

**«LE TEMPS»  
AND OTHER PARISIAN NEWSPAPERS  
ON THE 1909 CILICIAN MASSACRES  
AND THEIR AFTERMATH**

---

The massacre of Armenians in Ottoman Cilicia in April 1909 was a turning point in Armeno-Turkish relations, which, after the high point of the proclamation of the Ottoman constitution in July 1908, soon were to reach the nadir of the Armenian genocide<sup>1</sup>. France, a world power with important political and economic interests in the Ottoman Empire and, in particular, in Cilicia, was concerned about these massacres and their repercussions. The presentation and interpretation of these events in

1. For general information on these massacres, see: H'AGOP BABIGIAN, *Adanayi egherné: deghegakir H'agop Babigeani* (Constantinople: Giligia Kradun, no. 1, Niwt'er hay mardirosakrut'ean patmut'ean, 1919); VAHAKN DADRIAN, "The Circumstances Surrounding the 1909 Adana Holocaust," *Armenian Review*, 41, no. 4/164, winter 1988, pp. 1-16; H'AGOP H'. T'ÉRZEAN, *Giligiyo aghédè* (Constantinople: n.p. [Asadurean ew ortik', first printing, 1912], second printing, 1912); Mgr. MOUCHEGH [MUSHEGH SEROPEAN], *Les vèpres ciliciennes: les responsabilités, faits et documents* (Alexandria, Egypt: Della Rocca, 1909); HAMPARTZUM H'. ASHJEAN, *Adanayi egherné ew K'oniayi h'usher (badmut'ean hamar)* (New York: Goch'nag Dbaran, 1950); GEORGES BRÉZOL, *Les Turcs ont passé là... recueil de documents, dossiers, rapports, requêtes, protestations, suppliques et enquêtes établissant la vérité sur les massacres d'Adana en 1909* (Paris: author, 1911); H. CHARLES WOODS, *The Danger Zone of Europe: Changes and Problems in the Near East* (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1911). For the Turkish point of view, that the Armenians had organized a rebellion, see: DAMAR ARİKOĞLU, *Hâtıralarım: Milli Mücadele* (Istanbul: Tan Gazetesi ve Matbaası) 1961; SALÂHI R. SONYEL, *İngiliz Gizli Belgelerine Göre Adana'da Vuku Bulan Türk-Ermeni Olayları (Temmuz 1908 - Aralık 1909). The Turco-Armenian 'Adana Incidents' in the Light of Secret British Documents (July, 1908 - December, 1909)* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1988). The aftermath of the massacres is studied in: ARAM ARKUN, "The Response of the Armenian National Assembly to the 1909 Cilician Massacres," Middle Eastern Studies Association Conference paper, November 1987.

contemporary French newspapers is important because French public opinion could be influenced, and this could put pressure on the French government to eventually take certain types of action. At the same time, some newspapers might reveal the direction official French policy was taking through their editorial stances. Armenians, Turks and other Ottomans followed French newspapers closely for these two reasons, and because of the value placed on French cultural and intellectual opinions in the Ottoman Empire. This study will examine the amount and type of information on the Cilician massacres Parisian newspaper readers were exposed to as well as the types of editorial positions taken by a select number of newspapers. Particular attention will be paid to the newspaper *Le Temps*, for reasons to become apparent shortly<sup>2</sup>.

It would seem likely at first glance that the political affiliation and general format of a newspaper would affect its treatment of the Cilician massacres. Therefore, seven daily Parisian newspapers spanning a range of ideologies and levels of sophistication, namely *La Croix*, *L'Événement*, *Le Figaro*, *L'Intransigeant*, *Le Petit Parisien*, *La Petite République*, and *Le Temps*, were used, as well as two lesser known weeklies, *La Bastille* and *Les Temps Nouveaux*, which provide interesting ideological contrasts. *Les Temps Nouveaux* was an anarchist paper, while *La Bastille*, anti-masonic and anti-Semitic, seems close to the Action Française. As for the dailies, during the period in question *La Petite République* was mildly socialist, *Le Petit Parisien*, and *L'Événement* were republican papers, and *Le Temps* was a moderate republican or centrist paper. *Le Figaro* was conservative in tenor, and *L'Intransigeant* was a nationalist, rightist paper. *La Croix*, adhering to a fairly conservative line, was the most important Catholic paper in France. All newspapers were examined for the period from July 1908 to the end of February 1910 except for *L'Événement*, for which only the issues from January to December 1909 were available for study<sup>3</sup>.

2. The semi-official French news agency, Agence Havas, through a number of agreements with the other major world news agencies which divided up the world into spheres of influence, was one of the two world news services monopolizing the Ottoman Empire at this time. It would be interesting to do a broad survey of the international press to see what sort of an effect this had on coverage of the Cilician massacres and other Armenian topics.
3. For general information on the French press of this period, as well as specifically on the newspapers used in this study, see: JEAN-FRANÇOIS PICARD, "Tableaux des tirages de la presse nationale de 1803 à 1944," in PIERRE ALBERT, GILLES FEYEL, JEAN-FRANÇOIS PICARD, *Documents pour l'histoire de la presse nationale aux XIX<sup>e</sup> et XX<sup>e</sup> siècles*, Collection Documentation of Centre de Documentation Sciences Humaines (Paris: Éditions de Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, n.d.), pp. 47-55;



As far as sophistication goes, at least in the realm of international affairs, *Le Temps* was considered the top of the line, and was renowned throughout Europe for its international coverage. It was in favor of a colonialist foreign policy, and, most importantly, had the reputation of being a semi-official mouthpiece of the French government. *Le Figaro* also provided good international coverage. *Le Petit Parisien*, though it had the largest circulation of all French papers in this period, provided less coverage of international affairs and did not make an effort to develop an extensive network of foreign correspondents. *La Croix*, the principal French Catholic paper, did not provide comprehensive coverage of international affairs. The other daily papers examined provided even less coverage. *L'Intransigeant*, primarily concerned with national and local news, devoted scanty newsprint to serious international events. With large print and huge headlines, gaudy *L'Intransigeant* articles appealed to a clientele of readers who must have relished tales of axe murderers and women of doubtful virtue. The two weeklies provided more polemics than news, and largely focused on topics relevant to their ideological interests.

## NEWS COVERAGE

*Le Temps* bears out its reputation of having the best international news of all French papers with its coverage of the Cilician massacres. An attentive reader of the newspaper putting together all the information printed during the months of April and May 1909 would know how the first set of massacres of Armenians began in Adana from April 14 to 16, immediately after an April 13 counter-coup attempt against the central, constitutional Ottoman government. Despite their halt in the provincial capital of Adana, massacres spread to other parts of Cilicia. The reader would also know of the second set of massacres erupting in Adana on April 25, with the participation of soldiers originally sent by the pro-

PIERRE ALBERT, "La presse française de 1871 à 1940," in *Histoire générale de la presse française*, Claude Bellanger et al., eds., 4 vols. (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1969-73), vol. 3 (1972), pp. 297-374; PIERRE DE BACOURT and JOHN W. CUNLIFFE, *French of To-day: Readings in French Newspapers, With a Preliminary Sketch of the Development of the French Press* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1917), pp. xiii-lij; RAYMOND MANEVY, *La presse de la III<sup>e</sup> République* (Paris: J. Foret, Editeur, 1955); "Copin-Albancelli," in HENRY COSTON, *Dictionnaire de la politique française*, 2 vols. (Paris: Publications Henry Coston, 1967, 1972), 2: 149-50; "La Bastille antimaçonnique," in *Ibid.*, p. 44.

The newspapers used for the present article were obtained during research at UCLA's University Research Library some six years ago.

constitutional Young Turks victorious in Constantinople to calm the Cilician situation. Arson and pillaging was particularly extensive in the Armenian populated portions of Adana.

*Le Temps* paid much attention to the actions of the great powers, which basically consisted in sending warships to patrol the area and occasionally trying to cow the authorities into ending the massacres. The provision of medical aid and provisions is described, while the fate of individual Europeans, such as the French engineer Godard, was followed relatively closely<sup>4</sup>. European and American missionaries also received a good deal of press coverage<sup>5</sup>.

During the months following the end of the massacres, *Le Temps* showed through its news and editorial pieces how local Ottoman officials and participants in the massacres attempted to shift responsibility for the massacres onto the Armenian victims, arresting many Armenians and even hanging six of them in June after court martial trials, while the central Ottoman government did not respond in a unified fashion to such actions. It periodically depicted the efforts of the Armenian Patriarchate and other Armenian bodies to rectify this situation and achieve justice and compensation for the Cilician Armenians. Readers of *Le Temps* also learned of French humanitarian aid to the Cilician Armenian survivors.

The frequency of articles on the Cilician Armenian massacres and their aftermath paints a clear picture of the focus of *Le Temps'* attention. As a point of comparison, articles or dispatches on any topic concerning Ottoman Armenians appeared in *Le Temps* starting in August 1908 only several times a month. Beginning on April 17, 1909, *Le Temps* carried one or more articles and dispatches on the Cilician Armenian massacres nearly every day, and often on page one. However, the frequency of such items decreased by June to one item every two to three days, and then from mid-June decreased even further. By November it was one or two per month, and by 1910 the massacres were mentioned only a few times during the entire year.

There are some problems for the readers of *Le Temps*. As *Le Temps* and *La Croix* note in their editorials, the task of covering the Cilician massacres was a difficult one. Information came in bit by bit from different sources, and it took a long time for the full extent of the massacres

4. On Godard: *Le Temps*, April 19, 1909, p. 2; April 20, 1909, p. 1.

5. For example, see: *Le Temps*, April 18, 1909, p. 1, 4; April 20, 1909, p. 1; April 21, 1909, p. 1; April 25, 1909, p. 2; April 29, 1909, p. 4; May 1, 1909, p. 1; May 2, 1909, p. 2; May 4, 1909, p. 1; May 6, 1909, p. 2.



to be realized<sup>6</sup>. Ottoman government censorship, trying to obscure the extent of the tragedy, made this task even more difficult for all the French papers<sup>7</sup>.

Thus, the information that *Le Temps*, as well as the other dailies, printed on the Cilician events was modified over time. On April 17, *Le Temps* cited a death toll of 60 Armenians in the city of Adana; on April 19, 400 Armenians; on April 21, over 1,000 killed, on April 22, 5,000 killed in Adana province, including 200 Muslims, of whom 2,000 were in the city proper; on April 24, over 10,000 Armenians; on April 30, about 35,000 dead; on May 6, 30,000 dead; and on May 9, 10-20,000 dead<sup>8</sup>. On May 12, the figures of the Adana governor-general of 1,455 Armenians and 1,924 Muslims dead were listed together with the statement of an "unofficial source" in Constantinople that these figures, too low, seem to be an attempt at self-justification of the governor-general<sup>9</sup>. On April 17 a dispatch read that though the existence of the Adana "troubles," a euphemism frequently used by the Ottoman government, had been denied, they were confirmed again by dispatches from Mersin. On April 18, it was noted that the events seemed graver than before as massacres spread to other areas. More details were given on the spread of the massacres in Cilicia on the 19th, 20th, and 21st. On April 22 a more detailed account of events in the city of Adana was given<sup>10</sup>. Accounts of massacres in Adana and Aleppo provinces continued to be printed through the second week of May. Not until April 29, four days after they began, was any mention of the second set of massacres in Adana city made. On May 1 and 2, further information was given<sup>11</sup>. This delay may have been due to official Ottoman censorship, since dispatches on events in other parts of Cilicia were printed throughout this period.

6. "Bulletin de l'étranger: les massacres d'Asie-Mineure," *Le Temps*, May 9, 1909, p. 1; J.-J. C., "Les Jeunes-Turcs et le Sultân," *La Croix*, April 24, 1909, p. 1. There were difficulties in understanding the events unfolding in Constantinople, let alone in Adana ("Bulletin de l'étranger: le péril oriental," *Le Temps*, April 18, 1909, p. 1).

7. "En Turquie: en Asie-Mineure," and "La situation en vue de Vienne," *Le Temps*, May 6, 1909, p. 2. Ottoman censorship was applied to the events of the coup attempt in Constantinople as well ("Soulèvement religieux et militaire à Constantinople," *Le Temps*, April 16, 1909, p. 1).

8. *Le Temps*, April 17, 1909, p. 4; April 19, 1909, p. 2; April 21, 1909, p. 1; April 22, 1909, p. 2; April 24, 1909, p. 1; May 2 1909, p. 2; May 6, 1909, p. 2; "Bulletin de l'étranger: les massacres d'Asie-Mineure," May 9, 1909, p. 1.

9. *Le Temps*, May 12, 1909, p. 1.

10. *Le Temps*, April 18, 1909, pp. 1, 4; April 19, 1909, p. 2; April 20, 1909, p. 1; April 21, 1909, p. 1; April 22, 1909, pp. 2, 4.

11. *Le Temps*, April 29, 1909, pp. 2, 4; May 1, 1909, p. 1; May 2, 1909, pp. 1, 2.

Obviously this sort of cumulative coverage could be confusing to an inattentive reader. Fragmentation of accounts relying on varied sources of different value added to the confusion. *Le Temps*' coverage of the Cilician massacres relied most heavily on European consular reports. European and Armenian eyewitness accounts and official Ottoman government reports also were frequently used. It is going too far to assert, as Adossidès does, that *Le Temps* and other great newspapers fell full prey to Ottoman diplomacy's skilled use of systematic denial, as the Ottoman statements often were accompanied by skeptical editorial remarks<sup>12</sup>. On the other hand, such denials did have a temporary impact. Reassuring but inaccurate statements such as those from Ottoman ambassadors, or Shevket Pasha's declaration that telegrams from Adana and Mersin reported satisfactory conditions, although the second Adana massacres were then underway misled public opinion for a day or two<sup>13</sup>. Soon, however, consular and other dispatches showed the error of such statements with graphic details (in Shevket Pasha's case, this took place beginning the very next day)<sup>14</sup>. Generally, statements of Ottoman government orders being sent to reestablish order cannot have inspired much confidence when news of further massacres stared the reader in the face on the same page.

Only once did *Le Temps* print a direct response from Armenians to an official Ottoman declaration. On May 24, 1909, it had published a note from the Ottoman ambassador in Paris asserting that both Armenians and Muslims were responsible for the Cilician events, the number of whose victims was being greatly exaggerated in some European newspapers. Five days later, *Le Temps* printed a rebuttal from the Armenian Revolutionary Federation center in Geneva, protesting this statement and stressing that the massacres were organized and prepared by Sultan Abdülhamit II and his supporters. In addition, contrary to the ambassador's statement, the Armenian victims were being oppressed instead of the guilty being punished by courtmartial<sup>15</sup>. This Ottoman declaration, widely published in European newspapers, also received a public response in the Ottoman Empire. The ambassador cited as evidence for his assertion that guilt was shared by both sides the testimony of Christian clerical leaders in Adana and Mersin, but the latter quickly denied that they ever had said such a

12. A. ADOSSIDÈS [GEORGE DORYS], *Arméniens et Jeunes-Turcs: les massacres de Cilicie* (Paris: P.-V. Stock, 1910), p. 114, fnnt. 1.

13. "La crise turque: les Turcs en Asie-Mineure," *Le Temps*, April 28, 1909, p. 2.

14. "La crise turque: les Turcs en Asie-Mineure et Syrie," *Le Temps*, April 29, 1909, p. 4.

15. "Les massacres d'Arménie," *Le Temps*, May 29, 1909, p. 2.



thing. Furthermore, they denied that a lack of sufficient troops was the reason for the spread of the "disturbances," pointed out that the numbers of dead were much greater than he stated, and emphasized that the central government did nothing to protect the Armenians<sup>16</sup>.

The reader of *Le Temps* would not have been well informed about the longterm consequences of the Cilician massacres, and the final abortive attempts by the Armenians to achieve justice and compensation. *Le Temps* covered the initial aftermath of the Cilician massacres fairly well, but soon began to falter in its coverage. After all, dramatic events like massacres are usually considered more newsworthy by journalists than the evolution of politics on a day to day basis. The issues became more complex, while French Near Eastern interests were no longer directly challenged. In fact, as shall be seen below, France had an interest in maintaining good relations with the Ottoman government and coverage of local injustices would not have contributed to this.

Surprisingly, *Le Temps* did not even mention the withdrawal in February 1910 of Constantinople Armenian patriarch Eghishé Turean's September 1909 resignation over the condemnation of innocent Armenians and the glossing over of the responsibility of the real criminals. The return of the patriarch was something at least on the surface favorable for the Ottoman government, though nothing had in reality been resolved. Less surprising is the failure to note the executions in Adana in fall and winter 1909 of those considered by the court martial to have acted criminally during the massacres. One Armenian was among those hanged.

Another deficiency in the presentation of the massacres by *Le Temps*, lack of analysis and background material, is one too frequently common to newspaper articles on any topic. Certain issues, like the background to an important incident preceeding the initial Adana massacres, or the reason why the troops sent by the Young Turks participated in the second set of Adana massacres, were not elaborated upon<sup>17</sup>. The economic causes of the tensions between Armenians and the Cilician Muslims were not explored sufficiently, but then, this issue has not even been fully treated in an academic forum to this day. The question of the newspaper's identification/s of those ultimately responsible for the massacres will be discussed along with editorial policy below.

16. ASHJEAN, pp. 43-46.

17. These two issues were also not dealt with in American newspapers of Boston covering the Cilician events. See LILLIAN K. ETMEKJIAN, "The Reaction of the Boston Press to the 1909 Massacre of Adana," *Armenian Review*, 40, no. 4-160, winter 1987, pp. 61-74.

It is not possible to discuss in a similarly detailed fashion the news coverage of the other newspapers here. They provided a fair amount of information during the massacres themselves, but much less during the aftermath, for the same reasons as *Le Temps*. The extent of Cilician news coverage by the dailies seems to have varied on the whole in correspondence with the general level of coverage of international affairs, with few exceptions. *La Petite République* did have somewhat better coverage than *Le Petit Parisien*, bringing it up to *Le Figaro*'s level. It is possible but not certain that this was due to *La Petite République*'s socialism and its prior championing of the Armenians in the 1890's. *La Croix* also presented more information on Ottoman Armenians than the extent of its general news coverage would warrant. It also provided more detailed coverage of Catholic Armenian affairs than the other newspapers. *La Croix* was second only to *Le Temps* in its coverage of the massacres and their aftermath. In this case, ideology had a decisive influence, as the greater interest in these topics was probably due to the role religion played in the massacre of the Christian Armenians, as well as the consequences of the Cilician events for the propagation and protection of French Catholicism in the Near East and the world. Most significantly, there were French Catholic clerics, institutions, and converted Armenians in Cilicia.

Ideology certainly also played an important role in the coverage provided by the two weeklies, *Les Temps Nouveaux* and *La Bastille*. Together they only mention Armenian affairs several times, including editorial commentary, throughout the period examined. This was due to the narrow focus of these weeklies, which only provided information on world events relating to their favorite causes or phobias.

None of the newspapers, not even *Le Temps*, had correspondents in Cilicia, but several of them did publish letters from the region. Most were sympathetic to the Armenians' plight. *Le Figaro*, however, published extracts of letters in early May from an anonymous officer of a French battleship that had gone to Cilicia. The officer blamed the Armenians for both sets of Adana massacres. This led to a great deal of criticism, especially by Armenians and Armenophiles, leading *Le Figaro* to print a rebuttal to the officer's assertions submitted by Bishop Mushegh Seropian, formerly the Armenian prelate in Adana<sup>18</sup>. This rebuttal, and

18. "Au pays du massacre: notes d'un témoin," *Le Figaro*, May 7, 1909, p. 1; "Les massacres d'Arméniens en Asie Mineure," *Le Figaro*, May 30, 1909, p. 3. Armenians criticized *Le Figaro* in a number of their own publications. See, for example, SURËN BART'EWAN and MIK'AYËL KIWRJEAN, "Ch'arik'in hantëb," forward to SURËN



the statement from the Armenian Revolutionary Federation in *Le Temps* mentioned above, were the only instances of the printing of Armenian responses. Usually, readers would have to compare unconnected accounts from various sources to determine what appeared to be the truth, although editorial commentary occasionally gave guidance.

All of the daily papers, from *Le Temps* down the sophistication scale to *L'Intransigeant*, shared many of the same problems of coverage. Despatches in April at first only provided bits and pieces of contradictory information. The fundamental origins and context of the massacres were not clearly expounded or even sufficiently explored. The two sets of Adana massacres were not sufficiently delineated or explicated; even the exact dates were not always given. A comparatively great deal of information on the actions of Europeans and their states was provided. The aftermath of the massacres were not as fully covered as the massacres, and most newspapers did not even mention the return of the Armenian patriarch to office in 1910, which symbolized the failure of attempts to achieve justice.

The extent of these problems was greatest, of course, in *L'Intransigeant*, the Parisian daily providing the least international news coverage. It barely differentiated between the two different stages of massacres in Adana, or the events happening elsewhere in Cilicia at this time. The participation of the troops sent by the Young Turks to gain control of the situation in the second set of Adana massacres is never mentioned. Not much is clear about what is going on in Cilicia besides the fact that Armenian Christians are being killed simultaneously with a counter coup in the capital, and that the European powers were taking some sort of action. Fewer of the despatches on European intervention were left out of this paper than items containing information on the massacres themselves, thus increasing the relative proportion of articles devoted to the Europeans' actions. *L'Intransigeant* after May 1909 printed nearly nothing — only three brief despatches — on the Cilician aftermath, so that readers could not comprehend the consequences of the massacres<sup>19</sup>.

BART'EWAN, *Giligean Arhawirk'ê* (Constantinople: Kradun Nshan - Babigean, 1909), pp. vii-x; [n.a. probably ARSHAG CH'OBANEAN], *Anahid*, 11, nos. 1-2, April-May 1909, p. 48.

19. "Dernière heure: les orphelins arméniens," *L'Intransigeant*, July 22, 1909, p. 2; "Dernière heure: quinze pendaisons en Turquie," *L'Intransigeant*, December 16, 1909, p. 2; "Dernière heure: les exécutions d'Adana," *L'Intransigeant*, January 10, 1910, p. 2.

## COMMENTARY AND EDITORIALS

News was often combined with interpretation in French newspapers. These newspapers expressed their opinions on the Cilician events through commentary in articles introducing news despatches as well as through editorials. *Le Temps* had the greatest number of editorials on Armenian related topics, followed by *La Croix*. The other papers had much fewer editorials. An examination of editorial positions can lead to an understanding of French attitudes towards Ottoman Armenians and Turks better than a study of the form and slant of news coverage alone. In the case of the semi-official *Le Temps*, it can also shed some light on government policy. Editorial commentary on the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP), responsibility for the massacres, the need for European intervention, the aftermath of the massacres, and a French Catholic protectorate in the Near East will be examined.

It is important to begin by examining the newspapers' attitude towards the CUP, the Young Turk party influential in the government before and after the April counter-coup attempt, because this attitude colored their interpretation of the origins of the massacres, the need for armed intervention, and the responsibility for enforcing justice afterwards, all topics that were dealt with by the French newspapers.

It was natural for these newspapers to support the CUP while it was powerful because this would aid France in her relations with the Ottoman Empire. Furthermore, this organization was seen as a progressive, Westernizing force<sup>20</sup>. In fact, all the papers were favorable towards the CUP except for *La Croix*, *La Bastille*, *Les Temps Nouveaux*, and *L'Intransigeant*. In the first three instances, ideology of one sort or another led to a different point of view. *La Croix*, a Catholic newspaper, associated the CUP with international freemasonry and Jews, objects of its most intense phobias. Furthermore, it feared for the interests of French Catholic missions abroad. Maurice Talmeyr summed this attitude up when in early June 1909 he wrote that he wanted to shatter the illusions of most Christians who saw the Young Turks as civilized and benevolent towards Christians. In fact, he stressed, most Young Turks were nonreligious rationalists with ties to freemasonry<sup>21</sup>. During the April counterrevolution, J.-J. C. wrote in support of the rebelling Liberal

20. For example, see "Bulletin de l'étranger," *Le Temps*, April 12, 15, and 30, 1909, p. 1; [ANONYMOUS "FRIEND"], "Encore Jeunes-Turcs et Vieux-Turcs," *La Croix*, June 25, 1909, p. 3.

21. MAURICE TALMEYR, "Jeunes-Turcs et Vieux-Turcs," *La Croix*, June 4, 1909, p. 1.



Union for the same reasons. He felt that it, unlike the CUP, was composed of true liberals in favor of a constitutional monarchy, administrative decentralization, and the traditional religions of the Ottoman Empire. *Le Temps*, said J.-J. C., wrongly claimed the Liberal Union was a secretive organization. The CUP, on the other hand, was indeed a violent and secret organization and was supported by international freemasonry<sup>22</sup>. Thus *La Croix* wherever possible took an anti-CUP point of view despite occasional attempts to present other points of view<sup>23</sup>. In its few commentaries on the Ottomans, *La Bastille* took the same stance as *La Croix* for the same reasons<sup>24</sup>.

*Les Temps Nouveaux* opposed the constitutional movement as a whole as a deception. As an anarchist paper, it saw the constitutional government as substituting many tyrants in the place of the one deposed, forming "golden chains" for the people<sup>25</sup>. This is the only editorial comment this weekly had that had any implications for Ottoman Armenians or Cilicia, thus confirming the lack of interest shown in its news coverage.

*L'Intransigeant's* position is somewhat more complex. A dislike for the Young Turks may be connected to hatred for the French premier who supported them. Flourens, a former minister of foreign affairs who wrote editorials for this newspaper, rather vitriolically called Clemenceau "the king of flies," and "our dictator," among other things. The *L'Intransigeant* writers also believed that the Ottoman Empire was bound to collapse, and so France should support its component nationalities which would eventually become independent states. Flourens felt in October 1908 that these nationalities were France's natural clients who had placed their hopes on French help. Opposing their struggles for independence would provoke their irreconcilable enmity and serve the purposes of English diplomacy<sup>26</sup>. J. M. in February 1909 states that "Whether they call themselves Fuad, Midhat or Ahmed Riza, all the Muslims know how to throw sand in the eyes of Europe and only try to live and gain time in order to prolong the Muslim domination which enslaves productive peoples

22. J.-J. C., "Les troubles en Turquie," *La Croix*, April 16, 1909, p. 1.

23. J.-J. C., "Les Jeunes-Turcs et le Sultan," *La Croix*, April 24, 1909, p. 1; [ANONYMOUS "FRIEND"], "Encore Jeunes-Turcs et Vieux-Turcs," *La Croix*, June 25, 1909, p. 3.

24. "La franc-maçonnerie en Turquie," *La Bastille*, October 3, 1908, p. 3; October 17, 1908, p. 3; April 24, 1909, p. 2; "Bulletin," May 1, 1909, p. 2.

25. MICHEL PETIT, "Les étapes de l'émancipation," *Les Temps Nouveaux*, May 15, 1909, p. 1.

26. FLOURENS, "Tribune libre: le rôle véritable de la France en Orient," *L'Intransigeant*, October 15, 1908, p. 1.

superior in civilisation and number to a barbarous and uncivilized minority"<sup>27</sup>. Fuad, Midhat, and Riza are all famous Ottoman reformers, and Riza was a CUP leader.

Strangely enough, however, Flourens changed his attitude concerning his support for the non-Turkish nationalities in January 1909, when Syrian separatists demanded to be heard at a proposed conference on the fate of the Ottoman Empire. He feared that other nationalities would also wish to participate and this could lead to the end of the Empire, which apparently was no longer a good thing for France. Perhaps he now felt that other European powers like Austria-Hungary or Russia would benefit the most from the Empire's disintegration and by annexing territories freeze out French commercial and economic interests. In any case, he now urged French support of the Young Turks. Only if the latter failed to secure equality and liberty for all did he feel that France then could loyally support the Syrians, and presumably other Ottoman nationalities like the Armenians<sup>28</sup>.

Nearly all of the papers placed the responsibility for the massacres on Muslims and usually felt there was some connection with the counter-coup attempt in Constantinople, but were less decided as to who was responsible: Sultan Abdülhamit, political reactionaries, religious figures, or the fanatic Muslim population at large. *Le Petit Parisien* felt they were the work of that old master, Abdülhamit<sup>29</sup>, and Henri Turot, writing in *La Petite République*, declared that the old regime was involved<sup>30</sup>. An introduction to despatches in *La Petite République* ascribed the massacres to the Muslim fanaticism of Asiatic Turkey which was in opposition to the European modernisation and constitutionalism that Armenians and other Christians represented to a certain degree<sup>31</sup>. Vivonne (a pseudonym) in *Le Figaro* felt that it was the revolt of fanatic hojas<sup>32</sup>. *La Croix* did not print any editorial opinions on responsibility for the massacres, but its despatches generally portrayed the Armenians as victims. Furthermore, it did not print any of the major interviews with Ottoman government representatives, while printing letters and other items condemning injustices against the Armenians. Perhaps responsibility for

27. J. M., "Ce qui se passe: La crise turque," *L'Intransigeant*, February 21, 1909, p. 1.

28. FLOURENS, "Tribune libre: le séparatisme en Turquie et la conférence," *L'Intransigeant*, January 11, 1909, p. 1.

29. "La terreur en Asie," *Le Petit Parisien*, May 8, 1909, p. 1.

30. HENRI TUROT, "Libres opinions: en Turquie," *La Petite République*, May 6, 1909, p. 1.

31. "Guerre civile en Turquie," *La Petite République*, April 18, 1909, p. 1.

32. VIVONNE, "L'ambassade de Constantinople," *Le Figaro*, April 30, 1909, p. 1.



the massacres seemed all too clear to the editorial board and readers of *La Croix* to require further commentary. An introduction to a set of early despatches in *L'Intransigeant* in April pointed to Muslim fanaticism. *L'Intransigeant* also published two editorials which implied that Sultan Abdülhamit was guilty but predominantly dwelt on the 1894-6 massacres. This focus may have been due to the active role their authors, Urbain Gohier and Séverine, played in protesting the first set of massacres over twenty years earlier<sup>33</sup>. *L'Événement* has only one bit of commentary on the Cilician massacres or their aftermath. It declares that Abdülhamit, and not spontaneous fanaticism, was behind the massacres, and the rule of the Young Turks would attenuate such incidents, though conflicts of races and religions would naturally always take place to a certain degree<sup>34</sup>. No newspaper directly blamed the Young Turks in power in the central government. None of these papers provided extended or sophisticated analyses<sup>35</sup>.

*Le Temps'* editorial policy is more complex, and changed over a period of time. *Le Temps* at first spoke of the role of the sultan and Islam in Cilician attacks on Armenians, who symbolized all supporters of the Ottoman constitution. In a more detailed discussion, on May 9, 1909, *Le Temps* placed the onus on local Muslims who killed Armenians in revenge for the constitution, and local officials who tolerated, if not organized, the massacres. Furthermore, the telegram of Adil Bey, an official in the Ministry of the Interior in Constantinople, ordering Europeans not to be touched, was interpreted as a license for the murder of Armenians by the Cilician population<sup>36</sup>. However, for reasons soon to be examined below, *Le Temps* adopted a different interpretation a few weeks later. While *Le Temps* continued to find the local Adana authorities gravely compromised by the massacres, and deserving of punishment, it now found that the central authorities connected with

33. URBAIN GOHIER, "Tribune libre: pour Abdul-Hamid," *L'Intransigeant*, May 7, 1909, p. 1; SÉVERINE, "Tribune libre: évocations," *L'Intransigeant*, May 6, 1909, p. 1; "Les perturbations turques," *L'Intransigeant*, April 19, 1909, p. 1.

34. "Les événements de Turquie: l'investiture du sabre," *L'Événement*, May 11, 1909, p. 2.

35. It should be noted that there appeared to be a genuine concern over the Armenian victims of the massacres, though Eurocentric bias occasionally reared its head. J.-J. C. of *La Croix*, for example, found the massacres of Europeans the most disquieting aspect of the events during the counter-coup in the Ottoman Empire (J.-J. C., "La guerre civile en Turquie: calme relatif," *La Croix*, April 27, 1909, p. 1).

36. "Bulletin de l'étranger: le succès des Jeunes-Turcs," *Le Temps*, April 20, 1909, p. 1; "Bulletin de l'étranger: les massacres d'Asie-Mineure," *Le Temps*, May 9, 1909, p. 1. The May 9 editorial pleased the Armenians (BART'EWAN and KIWRJEAN, p. x; [n. a., probably ARSHAG CHÖBANEAN], *Anahid*, 11, p. 48).

the Young Turks played no role in the massacres. The Armenians thought Adil Bey encouraged the massacres, but Minister of the Interior Ferid Pasha convinced the Ottoman Chamber that Adil Bey bore no responsibility for them<sup>37</sup>. In September, after the Armenian patriarch's resignation, *Le Temps* even went so far as to say that the massacres were just a result of local tensions. These tensions were created by legitimate activities of Armenians which were viewed as provocations by Muslims. The assassination of a Muslim by two Armenians while the central government was weakened from the counter-coup was the final spark that lit the fuse<sup>38</sup>. Letters of Armenians protesting this editorial led *Le Temps* to again shift its position, this time in the opposite direction. In an editorial repeating the differing points of view expressed by Turks and Armenians on the massacres, *Le Temps* stated that it was not trying to judge from afar, but merely wanted to work for the reconciliation of Armenians and Turks. However, it did go on to declare that there was no doubt that history indicates the Turkish responsibility for the Adana events as preponderant<sup>39</sup>.

During the massacres nearly all the papers favored at least some degree of European intervention. In *La Croix*, J.-J. C. on April 28, 1909 expressed his hope that the French and English warships which had arrived at Beirut would intimidate the fanatic Muslims<sup>40</sup>. On May 8, 1909, the introduction/summary to *L'Intransigeant's* dispatches from the Ottoman Empire pointed out the importance of the suppression of massacres and fanaticism by pro-constitutional Ottoman Third Army Corp commander Mahmud Shevket's forces, and ominously noted that the very existence of the Ottoman Empire depended on their success<sup>41</sup>. Some writers were critical of the limited actions of the powers. *Le Petit Parisien* noted that though the great powers were concerned about cutting the massacres short, the fanatics of the interior of Turkey were not impressed by foreign cruisers which appeared to them incapable of decisive action<sup>42</sup>. In the introduction to an article in *L'Intransigeant* composed of news dispatches on events in the Ottoman Empire at the end of April, it is deplored that European warships do nothing while: "There the true ferocious Turks

37. "Bulletin de l'étranger: France et Turquie," *Le Temps*, May 19, 1909, p. 1. On Adil Bey see SEROPIAN, 1909, pp. 51-2.

38. "Bulletin de l'étranger: la question arménienne," *Le Temps*, September 30, 1909, p. 1.

39. "Bulletin de l'étranger: les massacres d'Adana et les responsabilités," *Le Temps*, October 15, 1909, p. 1.

40. J.-J. C., "L'état de siège à Constantinople," *La Croix*, April 28, 1909, p. 1.

41. "La terreur turque," *L'Intransigeant*, May 8, 1909, p. 1.

42. "La terreur en Asie," *Le Petit Parisien*, May 8, 1909, p. 1.



burn, pillage, and kill."<sup>43</sup> Vivonne, a writer for *Le Figaro*, wondered at the end of April if France would continue to renounce its glorious past of protection of the Catholic schools in the Orient or would police the area to protect her missionaries<sup>44</sup>. J. B. wrote in *La Bastille* on May 1 that, "Civilized Europe smiles and lets events take their course in order to please Muslims and Jews."<sup>45</sup> *La Petite République* did not have any editorial comments on intervention.

*Le Temps'* editorial policy concerning European intervention changed parallel to its stance on responsibility for the massacres. On April 20, 1909 it criticised the delay in sending warships to Cilicia by the European governments, who "have most placidly let the Armenians be killed." *Le Temps* declared that Europe was dishonored by the spilling of Christian blood, and its prestige lowered. Belief in the power of European intervention had been lost in the Orient<sup>46</sup>. Though the very next day it praised the the non-interventionist attitude of the powers in the general crisis as appropriate, with hopes that crisis would limit itself, this seems to be a temporary aberration perhaps due to the feeling that the situation did not worsen from the previous day; furthermore several European cruisers were now strategically in place<sup>47</sup>. At the end of April, *Le Temps* praised Shevket's expeditions but made the same threat as *L'Intransigeant*. If Muslim fanaticism erupted anew, the inertia of the European powers would not be able to prevent European public opinion from demanding protective measures: "And these measures could have unexpected consequences"<sup>48</sup>. *Le Temps* made its most bitter criticisms of the French government and public on May 9: "The powers prevented nothing since they foresaw nothing, and also because they have the habit of allowing Armenians to be killed," "And it is truly prodigious that one can, in our epoch, proceed with such suppressions without provoking a minute of emotion from governments or the public."<sup>49</sup> *Le Temps* softened its strongly critical attitude towards European, and notably French, non-intervention in Cilicia, and the causes of the massacres, after the subject was brought up in the French Chamber and the foreign minister justified his government's policy and its friendship with the Young Turks. *Le Temps* disagreed with Denys Cochin's criticism in the Chamber of

43. "Abdul-Hamid devant la cour martial," *L'Intransigeant*, April 30, 1909, p. 1.

44. VIVONNE, "L'ambassade de Constantinople," *Le Figaro*, April 30, 1909, p. 1.

45. J. B., "Bulletin," *La Bastille*, May 1, 1909, p. 2.

46. "Bulletin de l'étranger: le succès des Jeunes-Turcs," *Le Temps*, April 20, 1909, p. 1.

47. "Bulletin de l'étranger: le succès des Jeunes-Turcs," *Le Temps*, April 21, 1909, p. 1.

48. "Bulletin de l'étranger: état de siège et Constantinople," *Le Temps*, April 28, 1909, p. 1.

49. "Bulletin de l'étranger: les massacres d'Asie-Mineure," *Le Temps*, May 9, 1909, p. 1.

the relative lack of action of the French cruisers, and his demand that France place pressure on the new Ottoman regime to assure order. It justified its new position by suggesting that European aid might have worsened the situation by inflaming religious and national hatreds. International precautions would also have had to be taken to avoid the risks of an isolated intervention<sup>50</sup>.

Why did *Le Temps* change its stance? Perhaps it was time to set aside emotional reactions and follow the government line, as *Le Temps* generally was wont to do. The debate in the Chamber showed the road to follow. The real danger in Cilicia and the Ottoman Empire appeared to be over, with intervention no longer necessary. The CUP emerged a clear victor with which France desired good relations for economic and political reasons. The Young Turks should be given a chance to execute reforms on their own, though Europe could still remind them of what was expected.

Moreover, apparently the critical articles in *Le Temps* and other French papers were not well taken in the Ottoman Empire, whose ambassadors defended their central government's actions and claimed that both Armenians and Muslims were to blame in Cilicia<sup>51</sup>. Thus, *Le Temps* had to backpedal on this issue, as noted above. It assured the Ottomans of French goodwill on the occasion of an extraordinary Ottoman mission which had come to the President of the French Republic to announce the ascension of a new sultan to the Ottoman throne. *Le Temps* insisted that all its criticism was given in the spirit of true friendship, and that there wasn't a more disinterested power concerning the Ottomans in Europe<sup>52</sup>. Almost a month later *Le Temps* repeated similar statements<sup>53</sup>. *Le Temps* soon felt that the cordial reception of the new French ambassador to Constantinople, Bompard, showed that the statements of the past months were understood "correctly" by the Ottomans. It also praised the Ottoman government's appointments of provincial officials, notably that of Jemal bey to Adana<sup>54</sup>.

Most of the papers did not deal editorially with the aftermath of the Cilician massacres. This was due to the same reasons as the paucity of news coverage of this period. Events were not as directly dramatic, people

50. "Bulletin de l'étranger: France et Turquie," *Le Temps*, May 19, 1909, p. 1.

51. "Les massacres en Asie-Mineure: une note de l'ambassade ottomane," *La Petite République*, May 24, 1909, p. 3; "En Turquie," *Le Temps*, May 28, 1909, p. 1.

52. "Bulletin de l'étranger: France et Turquie," *Le Temps*, June 15, 1909, p. 1.

53. "Bulletin de l'étranger: les députés turques à Paris," *Le Temps*, July 11, 1909 p. 1.

54. "Bulletin de l'étranger: France et Turquie," *Le Temps*, August 8, 1909, p. 1.



may have gotten bored with the continued recent coverage, and the French were not very involved. More dangerous politically was the possibility that the CUP would be offended and French-Ottoman relations adversely affected. *Le Temps* commented on these events due both to its greater interest in international affairs, and probably its need as a semi-official paper to express France's opinions on these issues. *La Croix* had a decided interest in international affairs concerning Christians, and, unlike *Le Temps*, it may have been pleased at the chance to criticize the actions of the CUP.

Moukhbir (a pseudonym), very favorable towards the Armenians, recounted in *La Croix* the many unfulfilled government promises and injustices that led the Armenian patriarch in Constantinople to resign in protest. On October 16, Moukhbir criticized the Ottoman government's attempt to protect the most important instigators of the Cilician massacres while trying to placate the Armenians by consenting to the retrial of only one official. Moukhbir felt that the Armenian patriarch's demands were just and that he would not be fooled by such a ploy. Moukhbir summarized the situation again at the end of December, when little had changed, but strangely had not commented on the withdrawal of the patriarch's resignation by the end of February 1910<sup>55</sup>. Perhaps he was upset because he felt the patriarch was indeed fooled into doing this by false promises.

*Le Temps*, in contrast with *La Croix*, at first continued its policy of placating the CUP. Towards the end of May 1909, it declared that nobody could doubt the sincerity of the Ottoman government's desire to punish the guilty<sup>56</sup>. In September, it praised the recent Armenian Revolutionary Federation-CUP accord. It felt that the CUP's "courageous" attitude in favor of bringing the Cilician events to light and demanding the necessary sanctions convinced the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, the largest Ottoman Armenian political party, of CUP sincerity and led to the signing of the agreement<sup>57</sup>.

At the end of September, after the Armenian patriarch's resignation, *Le Temps* conceded that the accord did not settle the Armenians' problems. It felt, however, that the Young Turks were acting impartially and correctly in attempting to carry out the new death sentences of the

55. MOUKHBIR, "Chronique de la Turquie," *La Croix*, October 6, 1909, p. 3; October 16, 1909, p. 3; December 25, 26, 27, 1909, p. 4.

56. "Bulletin de l'étranger: France et Turquie," *Le Temps*, May 19, 1909, p. 1.

57. "Bulletin de l'étranger: les questions de races en Turquie," *Le Temps*, September 12, 1909, p. 1.

court-martial, including those of five Armenians. As far as the criticism of lack of punishment of culpable high ranking Ottoman officials, *Le Temps* responded that the CUP would love to do so if evidence actually existed implicating any members of the old regime<sup>58</sup>. This was the same editorial that brought on such vehement responses from Armenians and Armenophiles, as noted above; but it coincided with a visit by Ottoman military leader Shevket Pasha to Paris, and it cheered Ottoman authorities in Adana, according to a British consular report<sup>59</sup>. A few weeks later, *Le Temps*, in its response to Armenian protests, added that the Armenians must be patient and understand the problems the CUP faces, which make it difficult for justice to be fully realized<sup>60</sup>.

Finally, in a discussion of Grand Vizir Hussein Hilmi Pasha's resignation at the end of December, 1909, *Le Temps* began to show changes in its attitude towards the CUP. It mentioned the unconfirmed rumors that the CUP criticized Hilmi Pasha's decision to open a new Adana inquiry after the Armenian Apostolic patriarch offered to prove that the Cilician Armenians condemned were innocent. The Armenians were indeed proven innocent by the inquiry and Hilmi Pasha pardoned them. *Le Temps* did not try to explain at this point the contradiction with the sentiments expressed in the September 30 editorial that the Armenians condemned may very well have been guilty and that in any case their sentences were a product of the regular Ottoman judicial process which had to be carried out. *Le Temps* went on to note that only Muslims were hanged (which was not true until after September), and public discussion of such a circumstance in the Ottoman Empire could have stirred up a great deal of Muslim resentment. This could have been the reason why the CUP asked Hilmi Pasha to retire without any discussion. *Le Temps* stated that it hoped this was not true, but that if it were, it extended its sympathies to Hilmi Pasha. It ended by concluding that the CUP's influence on the Ottoman government was unconstitutional and abnormal<sup>61</sup>. Like *La Croix*, *Le Temps* did not deal with the patriarch's return to office. For *Le Temps*, perhaps the whole issue of responsibility for the Cilician massacres was a touchy subject, by this time best left forgotten.

58. "Bulletin de l'étranger: la question arménienne," *Le Temps*, September 30, 1909, p. 1.

59. ADOSSIDÈS, p. 137; Chافت to Lowther, no. 12, Adana, October 13, 1909, enclosure in British Foreign Office 221-51, Lowther to Grey, no. 866, October 21, 1909, p. 58.

60. "Bulletin de l'étranger: les massacres d'Adana et les responsabilités," *Le Temps*, October 15, 1909, p. 1.

61. "Bulletin de l'étranger: la démission de Hilmi Pacha," *Le Temps*, December 31, 1909, p. 1.



The Cilician massacres, which involved French missionaries in acts of heroism and danger, provided a springboard for those who advocated an active exercise of a French religious protectorate in the Orient. *Le Temps* felt that years of anticlerical prejudice and the rupture with the Vatican weakened the French position, but Foreign Minister Pichon's declaration in the Chamber that France would actively exercise its protectorate was a step in the right direction<sup>62</sup>. *Le Temps* on another occasion pointed out, quite correctly, that whether one likes it or not France is largely represented by clerics in the Orient. It then proceeded to criticize Professor Aulard, who allegedly protested proposals to award decorations to French clerics of Cilicia for their actions, as well as the sanctimoniousness of Constans, the former French ambassador to the Ottomans<sup>63</sup>. Aulard quickly responded, denying all the charges made against him<sup>64</sup>. J.-J. C. of *La Croix* praised *Le Temps*' high valuation of the role of French Catholic clerics in the Orient during the Aulard controversy, but felt that it was deluded if it hoped that Pichon was going to alter the official policy of anticlericalism<sup>65</sup>. Vivonne of *Le Figaro* also espoused a more active French protectorate in the Orient, as we have seen.

## CONCLUSION

What makes French newspaper coverage of the Cilician massacres particularly interesting is that there was a precedent for such coverage. In the mid-1890's a great battle took place in these newspapers which soon became overshadowed by the Dreyfus affair<sup>66</sup>. Many of the great figures of French socialism and republicanism/radicalism, such as Jean Jaurès and Georges Clemenceau, criticised the inaction of the relatively con-

62. "Bulletin de l'étranger: France et Turquie," *Le Temps*, August 8, 1909, p. 1.

63. "Bulletin de l'étranger: France et Turquie," *Le Temps*, June 15, 1909, p. 1.

64. "Bulletin de l'étranger: France et Turquie," *Le Temps*, June 17, 1909, p. 1.

65. J.-J. C., "Les missions catholiques d'Orient," *La Croix*, June 18, 1909, p. 1.

66. EDMOND KHAYADJIAN, *Archag Tchobanian et le mouvement arménophile en France* (Marseille: Centre National de Documentation Pédagogique, 1986); GÉRARD BÉDROSSIAN et NICOLE PRIOLLAUD, *Arménie, j'écris ton nom: histoires de France et d'Arménie* (Paris: Éditions Liana Levi, Collection Écrivains reporters, 1990), pp. 127-144; MADELEINE REBÉROUX, "Jean Jaurès and the Armenians," *Armenian Review*, 44, 2/174, summer 1991, pp. 1-11; MICHAEL VARANDIAN, "A Great Armenophile: Francis Dehaut de Pressense [sic]," *Armenian Review*, 11, no. 3-43, autumn 1958, pp. 13-22, transl. from id., "Mart mē: Brēssansēi mahuan dasnameagin," *Hayrenik' amsakir*, 1, no. 6, April 1923, pp. 34-40, and no. 11, September 1923, pp. 52-61.

servative French government of the time, and in particular that of Foreign Minister Hanotaux, in the face of the massacres of several hundred thousand Armenians conducted under the aegis of Sultan Abdülhamit II. Even some extreme rightists like Édouard Drumont and fervent Catholics such as the Assomptionists associated with the newspaper *La Croix* spoke out against their government's policies. Leading French intellectuals like Charles Péguy, Romain Rolland and Anatole France joined in the outcry. The Ottoman government was so unnerved by this criticism, which it feared could eventually affect the policy of the French government, that it bribed various French journalists to deny or minimize the Armenian massacres of 1894-6, while throwing responsibility for any deaths on the Armenians themselves<sup>67</sup>.

A good number of the French defenders of the Armenians soon became involved in the Dreyfus affair, on one side or another. If the general public had forgotten about the Armenians, many of these intellectuals and public figures had not. Romain Rolland, for example, excoriated those who now turned a deaf ear to the Armenians, and noted the connection between these different manifestations of injustice<sup>68</sup>. A French Armenophile movement continued its activities until the Young Turks' success in proclaiming a constitution for the Ottoman Empire in July 1908.

Many of the Armenophiles were won over by the Young Turks. Jean Jaurès is a good example. He saw the latter as a progressive force and opposed French military intervention in Cilicia<sup>69</sup>. In addition, France as a state continued to pursue close relations with the Ottoman Empire, in particular for financial motives. Thus, as one student of the French Armenophiles has noted, the Cilician massacres did not lead to an outcry on as great a scale as the Hamidian massacres<sup>70</sup>.

If the Parisian newspapers with the best international coverage did give their readers an opportunity to become aware of the Cilician massacres, they were not as clear as to who was responsible and how justice could be best attained. The newspapers with less coverage only gave their readers a rough idea as to what took place. Readers of ideologically extreme weeklies did not even know this much. The only real attempt to stir public opinion and influence the government was during the heat

67. KHAYADJIAN, p. 45; URBAIN GOHIER, "Tribune libre: les mouchards du Sultan Rouge," *L'Intransigeant*, September 12, 1908, p. 1; id., "Tribune libre: pour Abdul-Hamid," *L'Intransigeant*, May 7, 1909, p. 1; ALBERT, pp. 270-275; on general venality of French press, see MANEY, pp. 144-6.

68. BÉDROSSIAN and PRIOLLAUD, p. 142.

69. REBÉROUX, pp. 6-7.

70. KHAYADJIAN, p. 170.



of the massacres, when nearly all newspapers briefly called for French intervention.

While there were periodic public statements or interviews issued by Ottoman authorities, and information provided by Armenians to the newspapers, few impassioned wars of words were fought on paper during the massacres. None of the dailies except for *Le Temps* and *La Croix* paid much attention to the injustices occurring afterwards in Cilicia, when attempts were made to portray the Armenian victims as responsible for their own deaths and destruction. *Le Temps*, as we have seen, for long periods of time was supportive of the CUP, and downplayed the renewed oppression taking place. Only *La Croix*, through Moukhibir's commentary, was consistently critical.

ARAM ARKUN