to maintain the workers. The em-
ployers have denied the request and have stated
that they cannot afford to increase the wages.

ONLY TRENCH WARFARE ON THE BRITISH FRONT

London, March 1.—The British government has
decided to continue the trench warfare on the Brit-
ish front. This decision has been made after con-
siderable discussion in the Cabinet. The govern-
ment has decided that the trench warfare is the
best way to continue the war. The government has
also decided to increase the number of troops in the
trenches.

GERMAN WARSHIPS ARE HOME AGAIN

LONDON, March 1.—The German warships have
returned to the German ports. The warships have
been returning to the German ports for several days.
They have been returning to the German ports be-
because of the war. The German warships are
believed to be returning to the German ports to
prepare for a new war. The German government
has not yet made any public statement about the
warships.

MINERS' NEW WAGE CONTRACT DISAPPROVED

New York, March 1.—The miners' new wage con-
tract has been approved by the miners. The mine-
ers have stated that the new wage contract is ade-
quately covering the cost of living. The miners have
stated that they are satisfied with the new wage con-
tact.
WAR SUMMARY

(Continued from Page 1, Col. 5 and 6)

The German advance in the west was checked and the Allies were able to gain a foothold. The fighting was intense and casualties were heavy.

GERMANS MOVED DOWN IN MASS FORMATION

Ordered to Attack the British in Wexford After Wave

They Suffer Very Heavy Losses - Gallantry of the Australians

(From Correspondents)

Paris, Aug. 17 (Special): Frenzied scenes of violence were reported throughout the Allied lines. The German forces, rushing down in mass formation, were met with relentless fire from the Allied trenches. The fighting was intense, and the Allies suffered heavy losses. However, the Australians distinguished themselves with gallantry.

WISH THE CHILDREN TO KNOW A GOOD PASTE.

Kellogg's is a favorite with them because the delicious crispness of the deli toast. It gives them the

New System of Fat Reduction

Here is a new way to cut and control fat. It is a scientific method of reducing fat that is based on the principle of reducing the amount of fat in the body. The method is simple and effective, and it is suitable for people of all ages.

TRUST the children to know a good paste. Kellogg's is a favorite with them because the delicious crispness of the deli toast. It gives them the

BULGARIA NEARS BREAK WITH FOE

It is believed she will shortly join the Allies.

PEOPLE IGNORE KING

Explanations of action on the part of the British, French and Belgian governments to form a new front have been ignored by the people.
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Little Hands
How Will They Grow? Trained or Untrained?

THOSE little hands are now in your care, mother. You can train them to bring lifelong happiness or let them go untrained. But now is the time to begin their education.

For more than half a century the Gerhard Heintzman piano has trained little hands and little ears. It has the easy action that brings true delivery of touch and expression. It has the beauty, depth and resonance of tone that bring the highest appreciation of musical values. And because it is Canada's Greatest Piano it is an inspiration, an encouragement to achieve something.

—and it's a possession worthy of pride. Start now to let the Gerhard Heintzman piano train your children as you wish you had been trained.

A SPRING TONIC
and Tonic for Fainting and Fatigue

In the spring you think of your health. Why not give your child a spring tonic? A glass daily of the finest quality tonic is the best spring tonic of all. It is a tonic for health, a tonic for beauty, a tonic for energy. Give your child a glass of tonic every day and see the difference it makes.

Watch Your E
Since Bell Invented it telephone there has been a forty-four years of service designed to combine strength and utility.

Your desk telephone has a hundred parts and it is not to be touched. The movement will work in the same way, with the same smoothness and without any work. Rough usage is sure to affect it.

Telephone company expects the public to use it in order that, with the same smoothness, with the same beauty, with the same efficiency, it will work for years.

The Bell Telephone Company.
The veterans and nursing sisters are returning to their homes after the armistice. They
have been doing an invaluable service in the hospitals and sanatoria, and their
return will be a great relief to the medical profession. The veterans are
expected to have a most cordial reception when they arrive.

The armistice has been signed by the Allies and Germany, and the
war is at an end. The terms of the armistice were agreed upon by the
representatives of the Allies and Germany at the conference
held at Compiegne, France, on November 11, 1918.

The terms of the armistice provide for the immediate cessation of hostilities
between the Allies and Germany. The Allies are to be given
access to all German territory in order to effect the
cessation of hostilities.

The terms of the armistice also provide for the
return of the Allies to their own territory.

The terms of the armistice were signed by
the representatives of the Allies and Germany at
the conference held at Compiegne, France, on
November 11, 1918.

The terms of the armistice provide for the
immediate cessation of hostilities between the
Allies and Germany. The Allies are to be given
access to all German territory in order to effect
the cessation of hostilities.

The terms of the armistice also provide for the
return of the Allies to their own territory.
Tianmenmen's shadow

During Chinese reunification with Taiwan on the Chinese mainland, the Tianmenmen incident in Tianjin, China, which left a shadow on the Chinese people's memory. The incident occurred on April 26, 1989, when 3,000 student protesters entered the Tianmenmen area to attend a rally. The Chinese government was determined to prevent the students from entering the area and arrested them. The incident led to widespread protests and demonstrations among Chinese people. Today, the Tianmenmen incident remains a symbolic event in Chinese history.

Separatism's future after Bernard Landry

Bernard Landry, the leader of the Parti Québécois in Quebec, Canada, has been a prominent figure in the separatist movement for Quebec independence. Landry's leadership has been instrumental in shaping the future of Quebec's political landscape. His legacy will undoubtedly continue to influence Quebec's separationist movement.

Clear and present danger

The term “clear and present danger” refers to a situation where there is a significant threat of harm. It is often used in the context of freedom of speech and the right to express opinions. However, the term is not well-defined and can be interpreted in various ways, leading to differing opinions on its application.

My kingdom for a source

The desire for knowledge and the quest for sources are fundamental to the pursuit of learning. Access to information can be a source of power and influence. The search for knowledge is essential in understanding the world around us and making informed decisions. The quest for sources is a continuous process that requires effort and determination.

What a wonderful world

I have always admired Margaret's philosophy on life. She believes in the importance of living life to the fullest and embracing the beauty of the world. Her positive attitude towards life is truly inspiring. I wish more people could learn from her and make the most of their time on earth.
Johnny can't read, and he's in college

That's an open secret on every university and community college campus in America. The problem is so well known that students are encouraged to take spelling and grammar tests to prove they can read. However, in the modern college experience, there is a growing number of students who are struggling with basic literacy skills. This has led to the development of special programs and courses designed to help these students improve their reading and writing abilities. While this is a significant issue, it is also one that is often overlooked. The problem is not limited to college students but affects individuals of all ages. It is estimated that over 100 million adults in the United States struggle with basic literacy skills, which can have a significant impact on their personal and professional lives. This issue is not just a matter of reading and writing; it is also about the ability to understand and interpret the world around us. It is crucial that we address this issue and work towards creating a system that supports all individuals, regardless of their background or circumstances, in developing the skills they need to succeed in life.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Daycare debate

The issue of daycare quality and affordability is a critical one, as high-quality daycare can provide a foundation for a child's future success. However, the current state of daycare provision in many parts of the country is inadequate. The lack of funding for daycare facilities and the high costs associated with them make it difficult for many families to access high-quality care. It is essential that we work towards improving the situation by increasing funding for daycare facilities, providing subsidies for families, and encouraging the development of more daycare spaces. This will not only benefit the children who attend these facilities but also the entire community, as it will help create a more equitable and prosperous society.

A sense of hope

In a world that often feels dark and daunting, it is vital to remember the power of hope. Even in the most difficult of circumstances, hope can provide a source of strength and resilience. It is the belief that things will get better that helps us to move forward and overcome adversity. It is the conviction that tomorrow will be brighter that allows us to face the challenges of today with courage and determination. It is the hope that can turn a difficult situation into a new opportunity.

The Queen's decision

The decision of Her Majesty The Queen to step down from her official duties is a momentous one. It is a testament to her dedication and commitment to her role as a symbol of national unity and a beloved figure to millions around the world. Her Majesty has served with distinction and honor throughout her reign, and her legacy will be remembered for generations to come. As we look towards the future, we can be confident that the Queen's decision will usher in a new chapter of leadership and service.

Toronto's trash troubles

Multiple turnovers with city leadership in recent years have created uncertainty and confusion. The city is facing a range of challenges, including budgetary constraints, environmental concerns, and community issues. It is essential that we work together to address these challenges and create a city that is sustainable, inclusive, and welcoming for all. This requires strong leadership and effective governance. It is time for a fresh perspective and a new approach to tackling the city's issues. We need leaders who are committed to listening to the voices of residents and working towards solutions that benefit all.

Toronto Star Correspondent, Toronto
Turkey, EU commence accession talks

Ottoman sultans long sought alliance with Europe

Austria objects to negotiation terms

Indonesia launches campaign to identify Bali bombers

New rules assure Iraqi constitution will pass

Critics complain of vote fixing

Turkey's EU accession talks have been delayed after amendments to the draft treaty were rejected by the European Union. The EU had been seeking closer ties with the former Turkish Empire in a bid to boost its economy and integrate more closely with Western Europe. However, Ankara decided to introduce changes to the treaty that would be more in line with Turkish interests, leading to a bitter dispute with the EU over the nature of the negotiations.

In the meantime, the EU and Turkey have been working on a new framework for their future relationship, with talks continuing in Brussels. The aim is to establish a close partnership that will allow Turkey to play a greater role in the EU's foreign政策.

The talks are expected to address issues such as trade, visa liberalisation, energy cooperation and the rule of law. The EU hopes to secure better market access for Turkish products, while also seeking to ensure that Turkey respects EU standards in areas such as human rights and the environment.

Turkey has made some progress in recent years in its efforts to join the EU, but the country has also faced challenges in implementing certain reforms and meeting the Union's criteria. While the talks are ongoing, both sides are working to strengthen their bilateral relations and to pave the way for a successful conclusion to the negotiations.

#TurkeyEU #EUAccession #TurkeyRelations
The GLOBE AND MAIL

Considering Turkey as an EU member

Example welcome to Turkey, this week: an observer (the second in a series of visits by the European Union) to Istanbul, as Turkey seeks to become a member of the European Union. Turkey is currently applying for membership in the European Union, which it has done formally since 1987. However, the process of accession is complex and lengthy, and it is likely to take several years before the country can be considered a candidate for membership.

The European Union is composed of 27 member states, each of which has its own national identity and culture. Turkey is a predominantly Muslim country, with a population of approximately 76 million people. The country is located in Asia Minor, and is bordered by the Black Sea to the north, the Aegean Sea to the south, the Mediterranean Sea to the west, and the Caspian Sea to the east.

Turkey is a constitutional republic with a presidential system of government. The president is both the head of state and the head of government, and is elected by direct popular vote for a term of seven years. The president appoints the prime minister, who leads the government and is responsible for the day-to-day running of the country.

The country has a mixed economy, with a combination of private and public sector businesses. Turkey's economy is primarily driven by the service sector, which accounts for more than 60% of the country's GDP. The country is also a major export destination, with a significant presence in the automotive, electronics, and construction industries.

Turkey is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and is a member of the United Nations, the World Trade Organization (WTO), and the European Free Trade Association (EFTA).

Letter to the Editor

Dear Editor,

I am writing to express my concern regarding the recentrevocation of the license for a local radio station in our community. I believe this action is unwarranted and that the station has been unfairly targeted.

The station, which has been a source of entertainment and information for our community for many years, has always operated within the legal and regulatory framework. It has consistently followed the guidelines and regulations set by the regulatory body, and has always strived to provide a diverse range of programming that caters to the needs and interests of our community.

I am therefore deeply disappointed and concerned by the recent action taken by the regulatory body. I believe this move is unjustified and that the station has been unfairly targeted. I urge the regulatory body to reconsider its decision and to allow the station to continue operating.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]

Smoke and surprises

When governments consistently (and usually unsuccessfully) speculate about the future of the global economy, it is essential to understand the underlying risks and uncertainties. As governments are often constrained by the need to act quickly, they may find it difficult to consider the long-term implications of their policies. In addition, the decisions made by governments can have significant consequences for the global economy, and it is important to consider the potential impacts of these decisions.

One of the key risks to the global economy is the threat of a major financial crisis. Financial crises can be caused by a variety of factors, including over-reliance on debt, over-leverage, and a lack of regulation. Financial crises can have significant consequences for the global economy, and it is important to consider the potential impacts of these crises.

In conclusion, it is important to consider the potential risks to the global economy and to act proactively to minimize these risks. Governments should be aware of the potential risks to the global economy and should consider the long-term implications of their policies. It is also important to consider the potential impacts of financial crises, and to take steps to mitigate these risks.
A writer fights the war of words

Turkey's Orhan Pamuk was charged with 'denigrating' his beloved country

BY COMA TO BE

ative literature, Turkey's most celebrated novelist, Orhan Pamuk, told a British newspaper this week: "Every thousand Turks and a billion Armenians were killed" in these 20 years since the end of the genocidal campaign.

This latest in a series of attacks by Turkish authorities on the exiled writer's public profile is an indication of how the government is using the legal system to control the flow of ideas.

In the past two years, Turkish authorities have arrested over 200 journalists, intellectuals, and human rights activists who have criticized the government's policies or expressed support for democracy and human rights.

The latest charges against Pamuk were filed in response to an article he wrote in 2007, titled "Turkey's Armenian Genocide: A Tragedy of Memory," in which he wrote: "Turkey has never acknowledged its responsibility for the deaths of millions of Armenians during World War I."

"This is a clear attempt to silence critical voices," said Human Rights Watch's Asia division director, Brad Adams.

"The government is using this case to send a message to other writers and activists who dare to speak out against the regime," he added.

Orhan Pamuk was sentenced to three years in prison in 2008 for what the government described as "insulting" the Turkish military. The European Court of Human Rights later ruled in his favor, saying his freedom of expression had been violated.

"The government's actions are a clear violation of Turkey's obligations under the European Convention on Human Rights," said Adams.

"Turkey must respect the rights of all its citizens to freedom of expression and association, and to peaceful assembly and demonstration."

The government has also arrested dozens of journalists and activists who have criticized the regime or expressed support for democracy and human rights.

"These arrests are a clear attempt to silence critical voices," said Adams. "The government is using this case to send a message to other writers and activists who dare to speak out against the regime."
Harper chasing ethnic vote with Air-India inquiry

JEFFREY SIMPSON

The judicial inquiry into the 1985 Air India bombing has the Harper government set to run for the ethnic vote on the Conservative campaign trail. But the Prime Minister’s水稻 to interrogate former judge John Major is not the only provocation to come from the Conservatives.

Prime Minister Harper has acknowledged, only three years after being convicted in 2001, that the Liberal government was right to strike out against the country in the 1980s. The Air India bombing, which killed 329 people, was the worst terrorist attack in Canadian history. But the Harper inquiry, the government announced last week, will focus on the police response to the attack.

The Harper inquiry, which will be led by former justice minister Beverley McLachlin, is expected to begin in the fall. The government has said it will release a report by early 2014.

See momma run (to the Conservatives)

Liberals have lost touch with traditional families, but Stephen Harper knows what to do

MARGARET WENTE

Canada is a nation of immigrants, and we must remember that. The values we hold dear today are the result of the hard work and sacrifices of generations past. We must continue to build on this legacy and ensure that our children have the same opportunities as their parents and grandparents.

The Conservative government has been working to strengthen our borders and keep our country safe. We have also been working to ensure that our laws are fair and just, and that our schools and communities are safe and welcoming places for all.

The Conservatives have been working hard to ensure that our country remains a place where people can live together in peace and harmony. We have been working to ensure that our laws are fair and just, and that our schools and communities are safe and welcoming places for all.
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The Conservatives have been working hard to ensure that our country remains a place where people can live together in peace and harmony. We have been working to ensure that our laws are fair and just, and that our schools and communities are safe and welcoming places for all.
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