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NEGATIVE PHILOSOPHY: We need more study before we can label the Armenian “genocide”.

The Armenian genocide historical debate is not over: There’s still great dispute over what happened 100 years ago

Prof. Guenter Lewy 2005. (professor emeritus at the University of Massachusetts Amherst; Holocaust survivor from a Jewish family that fled Nazi Germany in 1938; has received numerous distinctions and fellowships including the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Rockefeller Foundation) The Armenian Massacres in Ottoman Turkey: A Disputed Genocide <http://www.amazon.com/Armenian-Massacres-Ottoman-Turkey-Disputed/dp/0874808901>

The literature on what Armenians call the first genocide of the twentieth century and what most Turks refer to as an instance of intercommunal warfare and a wartime relocation is voluminous. Yet despite the great outpouring of writing, an acrimonious debate over what actually happened almost one hundred years ago continues unabated. The highly charged historical dispute burdens relations between Turkey and Armenia and increases tensions in a volatile region. It also crops up periodically in ocher parts of the world when members of the Armenian diaspora push for recognition of the Armenian genocide by their respective parliaments and the Turkish government threatens retaliation.

It isn’t like Holocaust denial: Some of the best-known expert scholars question the Armenian situation

Prof. Guenter Lewy 2005. (professor emeritus at the University of Massachusetts Amherst; Holocaust survivor from a Jewish family that fled Nazi Germany in 1938; has received numerous distinctions and fellowships including the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Rockefeller Foundation) The Armenian Massacres in Ottoman Turkey: A Disputed Genocide <http://www.amazon.com/Armenian-Massacres-Ottoman-Turkey-Disputed/dp/0874808901>

Supporters of the Armenian cause have referred to the alleged Turkish genocide of the Armenians as an "established, incontrovertible historical fact," thus making it a closed issue similar to the Jewish Holocaust that would be questioned only by pseudo-historians such as Arthur Butz and Robert Faurisson. Yet the scholars who signed the Open Letter and who have questioned the appropriateness of the genocide label cannot be dismissed as a fringe group; they include some of the best-known experts on the history of Turkey. Even as strong a defender of the Armenian position as the historian Taner Akcam has acknowledged the difference between the generally accepted historical reality of the Holocaust and the issue of the Armenian massacres. “One cannot deal with this set of questions as with the National Socialist crimes and the ‘Auschwitz lie,' which are settled unequivocally both historically and legally. With regard to the relations between Turks and Armenians we are miles away from such a situation.”

Both sides are using propaganda and flawed research. We need a genuine search for truth.

Prof. Guenter Lewy 2005. (professor emeritus at the University of Massachusetts Amherst; Holocaust survivor from a Jewish family that fled Nazi Germany in 1938; has received numerous distinctions and fellowships including the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Rockefeller Foundation) The Armenian Massacres in Ottoman Turkey: A Disputed Genocide <http://www.amazon.com/Armenian-Massacres-Ottoman-Turkey-Disputed/dp/0874808901>

The Treaty of Lausanne, signed on July 24, 1923, ended the dream of an Armenian state that would include the eastern provinces of Anatolia, the heartland of historic Armenia, and Cilicia. The setback was serious and deeply demoralizing. It was not until 1965, the fiftieth anniversary of what Armenians began to call the first genocide of the twentieth century, that Armenians in Soviet Armenia and in the worldwide diaspora started to focus new attention on the events of 1915-16. History became a tool to highlight the suffering and injustices suffered by the Armenian nation. At the same time, the Turkish side stepped up its efforts to deny the alleged genocide and to insist on its version of history. Since then both sides have used heavy-handed tactics to advance their cause and silence a full and impartial discussion of the issues in dispute. Both Turks and Armenians cite important documents out of context or simply ignore the historical setting altogether. A polemical and propagandistic style of writing now dominates the field and for the most part has displaced the search for historical truth.

HISTORICAL REVIEW – WHAT REALLY HAPPENED and WAS THERE AN ARMENIAN GENOCIDE?

Conflict was started by Marxist Armenian terrorist groups who violently attacked Turkish Muslims

Dr. Justin A. McCarthy 2005.  (PhD in Ottoman history; demographer, Ottoman Empire expert, and Balkan history expert and history professor at the University of Louisville, Kentucky) 24 Mar 2005 Armenian-Turkish Conflict <http://wilson.engr.wisc.edu/Armenia/justin.html>

It was not until Russian Armenians brought their nationalist ideology to Eastern Anatolia that Armenian rebellion became a real threat to the Ottoman State. Although there were others, two parties of nationalists were to lead the Armenian rebellion. The first, the Hunchakian Revolutionary Party, called the Hunchaks, was founded in Geneva, Switzerland in 1887 by Armenians from Russia. The second, the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, called the Dashnaks, was founded in the Russian Empire, in Tiflis, in 1890. Both were Marxist. Their methods were violent. The Hunchak and Dashnak Party Manifestos called for armed revolution in the Ottoman Empire. Terrorism, including the murder of both Ottoman officials and Armenians who opposed them, was part of the party platforms. Although they were Marxists, both groups made nationalism the most important part of their philosophy of revolution. In this they were much like the nationalist revolutionaries of Bulgaria, Macedonia, or Greece. Unlike the Greek or Bulgarian revolutionaries, the Armenians had a demographic problem. In Greece, the majority of the population was Greek. In Bulgaria, the majority was Bulgarian. In the lands claimed by the Armenians, however, Armenians were a fairly small minority. The region that was called "Ottoman Armenia," the "Six Vilâyets" of Sivas, Mamüretülaziz, Diyarbakir, Bitlis, Van, and Erzurum, was only 17% Armenian. It was 78% Muslim. This was to have important consequences for the Armenian revolution, because the only way to create the "Armenia" the revolutionaries wanted was to expel the Muslims who lived there. Anyone who doubts the intentions of the revolutionaries need only look at their record-actions such as the murder of one governor of Van Province and attempted murder of another, murders of police chiefs and other officials, the attempted assassination of sultan Abdülhamid II. These were radical nationalists who were at war with the Ottoman State.

Armenians massacred Turks in 1914 (7 months before the so-called “genocide” – actually deportation - of the Armenians)

Dr. Justin A. McCarthy 2005.  (PhD in Ottoman history; demographer, Ottoman Empire expert, and Balkan history expert and history professor at the University of Louisville, Kentucky) 24 Mar 2005 Armenian-Turkish Conflict <http://wilson.engr.wisc.edu/Armenia/justin.html> (Note: The “Dashnak” were a Marxist Armenian rebel/terrorist group)

Before the war began, Ottoman Army Intelligence reported on Dashnak plans: They would declare their loyalty to the Ottoman State, but increase their arming of their supporters. If war was declared, Armenian soldiers would desert to the Russian Army with their arms. The Armenians would do nothing if the Ottomans began to defeat the Russians. If the Ottomans began to retreat, the Armenians would form armed guerilla bands and attack according to plan. The Ottoman intelligence reports were correct, for that is exactly what happened. The Russians gave 2.4 million rubles to the Dashnaks to arm the Ottoman Armenians. They began distributing weapons to Armenians in the Caucasus and Iran in September of 1914. In that month, seven months before the Deportations were ordered, Armenian attacks on Ottoman soldiers and officials began. Deserters from the Ottoman Army at first formed into what officials called "bandit gangs." They attacked conscription officers, tax collectors, gendarmerie outposts, and Muslims on the roads. By December a general revolt had erupted in Van Province. Roads and telegraph lines were cut, gendarmerie outposts attacked, and Muslim villages burned, their inhabitants killed.

Ottomans deported the Armenians because the Armenians were helping the Russian Army invade Turkey

Dr. Justin A. McCarthy 2005.  (PhD in Ottoman history; demographer, Ottoman Empire expert, and Balkan history expert and history professor at the University of Louisville, Kentucky) 24 Mar 2005 Armenian-Turkish Conflict <http://wilson.engr.wisc.edu/Armenia/justin.html>

General histories of World War I, for example, name the wrong generals, move troops to the wrong places, and never seem to understand Ottoman strategy. They seldom mention the one most significant factor in the war-the incredible strength and endurance of Turkish soldiers. Why is this important to the Armenian Question? It is important because the danger from the Armenian rebellion and the reason for the Armenian deportations cannot be understood unless the military situation is understood. The Ottoman sources prove that the Armenian rebellion was an essential part of the Russian military plan. The Ottoman sources prove that the Armenian rebellion was an important part of the Russian victory. The Ottoman sources prove that the Armenian rebels were, in effect, soldiers in the Russian Army.

“Post-WW1 trials convicted Ottoman leaders of genocide, so that proves it” – Response: Those trials were bogus

Dr. Justin A. McCarthy 2005.  (PhD in Ottoman history; demographer, Ottoman Empire expert, and Balkan history expert and history professor at the University of Louisville, Kentucky) 24 Mar 2005 Armenian-Turkish Conflict <http://wilson.engr.wisc.edu/Armenia/justin.html>

An ideologue takes evidence wherever he can find it, and may invent the evidence he cannot find. He does not look too closely at the evidence, perhaps because he is afraid of what he will find. As an example, the ideologues contend that the trials of Ottoman leaders after World War I prove that the Turks were guilty of genocide. They do not mention that the so-called trials reached their verdicts when the British controlled Istanbul. They do not mention that the courts were in the hands of the Quisling Damad Ferid Pasha government, which had a long record of lying about its enemies, the Committee of Union and Progress. They do not mention that Damad Ferid would do anything to please the British and keep his job. They do not mention that the British, more honest than their lackeys, admitted that they could not find evidence of any "genocide." They do not mention that the defendants were not represented by their own lawyers. They do not mention that crimes against Armenians were only a small part of a long list of so-called crimes, everything the judges could invent. The ideologues do not mention that the courts should best be compared to those convened by Josef Stalin. The ideologues do not mention this evidence.

HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE

“Many Armenians Suffered” is true, but not enough to prove genocide

Prof. Guenter Lewy 2005. (professor emeritus at the University of Massachusetts Amherst; Holocaust survivor from a Jewish family that fled Nazi Germany in 1938; has received numerous distinctions and fellowships including the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Rockefeller Foundation) The Armenian Massacres in Ottoman Turkey: A Disputed Genocide <http://www.amazon.com/Armenian-Massacres-Ottoman-Turkey-Disputed/dp/0874808901>

The key issue in this quarrel, it should be stressed at the outset, is not the extent of Armenian suffering, but rather the question of pre-meditation: that is, whether the Young Turk regime during the First World War intentionally organized the massacres that took place. Both sides agree that large numbers of Christians perished and that the deportation of the Armenian community was accompanied by many excesses. Several hundred thousand men, women, and children were forced from their homes with hardly any notice; and during a harrowing trek over mountains and through deserts uncounted multitudes died of starvation and disease or were murdered. To the victims it makes no difference whether they met their death as the result of a carefully planned scheme of annihilation, as the consequence of a panicky reaction to a misjudged threat, or for any other reason. It does make a difference for the accuracy of the historical record, not to mention the future of Turkish-Armenian relations.

There was lots of killing on both sides: It was war, not genocide

Dr. Justin A. McCarthy 2005.  (PhD in Ottoman history; demographer, Ottoman Empire expert, and Balkan history expert and history professor at the University of Louisville, Kentucky) 24 Mar 2005 Armenian-Turkish Conflict <http://wilson.engr.wisc.edu/Armenia/justin.html>

The Armenian Nationalists have decided that they will win their political fight if no one knows there is a scholarly opposition to their ideology. Therefore, Armenian Nationalists will only meet with Turks who first state that Turks committed genocide. These are described in the American and European press as "Turkish scholars." Readers are left with the impression, a carefully-cultivated impression, that Turkish scholars believe there was a genocide. Readers are left with the impression that it is only the Turkish Government that denies there was a genocide. We know this is not true. Every year many books and articles are published in Turkey that not only deny the "Armenian Genocide" but document Armenian persecution of Turks. Conferences are held. Mass graves of innocent Turks killed by Armenian Nationalists are found. Museums and monuments are opened to commemorate the Turkish dead. Historians who have seen the Ottoman archival records or read the Turkish books on the Armenian Question do not accept the idea of a genocide. They know that in wartime many Armenians were killed by Turks, and that many Turks were killed by Armenians. They know that this was war, not genocide.

Massacre of Armenians wasn’t like Nazi Germany: Armenians were in armed rebellion against the Turkish government

Dr. Bernard Lewis 2002. (PhD in history of Islam;  Professor Emeritus of Near Eastern Studies at Princeton University) 14 Apr 2002 Distinguishing Armenian Case from Holocaust, <http://www.ataa.org/reference/lewis.pdf>

But in this particular case, the point that was being made was that the massacre of the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire was the same as what happened to Jews in Nazi Germany and that is a downright falsehood. What happened to the Armenians was the result of a massive Armenian armed rebellion against the Turks, which began even before war broke out, and continued on a larger scale. Great numbers of Armenians, including members of the armed forces, deserted, crossed the frontier and joined the Russian forces invading Turkey. Armenian rebels actually seized the city of Van and held it for a while intending to hand it over to the invaders. There was guerilla warfare all over Anatolia. And it is what we nowadays call the National Movement of Armenians Against Turkey. The Turks certainly resorted to very ferocious methods in repelling it.

It wasn’t a genocide because there was no evidence of a government decision to massacre the Armenians

Dr. Bernard Lewis 2002. (PhD in history of Islam;  Professor Emeritus of Near Eastern Studies at Princeton University) 14 Apr 2002 Distinguishing Armenian Case from Holocaust, <http://www.ataa.org/reference/lewis.pdf>

There is clear evidence of a decision by the Turkish Government, to deport the Armenian population from the sensitive areas. Which meant naturally the whole of Anatolia. Not including the Arab provinces which were then still part of the Ottoman Empire. There is no evidence of a decision to massacre. On the contrary, there is considerable evidence of attempt to prevent it, which were not very successful. Yes there were tremendous massacres, the numbers are very uncertain but a million nay may well be likely. The massacres were carried out by irregulars, by local villagers responding to what had been done to them and in number of other ways.

“Turks are hiding documents” – Responses: 1) crucial documents were destroyed at the end of WW1. 2) they’ve released other documents. 3) the Turkish documents aren’t that important anyway.

Prof. Guenter Lewy 2005. (professor emeritus at the University of Massachusetts Amherst; Holocaust survivor from a Jewish family that fled Nazi Germany in 1938; has received numerous distinctions and fellowships including the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Rockefeller Foundation) The Armenian Massacres in Ottoman Turkey: A Disputed Genocide <http://www.amazon.com/Armenian-Massacres-Ottoman-Turkey-Disputed/dp/0874808901>

Crucial Turkish documents were destroyed at the end of World War I, so that even a person who knows Turkish and can read it in its old script most likely would not be able to write a definitive history of these occurrences. My aim has been to deal with this emotion-laden subject without political preconceptions and to carry out a critical analysis of the two historiographies. Time and again, it will be seen, authors on both sides have engaged in highly questionable tactics of persuasion that include willful mistranslations, citing important documents out of context, or simply ignoring the historical setting altogether. After this uninviting task of "cleaning out the stables" (the results of which probably will please neither side), I attempt a historical reconstruction of the events in question—to show what can be known as established fact, what must be considered unknown as of today, and what will probably have to remain unknowable. My hope is that such an undertaking will clarify and advance our understanding of these fateful occurrences and perhaps also help build bridges between the two rival camps. The Turkish government has issued collections of pertinent documents in translation, but the material from Western sources outweighs the available Turkish records (translated and untranslated), if not in quantity then in importance.

“Lack of Armenian genocide publicity led to Hitler’s genocide” – Response: Theory rests on a shaky factual foundation

Prof. Guenter Lewy 2005. (professor emeritus at the University of Massachusetts Amherst; Holocaust survivor from a Jewish family that fled Nazi Germany in 1938; has received numerous distinctions and fellowships including the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Rockefeller Foundation) The Armenian Massacres in Ottoman Turkey: A Disputed Genocide <http://www.amazon.com/Armenian-Massacres-Ottoman-Turkey-Disputed/dp/0874808901>

Pro-Armenian authors, too, have tried to link their opponents to Hitler's Holocaust. "There is now some evidence to suggest," writes Dadrian, "that the impunity accorded the Turks in the aftermath of the World War I genocide by the rest of the world served to stimulate Hitler to embark upon his own initiatives of genocide." Dadrian does not say what that evidence is, but he is probably thinking of a reference to the Armenian massacres that Hitler is said to have included in a speech before his generals on August 22, 1939. In the context of outlining Germany's need for Lebensraum (vital space) and the destruction of people standing in the way of this expansion, Hitler is supposed to have said: "Who still talks nowadays of the extermination of the Armenians?" This statement is frequently quoted to suggest that Hitler felt encouraged to pursue his plan to exterminate the Jews of Europe because the world did not punish the Ottoman Turks for their annihilation of the Armenians. There are several problems with this charge. First, it is generally accepted that by August 1939 Hitler had not yet decided upon the destruction of the Jews, the Final Solution of the Jewish Question. The remark therefore can have referred only to the forthcoming ruthlessness of the military campaign against the Slays and not to the destruction of the Jews. More importantly. a controversy exists with regard to the authenticity of this reference to the Armenians. Without entering into the minutiae of this dispute, it must suffice to note here that we have no stenographic record of Hitler's speech on that day in 1939 but only five sets of notes taken by persons who heard the speech. Two of these versions were accepted as evidence by the Nuremberg Tribunal in 1945; the version containing the remark about the Armenians was not. The pro-Turkish historian Heath Lowry therefore speaks of "a spurious quotation," which probably overstates the significance of this action by the Nuremberg court. In a more thorough analysis of the speech the German historian Winfried Baumgart allows for the possibility (that the sentence in question represents an embellishment of points made in the speech. Other scholars have lined up on one side or the other of this controversy, which must be regarded as irresolvable. The Armenian attempt to see in this purported remark by Hitler a link between the Armenian massacres and the Jewish Holocaust therefore stands on a shaky factual foundation.

SOLVENCY

No reconciliation: Resolutions harden Turkey’s position because they fear further concessions will be demanded

Prof. Guenter Lewy 2005. (professor emeritus at the University of Massachusetts Amherst; Holocaust survivor from a Jewish family that fled Nazi Germany in 1938; has received numerous distinctions and fellowships including the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Rockefeller Foundation) The Armenian Massacres in Ottoman Turkey: A Disputed Genocide <http://www.amazon.com/Armenian-Massacres-Ottoman-Turkey-Disputed/dp/0874808901>

Some Armenians would be satisfied with an official statement by the Turkish government that it deeply regrets the great suffering of the Armenians during World War I. Yet many other Armenians still vehemently condemn the Turks for perpetrating a premeditated genocide, and for some of them the return of the Armenian homeland "is the only meaningful redress the Turks can make for the massacres." This demand in turn causes the Turks to refuse to make even a limited admission of wrongdoing, for they fear that any concession would initiate a chain reaction, leading to sweeping demands for financial and even territorial restitution.

DISADVANTAGES

1. Harms US/Turkey relations

Link: Armenian genocide resolution would seriously damage Turkey/US relationship

Prof. Guenter Lewy 2005. (professor emeritus at the University of Massachusetts Amherst; Holocaust survivor from a Jewish family that fled Nazi Germany in 1938; has received numerous distinctions and fellowships including the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Rockefeller Foundation) The Armenian Massacres in Ottoman Turkey: A Disputed Genocide <http://www.amazon.com/Armenian-Massacres-Ottoman-Turkey-Disputed/dp/0874808901>

Despite this disclaimer, however, in actual fact the State Department has continued to use such arguments in opposing all subsequent congressional resolutions that have sought to recognize the Armenian genocide. At times the department has also acknowledged that such a resolution would seriously damage the strategically vital relationship between Turkey and the United States. There can be little doubt that this is indeed the most important reason why all U.S. administrations over many years have consistently objected to the ado ion of such a statement of recognition.

Impact: We need Turkey for stability and prosperity in the Mid East

American Forces Press Service 2012. (written by Army Sgt 1st Class Tyrone Marshall) published by US Dept of Defense, “Panetta Praises U.S.-Turkish Alliance, Pledges More Support” 12 June 2012 <http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=116697>

The defense secretary noted as part of this effort, the U.S. also wants to encourage nations like Turkey “whose values we share” to help advance peace and security in these regions. “As part of a shared vision for security and stability in the Middle East, the United States strongly supports Turkey's growing and vital leadership role as a prosperous, democratic nation that is an anchor of security, and an engine of growth for the region's economy,” Panetta said. “Together, Turkey and the United States are working closely to support the historic wave of democratic change that is sweeping the Middle East and North Africa,” he added. Turkey and the United States, Panetta said, are confronting nations blocking change and destabilizing behavior in the region such as Syria and Iran. The defense secretary said the U.S. and Turkey will continue to work together with the international community to bring pressure on Syria and Iran, because “there is no silver bullet here.” “We are more effective in achieving that objective when the international community stands together as one,” Panetta said.

2. Turkish economic boycott

Link: Turkey boycotts when genocide resolutions are enacted

Prof. Guenter Lewy 2005. (professor emeritus at the University of Massachusetts Amherst; Holocaust survivor from a Jewish family that fled Nazi Germany in 1938; has received numerous distinctions and fellowships including the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Rockefeller Foundation) The Armenian Massacres in Ottoman Turkey: A Disputed Genocide <http://www.amazon.com/Armenian-Massacres-Ottoman-Turkey-Disputed/dp/0874808901>

Turkish efforts to prevent the adoption of any commemoration of the Armenian massacres have continued. After the French parliament passed a law in early 2001 that recognized the killing of Armenians during World War I as genocide, the Turkish government canceled a $149-million deal to buy a spy satellite from the French firm Alcatel and excluded another French company from competing to sell Turkey tanks worth up to $7 billion. When the United States Congress considered a similar resolution during the election campaign of 2000, Turkey threatened an economic boycott and alluded to measures that could have disrupted U.S. air operations over northern Iraq that use bases in Turkey.

Link: Last time a genocide resolution was proposed, US defense contractors feared losing Turkish business

WALL STREET JOURNAL 2010. (journalists John D. McKinnon and Marc Champion) 4 Mar 2010 Genocide Vote Riles Turkey <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052748704187204575101981018521028>

The House panel's resolution, approved on a 23-22 vote, faces an uncertain future in Congress. But it nonetheless could damage U.S. relations with Turkey, a vital ally in the Middle East and Central Asia. Within minutes of the vote, Ankara said it was recalling its ambassador from Washington for consultations. Turkey took the same step in 2007, when the committee passed a similar resolution. Thursday's vote also raised concerns for big U.S. defense firms including Lockheed Martin Corp.  LMT +1.75% , Boeing Co. BA +0.66% , Raytheon Co. RTN +2.44% , United Technologies Corp. UTX +1.67% and Northrop Grumman Corp. NOC +2.13%Turkey is involved in several weapons projects with such companies, including helicopters, missiles and the F-35 fighter jet, and the companies are worried about losing business.

Impact: Jobs and economic growth threatened

White House Press Secretary 2013. “Fact Sheet: U.S.-Turkey Economic Partnership” 16 May 2013 <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/05/16/fact-sheet-us-turkey-economic-partnership> (brackets added)

Between 2009 and 2011, U.S. exports to Turkey increased 106 percent and, from 2010 to 2011, U.S. FDI [foreign direct investment] in Turkey nearly tripled.  Over 1,200 U.S. companies now operate in Turkey – an increase of nearly 50 percent since 2007.  Over the last two years, new investments by Cummins, Pratt and Whitney, AES, Dow, GE, 3M, AMGEN, and Pfizer are illustrative of increasing U.S. private sector interest in Turkey.  Many of the new successful joint ventures between U.S. and Turkish firms are designed to manufacture innovative products in Turkey for both domestic production and export to third country markets.  Examples include:  
- General Electric invested $900 million in 2012, AmGen made a $700 million acquisition, and 3M announced a $500 million project.    
- Ozkan Steel is planning to invest $150 million in a plant in Louisiana that will produce steel for the shipbuilding industry.    
- Borusan Mannesmann intends to manufacture steel pipes for shale gas production, investing $150 million in a construction facility that should become operational in the second half of 2014.  These two projects will create hundreds of jobs in the United States.

3. Sets back the search for truth

Link: Letting politicians vote on history blocks research into the truth and creates confusion

Prof. Guenter Lewy 2005. (professor emeritus at the University of Massachusetts Amherst; Holocaust survivor from a Jewish family that fled Nazi Germany in 1938; has received numerous distinctions and fellowships including the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Rockefeller Foundation) The Armenian Massacres in Ottoman Turkey: A Disputed Genocide <http://www.amazon.com/Armenian-Massacres-Ottoman-Turkey-Disputed/dp/0874808901>

It is possible, of course, to use the word "genocide" not as a legal concept under the exclusive ownership of the experts but as a "term of moral opprobrium" that is now part of our common discourse. Applied in this way the word "genocide" would express "a 75-year old moral consensus that a grave moral evil had been perpetrated against the Armenian people by the Ottoman regime." Yet we should remember that human history exhibits gradations or degrees of moral evil. We prejudge the precise nature of the evil suffered by the Ottoman Armenians by calling the deportations and massacres a case of genocide. With so much that is unknown about the workings of the Young Turk regime, it is highly presumptuous to cut off lines of inquiry that may end up putting some blame on others than just the "terrible Turk." To decide whether such conclusions are warranted is not the job of legislators but of historians. If we look to politicians for the confirmation of historical facts we may create more confusion than clarification. As a reviewer of the recently released moving picture Ararat has correctly put it: "If you turn the truth over to people who negotiate, you may end up with negotiated truth."

Link: Russians killed Armenians and Armenians killed Turks. Affirmative would have us ignore these historical facts

Dr. Justin A. McCarthy 2005.  (PhD in Ottoman history; demographer, Ottoman Empire expert, and Balkan history expert and history professor at the University of Louisville, Kentucky) 24 Mar 2005 Armenian-Turkish Conflict <http://wilson.engr.wisc.edu/Armenia/justin.html> (brackets added to show context)

Once careful preparations had been made, Armenians revolted in the City of Van. On April 20 [1915], well-armed Armenian units, many wearing military uniforms, took the city and drove Ottoman forces into the citadel. The rebels burned down most of the city, some buildings also being destroyed by the two canons the Ottomans had in the citadel. Troops were sent from the Erzurum and Iranian Fronts, but they were unable to relieve the city. The Russians and Armenians were advancing from the north and the southwest. On May 17 the Ottomans evacuated the citadel. Soldiers and civilians fought their way southwest around Lake Van. Some took to boats on the Lake, but nearly half of these were killed by rebels firing from the shore or when their boats ran aground. Some of the Muslims of Van survived at least for a while, put in the care of American missionaries. Most who did not escape were killed. Villagers were either killed in their homes or collected from surrounding areas and sent into the great massacre at Zeve. The ensuing suffering of the Muslims and Armenians is well known. It was a history of bloody warfare between peoples in which all died in great numbers. When the Ottomans retook much of the East, the Armenian population fled to Russia. There they starved and died of disease. When the Russians retook Van and Bitlis Provinces, they did not allow the Armenians to return, leaving them to starve in the North. The Russians wanted the land for themselves. It is also well known that Armenians who remained, those in Erzurum Province, massacred Muslims in great numbers at the end of the war.

Impact: Turn all the AFF harms about not-recognizing genocide. AFF is ignoring Russian and Armenian crimes.

4. Postpones reconciliation.

If we could stop insisting on the word “genocide,” we could probably get to an apology and reconciliation faster

Prof. Guenter Lewy 2005. (professor emeritus at the University of Massachusetts Amherst; Holocaust survivor from a Jewish family that fled Nazi Germany in 1938; has received numerous distinctions and fellowships including the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Rockefeller Foundation) The Armenian Massacres in Ottoman Turkey: A Disputed Genocide <http://www.amazon.com/Armenian-Massacres-Ottoman-Turkey-Disputed/dp/0874808901>

As mentioned earlier, some Armenians use the word "genocide" not as a legal concept but as a term of moral opprobrium that castigates the deportation and its attending huge loss of life as a grave moral evil. Paradoxical as it may seem, this way of approaching the problem may offer a way out of the frozen positions. If the Armenians could be persuaded to forego resort to the legal concept of genocide as a systematic and premeditated program of the destruction of a people and be satisfied with a Turkish acknowledgment of sincere regret for the terrible suffering of the Armenian people during the First World War, a path might open toward reconciliation. The Turkish political scientist Sina Aksin has suggested such a move in an official Turkish publication. Both Turks and Armenians should "accept publicly the fact that they inflicted great wrong on each other."

Reconciliation will only occur after we stop arguing over was-it-genocide-or-not

Prof. Guenter Lewy 2005. (professor emeritus at the University of Massachusetts Amherst; Holocaust survivor from a Jewish family that fled Nazi Germany in 1938; has received numerous distinctions and fellowships including the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Rockefeller Foundation) The Armenian Massacres in Ottoman Turkey: A Disputed Genocide <http://www.amazon.com/Armenian-Massacres-Ottoman-Turkey-Disputed/dp/0874808901>

Turks and Armenians, the historian Selim Deringil has urged, should "step back from the was-it-genocide-or-not dialogue of the deaf, which only leads to mutual recrimination and is ultimately unproductive" and instead concentrate on historical research that seeks a "common project of knowledge.' Ideally, Deringil writes, "the target should be a removal of the 'them' and 'us' as historians." Suny has similarly indicated that he is frustrated "by the usual sterile debates about whether a genocide occurred or not and by the banality of analysis and explanation." He, too, has proposed more empirically grounded historical research. Needless to say, the task of thus rescuing history from the grip and polemics of the politicians and nationalists is not an easy assignment. It and when it succeeds it may pave the way toward the reconciliation of Armenians and Turks and bring about the settlement of a conflict that has lasted all too long.

5. Hypocrisy

Link: After massacring the American Indians, how dare we condemn others?

Michael Hughes 2010. (Washington D.C.-based journalist and foreign policy analyst whose work has appeared in CNN, The Huffington Post and Afghan Online Press. He has been cited as an expert in Reuters and the Middle East Policy Journal and has made several live appearances on RT News. He is also a strategist for the New World Strategies Coalition which develops nonmilitary solutions for Afghanistan.; graduated from the University of Notre Dame with a history degree and is currently pursuing a Master's in Global Security Studies at Johns Hopkins University ) 7 Mar 2010 Who made the U.S. judge and jury of Armenian Genocide? <http://www.examiner.com/article/who-made-the-u-s-judge-and-jury-of-armenian-genocide> (ellipses in original)

How can the U.S., as well as Europeans, condemn Turkey when the North American Indian population had been reduced from an estimated 12 million in 1500 to just over 200,000 in 1900? Professor of ethnic studies at the University of Colorado [Ward Churchill](http://hnn.us/articles/7302.html" \t "_blank)described it as "vast genocide . . . the most sustained on record." Historian [David E. Stannard](http://hnn.us/articles/7302.html" \t "_blank)wrote that Native Americans had undergone the "worst human holocaust the world had ever witnessed, roaring across two continents non-stop for four centuries and consuming the lives of countless tens of millions of people." Many will argue that most Native American deaths were caused by disease, yet there is no question the U.S. government set in motion policies aimed at eradicating entire tribes. At a minimum, the U.S. is certainly guilty of cultural genocide. There is hard evidence that suggests there was a deep-rooted ideological motivation behind these policies. Euro-Americans saw themselves as the torchbearers of civilization and saw Native Americans as obstacles who failed to cultivate the vast wilderness, thus their extinction was inevitable.

Impact: [Aside from just being wrong] Hypocrisy in foreign policy undermines US credibility and creates enemies

Dr. Ted Galen Carpenter 2011. (Ph.D. in U.S. diplomatic history; senior fellow of foreign policy studies at The Cato Institute) 4 May 2011 The Hypocritical Strain in U.S. Foreign Policy <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/hypocritical-strain-us-foreign-policy>

No nation can be entirely consistent in its foreign policy. There will always be cases in which double standards cannot be avoided — or at least avoided without major damage to vital national interests. But policymakers should not casually engage in hypocrisy. That kind of behavior undermines credibility and creates needless enemies among foreign populations. Washington has been far too promiscuous in its use of foreign policy double standards over the decades, and it has paid a high price for such cynicism.

SOURCE INDICTMENTS

Turkish and Armenian sources are generally biased: they misrepresent historical documents by quoting out of context

Prof. Guenter Lewy 2005. (professor emeritus at the University of Massachusetts Amherst; Holocaust survivor from a Jewish family that fled Nazi Germany in 1938; has received numerous distinctions and fellowships including the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Rockefeller Foundation) The Armenian Massacres in Ottoman Turkey: A Disputed Genocide <http://www.amazon.com/Armenian-Massacres-Ottoman-Turkey-Disputed/dp/0874808901>

I had the opportunity to immerse myself in the rich holdings of the archive of the German Foreign Ministry in Berlin, the Public Record Office in London, and the National Archives in Washington. All of these sources yielded some findings that I believe are new. More importantly, many of the documents cited by Turkish and Armenian authors and their respective supporters, when looked at in their original version and proper context, yielded a picture often sharply at variance with the conclusions drawn from them by the contending protagonists. Both Turkish and Armenian authors, it turns out, have used these materials in a highly selective manner, quoting only those points that fitted into their scheme of interpretation and ignoring what Max Weber called "inconvenient facts." Both the Turkish and the Armenian sides, in the words of the Turkish historian Selim Deringil, "have plundered history"; and, as if the reality of what happened was not terrible enough, they have produced horror stories favorable to their respective positions.

SOURCE INDICTMENT RESPONSES

“He’s paid by the Turkish government!” –Response: Doesn’t matter, what matters is the quality of research

Prof. Guenter Lewy 2005. (professor emeritus at the University of Massachusetts Amherst; Holocaust survivor from a Jewish family that fled Nazi Germany in 1938; has received numerous distinctions and fellowships including the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Rockefeller Foundation) The Armenian Massacres in Ottoman Turkey: A Disputed Genocide <http://www.amazon.com/Armenian-Massacres-Ottoman-Turkey-Disputed/dp/0874808901>

Critics of this letter have pointed out that only four of the sixty-nine signers could be considered experts on the specific period and topic of Turkish policy toward the Armenians. They have also noted that the ad was commissioned and paid for by the Assembly of Turkish American Associations (an organization financed largely by the Turkish government) and that forty of the signatories had received a total of sixty-five grants from the Institute of Turkish Studies (a semiofficial Turkish body in Washington, D.C.) and the American Research Institute in Ankara. This information, while interesting, has no bearing on the validity of the arguments put forth by the sixty-nine scholars. Historical positions, like all scholarly findings, must be judged independently of their origin, motive, or consequences.