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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine how many courses exist, or how much course content exists in Division IA colleges/universities regarding the Armenian Genocide in undergraduate higher education throughout the United States. Armenians throughout the world commemorate the genocide of 1915 on April 24 each year to remember the slaughter and displacement of the thousands of Armenians during the rule of the Ottoman Empire (Balakian, 2003; Hovannisian, 1986; Melson, 1992; Miller & Miller, 1993). The Ottoman Empire succeeded in killing an estimated 1.5 million Armenians and eliminated the possibility of their living as a group in the homeland they inhabited for 3000 years (Boyajian & Grigorian, 1998; Dadrian, 1995).

As presented in this research, there are numerous, scholarly historical analyses and survivor accounts that contend the Turks desire to exterminate the Armenian race (Balakian 1997, 2003; Dadrian, 1995; Hartunian, 1968; Jernazian, 1990; Miller & Miller, 1993). However, the most unbelievable aspect of this particular genocide is that the Turkish government has yet to admit their guilt or responsibility for these killings (Balakian, 1997, 2003; Dadrian, 1995, 1999a, 1999b, 2003).

The data for this study were collected by accessing every Division 1A college/university web page and then researching their program catalog for courses on the Armenian Genocide. There were a total of three universities or 2.6% of the 116 Division IA colleges/universities that offered stand alone undergraduate courses on the Armenian Genocide and nine other schools or 7.8% (excluding stand-alone courses) that offered course content, through their undergraduate Holocaust/genocide courses, on the
Armenian Genocide. A total of 12 or 10.3% of the 116 Division I A schools offer undergraduate stand-alone courses and/or course content on the Armenian Genocide.

This research discusses the possible reasons as to why this horrific event is presently not covered in college/university curricular programs in the United States. The question remains, why, since this topic, this atrocity, which was so massive and so controversial historically and politically to this day, is the Armenian Genocide not being reviewed and discussed in a scholarly environment such as higher education in the United State of America?
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Chapter One

Introduction

“Who, after all, speaks of the annihilation of the Armenians?”
(Adolf Hitler, 1939, as authenticated and cited in Bardakjian, 1985).

Topic Overview and Purpose

The purpose of this study is to determine how many courses exist, or how much course content exists in Division IA colleges/universities regarding the Armenian Genocide in undergraduate higher education throughout the United States. This study determines to what degree higher education students are exposed to information on the Armenian Genocide through undergraduate stand-alone courses or through course content on the Armenian Genocide through undergraduate Holocaust/Genocide courses. Additionally, this research analyzes the forces that deny the atrocity and how that may undermine the knowledge and understanding of the Armenian Genocide today (Belenkaya, 2001; Falk, 1994; Okoomian, 2002; Papazian, 1997).

Armenians throughout the world commemorate the genocide (annihilation of a race) of 1915 on April 24 every year to remember the slaughter and displacement of the thousands of Armenians during the rule of the Ottoman Empire (Balakian, 2003; Hovannisian, 1986; Melson, 1992; Miller & Miller, 1993). The Empire (also referred to as the Ottoman Empire or the “Turks”) succeeded in killing an estimated 1.5 million Armenians and eliminated the possibility of their ever living as a group in the homeland which they inhabited for 3000 years (Boyajian & Grigorian, 1998; Dadrian, 1995).

The Armenian Assembly of America (AAA) (2002) report around 2,100,000 Armenians lived in the Ottoman Empire prior to World War I. One and a half million
Armenians were murdered, in what is now known as the Armenian Genocide. Out of the remaining 600,000 survivors, 500,000 were forced to leave their land and homes and live elsewhere in the world, known as the Armenian Diaspora (AAA, 2002). Only 100,000 Armenians were left in Turkey (AAA, 2002). Presently, there are an estimated 7 million Armenians throughout the world, with the largest Diaspora population center in Los Angeles, California (Pattie, 1999). Approximately 1 million Armenians presently live in the United States (The Armenian Research Center, 2004).

The Turkish Government’s Denial

There are numerous, scholarly historical analyses and survivor accounts that confirm the Turks desire to exterminate the Armenian race (Balakian 1997, 2003; Dadrian, 1995; Hartunian, 1968; Jernazian, 1990; Miller & Miller, 1993). However, the most unbelievable aspect of this particular genocide is that the Turkish government has yet to admit their guilt or responsibility for these killings (Balakian, 1997, 2003; Dadrian, 1995, 1999a, 1999b, 2003). More recently, in May 2003, the Armenian National Committee of America posted a press release entitled, “Turkish Education Minister Mandates Teaching of Armenian Genocide Denial in All Schools.” This press release states, “the Turkish Government has dramatically escalated its official campaign of genocide denial, requiring, at the direction of its Education Minister Huseyin Celik, that all students in Turkish schools be taught to deny the Armenian Genocide” (Armenian National Committee of America [ANCA], 2003b, p.1). Moreover, the United States has failed to recognize this genocide, which as many argue, is also an impediment to
dissemination of the knowledge and understanding of this horrific event (Belenkaya, 2001; Falk, 1994).

Falk (1994), a professor of International Law and Practice at Princeton University, states how such scholars as Vahakn Dadrian, Richard Hovannisian, and even non-Armenian historians, such as Robert Melson (1992), whose scholarly achievements, personal interests, empathy and extensive efforts are combating those who deny the Armenian Genocide. These scholars are promoting remembrance and working to ensure the availability of this critical, factual information to promote education and awareness of the Armenian Genocide (Falk, 1994). To support this scholarship, this genocide needs to be officially recognized by the United States.

There are many countries, including France, Argentina, Greece, Russia, Canada, Belgium, Italy, Lebanon, and Sweden that have recognized the Armenian Genocide (AAA, 2002; Armenian National Institute [ANI], 2004). However, the United States, as well as the United Kingdom, has failed to recognize officially the Armenian Genocide (Balakian, personal communication, July 2005). Moreover, there are many countries in the world that have not confronted the issue of acknowledging this historical atrocity against the Armenians as genocide (Balakian, personal communication, July 2005). What is preventing these countries from recognizing the genocide? Is the denial a political one?

Education and U.S. Relations with Turkey

It is widely assumed that the Turkish government has threatened Turkish-U.S. relations if the Armenian Genocide is recognized by the United States (Balakian, 1997,
2003; Kay, 2001; Rubin, 1995; Smith, Markusen & Lifton, 1995). An Armenian
professor and writer, Balakian (1997), explains how the Turkish government threatened
Turkey-U.S. relations, in response to the inclusion of the Armenian Genocide in
textbooks for the New York State Department of Education. Some argue that the Turkish
government has been attempting to develop Turkish departments in higher education in
the U.S. to promote their side of the story; continued denial of the Armenian Genocide
(AAA, 1997; Nazarian, 2000; ANCA, 2000; Smith, et al., 1995).

In 1995, a widely publicized example of the Turks continued denial of genocide
was that of the Heath Lowry Affair (Balakian, 2003). This situation occurred in 1995
when Dr. Heath Lowry, a professor at Princeton University, was appointed to the Chair in
Turkish Studies, a position supported financially by the Turkish government (The Heath
Lowry Affair, 1995). Balakian (2003) explains how Lowry had worked for the Turkish
government and became the director of the Institute for Turkish Studies, located in
Washington, D.C., to continue Turkish denial of the Armenian Genocide.

On December 21, 2000, the ANCA, posted on their website, “Proposal for
Congressional Hearings on Foreign Manipulation of U.S. Universities” (ANCA, 2000).
This “Action Alert,” discussed by Sarafian, a researcher working on his Ph.D., explains
he was denied access to material by the Turks, and who stated “…‘Materials were denied
through various avenues and pretexts’ such as ‘ignoring order forms,’ ‘claiming that…the
documents could not be found,’ and ‘closing entire collections.’ Much of the material
had already been referenced by academics known to be friendly to Turkish interests”
(ANCA, 2000, p. 3). Balakian (2003) agrees and states: “Indeed, there has recently been
exposed a paper trail in academe that involved Turkey’s attempt to cover up the Armenian genocide” (p. 381).

The Turkish Government’s Side of the Story

Balakian (1997) states that what is taught in Turkey regarding the Armenian Genocide of 1915 is that “…in 1915 Armenians were traitors who attacked and killed Turks and deserved everything they got” (p. 269). Balakian (1997) further explains how Turkey wants the public to believe that there are two sides to the story, and what the Armenians present, is a biased point of view.

Staub’s (1989), *The Roots of Evil: The origins of genocide and other group violence*, examines the social, cultural, and psychological theory needed to understand how humans can morally and ethically conduct such horrendous acts. Staub (1989), a social psychologist, provides a comprehensive model that he uses to explain why and how genocide can occur, and in doing so, extensively examines the importance of the roles of both perpetrators and bystanders in genocide. Staub (1989) also attempts to answer the question, “how can human beings kill multitudes of men and women, children and old people” (p. 3)? His study suggests that to prevent this human destructiveness, an understanding of the societal, cultural and psychological roots of genocide are necessary.

Staub (1989) defines genocide as “an attempt to exterminate a racial, ethnic, religious, cultural, or political group, either directly through mass murder or indirectly by creating conditions that lead to the group’s destruction” (p. 8). Staub (1989) emphasizes that in genocide one group in a society turns against a subgroup, defined as an internal enemy. The goal of genocide is to purify the desired rule of inhabitants by devaluing a
minority group and blaming this group for the already deteriorated or deteriorating conditions of the country (Staub, 1989). Implicit in the goal of genocide is the denial of responsibility by those who devalue and exterminate society's vulnerable subgroups.

In the case of the Armenian Genocide, the Turkish denial has been so effective, that few non-Armenians are aware of the dimensions of this tragedy. Cohan (2002) in “A study of the Armenian Genocide raises troubling questions of remembrance and responsibility” discusses the lack of knowledge of the Armenian Genocide in elementary education in the United States. Cohan (2002) a teacher in Pensacola, Florida, explains how one of her students, for a history competition contest, submitted a project on the Armenian Genocide. Cohan (2002), an Armenian herself, became interested in the importance of teaching the dimension of denial in genocide. She realized that history teachers were not aware of the events of the Armenian Genocide.

In just a few years, the last of those who survived will be gone. Educators at Armenian heritage schools find that teaching about the Genocide not only promotes historical awareness and intergenerational understanding but also regenerates the pride in Armenian culture that genocide and denial themselves threaten to destroy (Cohan, 2002, p.6).

Research Questions

In considering the virtual invisibility of the Armenian Genocide in a common understanding of the 20th Century, this dissertation seeks to discover why this profoundly tragic event is not more widely known, especially to those educated in U.S. universities. Questions explicitly seeking to provide insight include:

1. How many Division I A colleges/universities in the United States offer stand-alone undergraduate courses on the Armenian Genocide?
(2) How many Division IA colleges/universities offer an undergraduate course on Holocaust/Genocide in which the Armenian Genocide is included in the course content?

(3) If a Division IA college/university offers an undergraduate course or course content specifically on the Armenian Genocide, in what department is this course offered?

Data Analysis Plan

This study was conducted using content analysis to examine Division IA undergraduate higher education program catalogs. The content analysis first identified stand-alone undergraduate courses on the Armenian Genocide in higher education. Second, it identified if any content of the Armenian Genocide is embedded in any undergraduate Holocaust and/or genocide courses offered. Thirdly, this identified the departments in which undergraduate courses or course content on the Armenian Genocide is offered. A data table and graph quantify the mean, median, and mode of the number of Division IA higher education schools in the United States that offer course content on the Armenian Genocide.

In those instances when the program catalog was assessed electronically via the Internet, a request was made through email or telephone call to request delivery of the program catalog. Where the information was not publicly accessible, IRB materials were forwarded. If the information was not determined from the program catalog then a telephone call to the college/university was initiated to contact the appropriate department to discover if they offer courses including course content on the Armenian
Genocide. This study is a mixed methods project, focusing on quantitative content analysis to document the amount of content in college courses and qualitative passages and description.

Significance/Importance of Study

The significance of this study is its contribution to an understanding of whether higher education is including undergraduate course content concerning the Armenian Genocide. The importance of the study relates to efforts by the Turkish government, which still denies this genocide ever occurred and is taking measures to prevent the United States from officially recognizing these killings as the Armenian Genocide (Balakian, 2003; Graber, 1996; Dadrian, 1995). How much impact does the continual political pressure imposed on the United States by Turkey, have on higher educations history and knowledge of this genocide? Through content analysis research and a literature review of this horrific event, it is the hope of the researcher that people will become more aware and knowledgeable of genocide and consequently, be able to prevent it from occurring in the future (Freedman-Apsel, 1992; Okoomian, 2002).

Definitions of Terms

- *Armenian Genocide* – (also referred to as the Armenian Holocaust and Armenian Massacres) The systematic, planned annihilation of the Armenians by the Turkish government during World War I.
- *Gendarme* – Police/military officers
- *Genocide* – The systematic, planned annihilation of a race or cultural group
Holocaust (Jewish Holocaust) – The massive slaughter of European Jews by Nazi Germany during World War II

Infidels – The term the Turks used to describe the Armenians as unbelievers of Islam.

Ittihadists or Ittihad Ve Teraki (in Turkish) – The Young Turks also known as the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP)

Ottoman, Turkey, and Turan – The homeland of the Turks.

Ottoman Empire – The ruling government of Turkey preceding and during World War I.

Pan-Turkic/Pan-Turanism – A purified Turkish ideology based on the hope of reclaiming the Caucasus and central Asia.

The Young Turks also known as the Committee of Union Progress (CUP) – Turkey’s governing party from 1908-1918.

Bystanders – Witnesses who were not directly affected by the actions of the perpetrators.

Perpetrators – Someone who has committed a crime, or a violent or harmful act.

Diaspora – A dispersion of originally homogenous people.

Organizations:

Armenian Assembly of America (AAA) – The largest Washington-based nationwide organization promoting public understanding and awareness of Armenian issues.

Armenian National Committee of America (ANCA) – An organization that advances the concern of the Armenian-American community on a broad range of
issues; it is the largest and most influential Armenian-American grassroots political organization.

_Armenian National Institute_ (ANI) – A non-profit organization dedicated to the study, research, and affirmation of the Armenian Genocide.

_Armenian General Benevolent Union_ (AGBU) – To preserve and promote the Armenian identity and heritage through educational, cultural, and humanitarian programs. This charity organization, established in 1906 in Cairo, Egypt, operates in 30 countries today and has 22,000 members.

_The Zoryan Institute_ - An international center devoted to the research and documentation of contemporary issues related to the history, politics, society, and culture of Armenia and Armenians around the world.

**Scope and Delimitations**

This study is not intended to suggest a method of teaching the Armenian Genocide to students nor is it meant to critique existing Holocaust and/or genocide educational programs. The purpose of this study is to determine how much course content is devoted to the Armenian Genocide in undergraduate higher education Division IA colleges/universities throughout the United States and to provide a literature review of the genocide. This study also determined to what degree undergraduate college students are being exposed to information on the Armenian Genocide through stand-alone courses on the Armenian Genocide or through course content on the Armenian Genocide through Holocaust/genocide courses. Additionally, this research reports on, through the literature review, the impact of the Turkish government’s continued denial of this atrocity and how
it affects the knowledge and understanding of the Armenian (Belenkaya, 2001; Dadrian 1995; Okoomian, 2002; Papazian, 1997).

The following section, Chapter 2, includes a historical review, which describes the events of the Armenian Genocide of 1915. It will also introduce the societal, cultural, and political conditions of Turkey during and preceding 1915, as presented by various scholars, historians, and survivors. Moreover, this study focuses on research that discusses the Turkish government’s continued denial of their annihilation of the Armenians. Throughout the last 20 years, scholars, historians, and survivors such as Dadrian (1995, 1999a, 1999b, 2003), Balakian (1997, 2000, 2003), Adalian (1991, 1992, 1996) Hovannisian (1986, 1999, 2003), Miller and Miller (1993), and Turkish historian Ackam (2001), have located, uncovered, and translated substantial numbers of official state records proving Turkey’s governing political party’s systematic methods for exterminating the Armenians (Balakian, 2003).

Chapter 3, the research design, includes the research questions, sampling, and human subject’s issues involved. This section also describes the data sources, the data collection, and organization, verification methods, and data quality concerns. This study uses mixed method research, focusing on quantitative content analysis and qualitative passages and descriptions. Chapter 4 analyzes and discusses the results of the study and Chapter 5 includes conclusions and limitations to the study as well as further implications.
Chapter Two

Literature Review

Introduction

This study includes a historical review, which describes the events of the Armenian Genocide of 1915. It also introduces the societal, cultural, and political conditions of Turkey during and preceding 1915, as presented by various scholars, historians, and survivors. Moreover, the study focuses on research that discusses the Turkish government’s continued denial of their annihilation of the Armenians.


The significance of this study is its discovery of whether higher education is teaching undergraduate students about the Armenian Genocide. The study is important because the Turkish government still denies this genocide, and is taking measures to prevent the United States from officially recognizing this systematic atrocity as the Armenian Genocide (Balakian, 2003; Dadrian, 1995; Graber, 1996). Both Dadrian (2003) and Balakian (1997, 2003) discuss the efforts of the Turkish government to destroy documents of incriminating evidence in the past and present and compelling case for the continued, current political pressure imposed on the United States by the Turks, which is keeping the history and knowledge of this genocide from the public.
Armenia: An Introduction

Armenia is a country in southwestern Asia, just east of Turkey (see Figure 1). Armenia is landlocked, surrounded by Muslim Turkey, Azerbaijan, the militant Islamic republic of Iran, and Georgia (Library of Congress Country Studies, 1994). The capital of Armenia is Yerevan (sometimes spelled Erevan). The major part of Armenia's land mass, 28,400 square miles, is mostly mountainous terrain and can be compared to the size of Maryland in the United States (Central Intelligence Agency [CIA], 2003).

![Map of Armenia](http://www.climate-zone.com/continent/middle-east/)

**Figure 1-1.** Map of Armenia.
*Note. From the CIA World Fact Book, a public-domain work.*

It was around the 6th Century BC that Armenians were first identified as a group (Hovannisian, 1986). Armenians had inhabited the land of Armenia for 3000 years before they were dispersed by the Turkish regime (Armenian Library and Museum of
It was in the 4th Century, 301 A.D. that the Armenians, through their invention of the Armenian alphabet, declared Christianity as their religion (Armenian Library and Museum of America, 1999; Tashjian, 1995). Armenia was the first Christian nation, and one that survived for centuries battling empires (Balakian, 2003). Armenians were known for their endurance, as well as occupying important positions in the economy (Balakian, 2003; Weitz, 2003). By the 10th Century, the Armenians were socially cohesive, thriving culturally in music and poetry, and prospering through commerce and agricultural productivity (Balakian, 2003). Due to the Armenians adoption of the Christianity, the Church plays an important role of guardian in the nation’s culture, language, and identity (Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches [CCIA], 1984).

In May 1453, the Byzantine Empire fell to the Ottoman Turks (Balakian, 2003). The Armenians came under Ottoman rule in the 15th Century and were legally identified as “‘infidels’” (Balakian, 2003, p. 31). This label subjected the Armenians to superincumbent social and political rules (Balakian, 2003). The Christian Armenians continued to live for centuries under oppressive conditions forced upon them by the Muslim rulers (Balakian, 2003).

The Armenian Assembly of America (AAA) (1992) reports around 2,100,000 Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire prior to World War I. During and after WWI, one and a half million Armenians were murdered, in what is now known as the Armenian Genocide. Of the remaining 600,000 survivors, 500,000 were forced to leave and live elsewhere in the world, known as the Armenian Diaspora (AAA, 2002). Only 100,000 Armenians remained in their Turkish controlled homeland (AAA, 2002). Presently there
are an estimated 7 million Armenians throughout the world, with the largest Diaspora population center in Los Angeles, California (Pattie, 1999). Approximately 1 million Armenian-Americans live in the United States (The Armenian Research Center, 2004). Half of the Armenians in the United States, live in California, Armenians also reside in Philadelphia; the greater area of New York; Boston; Worchester, Massachusetts; and Detroit (Armenian Church, 2005). Other growing communities are today in Florida, Wisconsin, and Texas (Armenian Church, 2005).

For the second time since 1375 Armenia became an independent republic in 1991, after years of Soviet domination (Balakian, 1997). Beyond independence, Armenia no longer enjoyed the protection of the Soviet Union (Balakian, 1997). Consequently, Armenia’s major institutions, including their financial, political, and military infrastructure were crumbling apart from the leftover Soviet state systems (Library of Congress, 1994). As discussed by Hughes (2005) after the breakdown of the Soviet Union, industrialization in the region virtually disappeared, with the closing of factories and plants in the cities and the disintegration of collective farms in the villages (Hughes, 2005). Hughes (2005) further explains that even though villagers and farmers could privatize the lands, they lacked the skills and equipment to manage a business. Consequently, programs and organizations in Armenia were formed to loan money and equipment to the people in the provinces to help them manage agricultural resources and productivity (Hughes, 2005).

Armenia’s commerce is material intensive and its exports from manufacturing include textiles, shoes, and carpets (Library of Congress County Studies, 1994). A 1998 earthquake left 530,000 homeless, 25,000 dead, and wiped out about 30% of the
Armenian industrial infrastructure. Azerbaijan cut off energy imports that provided 90% of energy in Armenia (Library of Congress County Studies, 1994; Miller & Miller, 1993). The years of conflict between Turkey and Armenia continue, as Turkey refuses regional cooperation or economic integration with Armenia (AAA, 2003). Moreover, Turkey has an alliance with Muslim Azerbaijan, and both countries have Turkish troops stationed on the Armenian border (AAA, 2003). The World Bank estimates that the Turkey and Azerbaijan blockades have increased transportation costs by 30 to 35%, stifling Armenia’s trade and economy (AAA, 2002). Consequently, present day conflict with neighboring countries Azerbaijan and Turkey has prevented Armenia from economic opportunities.

In 1998, Robert Kocharian was elected President of the Republic of Armenia, (also known as Hayastan) (CIA, 2003; U.S. Department of State, 2002). Armenia’s population is presently 2,982,904 (CIA, 2005).

The History

The Armenians were a Christian minority in the Ottoman Empire. The Armenians were defined as Dhimmi millet under Ottoman law (Balakian, 2003; Walker, 1980). Dhimmi means they were non-Muslims, living under the Ottoman Muslim Turkish rule, as well as milleti mahkume (subordinate subjects) considered inferior to Muslims (Balakian, 2003; Dadrian, 2003). By the 18th Century, the Armenians were organized into communities, known as millets, by the Turks, with limited self-governance (Balakian, 2003).
To preserve their religion, language, and identity, the Armenian people endured being treated as second-class citizens and they "were not going to be allowed to enjoy equal rights..." (Dadrian, 2003, p. 40). This was demonstrated in the requirement that Armenians pay special taxes, their objectionable right to testimony, and in their lack of right to bear arms (CCIA, 1984). The Armenians were subjected to attacks from the Muslims because they were infidels and lacked the right to defend themselves in courts or in terms of physical safety (CCIA, 1984). Even the European powers could not intercede and protect this Christian race. Any pressure on the Turks by the European powers only caused an increase of the persecution of the Armenians (CCIA, 1984). "In the far off villages, plunders, rapes, murders and forced conversions to Islam had become frequent" (p. 11).

Morgenthau (1999), the American Ambassador to Turkey in 1918, described the plight of the Armenians:

The common term applied by the Turk to the Christian is "dog," and in his estimation this is not mere rhetorical figure; he actually looks upon his European neighbours as far less worthy of consideration that his own domestic animals. "My son," an old Turk once said, "do you see that herd of swine? Some are white, some are black, some are large, some are small-they differ from each other in some respects, but they are all swine. So it is with Christians. Be not deceived, my son. These Christians may wear fine clothes, their women may be very beautiful to look upon; their skins are white and splendid; many of them are very intelligent and they build wonderful cities and create what seem to be great states. But remember that underneath all this dazzling exterior they are all the same, they are all swine" (p. 7).

One of the conditions for genocide that Staub (1989) discusses is economic and political hardships. The Ottoman Empire went bankrupt in 1875 (Staub, 1989). Representatives from the great powers (Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and Austria at this time) set up a Public Debt Administration to supervise Turkey's finances (Staub,
Additionally, Staub (1989) explains, Turkey’s dependence on non-Muslim contributions in overall commerce and trade inhibited their industrial growth, as agreements between the Ottoman Empire and foreign countries granted foreigners economic privileges (Balakian, 2003; Staub, 1989). In addition to the Turks deteriorating economic and political structures, was their loss in the War of 1877 to Russia (Balakian, 2003; Staub, 1989). Melson (1996) states:

This dramatic shift in ideology and identity, from Ottoman pluralism to an integral form of Turkish nationalism, had profound implications for the emergence of modern Turkey…. From being once viewed as constituent millet of the Ottoman regime, [the Armenians] suddenly were stereotyped as an alien nationality. Their situation became especially dangerous because of their territorial concentration in eastern Anatolia on the border with Russia, Turkey’s traditional enemy. Thus the Armenians, at one and the same time, were accused of being in league with Russia against Turkey and of claiming Anatolia, the heartland of the projected pan-Turkic state. (p. 3)

The Turks increased their repression of the Armenians as the Armenians continued to advance in the Ottoman society (Balakian, 2003; Staub, 1989). "The Armenians were hardworking, capable, and intelligent. Many were successful, and some became wealthy. They became essential for the maintenance of the country" (Staub, 1989, p. 177). However, as Staub (1989) explains, the Empire’s administrative, financial and military structures began to fall apart both internally and externally, leading directly to an increase of intolerance and exploitation of the Armenians.

Massacres between 1894-1896. The sultan, Abdul Hamid II, known as the “bloody sultan,” and the “great assassin,” came to power in 1876, and ruled the Ottoman Empire until 1908 (Balakian, 2003). Under his rule, about 200,000 Armenians were massacred from 1894-1896 (Dadrian, 2003). Power (2002) reports the same number of
Armenians, 200,000, were killed but presents these murders as occurring only from 1895-1896. Adalian (1991) mentions how the killings targeted men and most occurred for the public to witness during the day. By doing this, “he hoped to wipe away the Armenians’ increasing sense of national awareness” (Adalian, 1991, p. 99). Further, as Miller and Miller (1993) noted, Sultan Abdul-Hamid “…intended the massacres to teach the Armenians a lesson that liberty and equality were not to be pursued by infidels living within the empire” (p. 38).

Adalian (1991) states that these massacres “were meant to undermine the growth of Armenian nationalism by frightening the Armenians with the terrible consequences of dissent. The sultan was alarmed by the increasing activity of Armenian political groups and wanted to curb their growth before they gained any more influence by spreading ideas about civil rights and autonomy” (Adalian, 1991, p.99). The more the Armenians tried to reconstruct and reaffirm their rights and form political parties, as well as ask for assistance from the European powers, the more the Sultan felt threatened and enraged (Balakian, 2003). The Armenians were not alone in their plight; Turkey also brutally treated the Serbian and Bulgarian Christians who were seeking independence from Abdul Hamid II (Balakian, 2003). However, within Turkey, the Armenians were rapidly becoming the scapegoats for the deteriorating economic and political conditions of the Ottoman Empire (Staub, 1989). As national scapegoats, the Armenians endured increasing frenzy of attacks and torture (Balakian, 2003).

In 1908, Sultan Abdul Hamid was overthrown, and the power of the Ottoman Empire was taken over by the Young Turks (AAA, 2002; Balakian, 2003). Between 1908 and 1912, the Young Turks wiped out 20% of its population and reduced Ottoman
territory by 40% (Melson, 1996). In response, the Armenians continued to resist the controls and discrimination by the Turkish state, endlessly requesting more rights and autonomy (Balakian, 2003; Staub, 1989). The Armenians aggressively pursued support from the European powers (Balakian, 2003), that eventually passed the Armenian Reform Agreement in 1914, which angered the Turks in power since their worst feared enemy, Russia, was part of the Reform Agreement.

*The Young Turks.* The Young Turks, *Ittihadists* or *Ittihad ve Teraki*, in Turkish, were also known as the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) (Dadrian, 1995; Graber, 1996). The Ittihadists overtook the control of Turkey and allied with Germany in World War I, against Russia (Melson, 1992). The Young Turks originally sought to establish liberal and democratic principles (Melson, 1996). However, this movement was short lived, in part the result of the continual conflict between the Ottomans and Russians during World War I (Balakian, 2003). A pan-Turkish ideology developed where the newly constructed goal was to *Turkicize* the minorities of the Ottoman Empire (Balakian, 2003; CCIA, 1984).

Melson (1992) suggests their ideology of pan-Turkism never had a possibility to succeed. However, it’s “primary result was to ‘increase a sense of Turkishness among Ottoman Turks’” (p. 164). However, pan-Turkism managed to decrease the sense that minorities, including the Armenians, had a right to exist under the control of the Young Turks (Melson, 1992, p. 164). Melson (1996) also states “the CUP leaders turned to a pan-Turkism, a xenophobic and chauvinistic brand of nationalism that sought to create a new empire based on Islam and Turkish ethnicity” (Melson, 1996, p.3).
The top authority of the Young Turks was in the hands of three men (Morgenthau, 1999). The Committee empowered Enver Pasha (the War Minister), and Djemal Pasha (the Minister for Marine) to be their leaders. The Minister of the Interior, Talaat Pasha, in control of the police, became the main person responsible for the massacres of the Armenians (Morgenthau, 1999). Melson (1986) reports it was both Talaat Pasha and Enver Pasha who were responsible for the deportations, before the onset of the genocide of 1915.

The Young Turks celebrated their victory once Sultan Abdul Hamid was overthrown (Boyajian, 1972). This conquest, counteracted with their failure to bring democracy to the remnants of the Ottoman Empire, instigated an intense thirst for power and control. The Young Turks were angry at their failure, and in turn, began to abandon their idea of democracy and their desire for a multinational state. The Armenians, however, hoping that the Young Turks would finally grant them their rights and freedom from years of discrimination and overall persecution, continued to pursue Armenian autonomy within the Turkish circle of influence.

Although far from the truth, Armenians were stereotyped as wealthy merchants in the cities building Armenian prosperity at the expense of poorer Turks (Balakian, 2003). Balakian (2003) acknowledges there were prosperous Armenian communities; however, there were many poor Armenians who were farmers and shepherds in rural regions who were subject to the unequal Ottoman taxes. In any case, the stereotype prevailed continued and the hostility grew toward the Armenians because they were Christians, educated, and, in some cases economically stable (Balakian, 2003). Consequently, in
1909, in Adana, an estimated 30,000 Armenians were massacred under the Young Turks (Boyajian, 1972; Staub, 1989).

**1909 Adana Massacres: The First Step to Oblivion.** Balakian (1997) describes these massacres:

The most bloody episodes were carried out against the Armenians of Adana in 1909. In Adana, Armenians had been celebrating their alleged new freedoms. How naive. How impolitic. Announcing that they were now equal to their fellow Turkish citizens. For such celebration, the Armenians were massacred. (p. 232)

Miller and Miller (1993) horrifically describe the Adana massacres of 1909:

It was Easter, traditionally a time of hope and optimism for Christians, when the Turkish soldiers advised all Armenians to close their shops and go home. Many of the Armenians, hearing news that they might be massacred, went to the church, thinking they would not be safe in their homes. “All of a sudden, we noticed the ceiling of the church was burning and was falling down and burning people like ‘kebab.’ People were running around like bees. Those who ran outside were shot by soldiers. Those inside were burning” (p. 63).

The Armenians were often targets for the failure of the Young Turks, but the Adana Massacres were the most brutal attacks from the new regime. Throughout, the Young Turks continued to fear that the Armenians could solidify a treaty or other agreement with Russia and create an independent state in eastern Anatolia (Melson, 1992; Staub, 1989). This fear, along with their failure of power and control, led the Young Turks to a ferocious, systematic initiative to rid their land of infidels (Staub, 1989).

**Genocide of 1915: The Voices were Silenced.** In Constantinople (now Istanbul) on the night of April 24, 1915, Balakian (2003) describes the beginning of the Armenian Genocide and its progression throughout Turkey. “In cities, towns, and villages everywhere, Armenian cultural leaders were arrested, tortured, and killed as quickly as possible” (Balakian, 2003, p. 211). Balakian (1997) states the following:

...because totalitarian regimes always find poets the most dangerous of people, they are often the first to be executed. The Young Turk government began its
plan of genocide by arresting a group of 250 prominent Armenian leaders and intellectuals on April 24, 1915. They were taken away in the middle of the night to small towns in the interior and executed. It haunts me to think about how a whole generation of writers was silenced in 1915, just as they were maturing and beginning to create something dynamic and new. With the destruction of the Armenians of Anatolia, Western Armenian literature was strangled. (p. 235)

Simpson (1993) describes how from 1914 and for the next three years, the Ittihad forced Armenian men into labor to assist building the Turkish railways that were aiding German business. Many of these men were worked to death and many survivors were shot. In the spring of 1915, the marked beginning of the Armenian Genocide, the Turkish government secretly ordered the murdering of Armenian intellectuals and politicians (Balakian 1997, 2003; Dadrian 1995, 1999a). Power (2002) states that Talaat Pasha ordered some 250 Armenian intellectuals to be rounded up and executed in Constantinople. The Turks also began rounding up Armenian women and children and deporting them to camps, which deprived them of food, shelter, and necessities. When the camps were at their maximum capacity, the Turks marched the women and children into the Syrian desert (Simpson, 1993). Thousands of Armenians lost their lives. Shootings, starvation and disease were rampant (Simpson, 1993). Many of the women died in transit (Adalian, 1991). Balakian (1997) describes some of the killings:

Women were tortured. If a woman would not readily submit to sex with a gendarme, she was whipped, and if she tried to run away, she was shot. Once when a young girl tried to run, the gendarme took out his sword and lashed her dress open, and she stood there with her young breasts naked, and he slashed each breast off her body, and they fell to the ground. I stared at the two small breasts lying on the ground. I stood frozen, then I just walked away. The girl bled to death next to her breasts. (p. 219)

The cruelty and brutality of the Turks was turned loose on the hopeless Armenians.
Balakian (2003) explains how Ambassador Morgenthau witnessed the plans to exterminate the Armenians in a conversation with Talaat and Enver Pasha. Balakian (2003) quotes what Talaat said to Ambassador Morgenthau:

“We have already disposed of three quarters of the Armenians; there are none at all left in Bitles, Van, and Erzerum. The hatred between the Turks and the Armenians is now so intense that we have got to finish with them. If we don't, they will plan their revenge” (p. 374).

Methods of Killing: Death and Deportation. Both massacres and deportations occurred during this 1915 genocide. The Turks would beat, shoot, hang, and poison any Armenian at any time. The Turks used many various methods to kill and torture the Armenians. Beheading, shooting, burning Armenians or the place they were living, throwing them into rivers and wells, and most brutal of all, the death marches, reached a crescendo of hatred (Miller & Miller 1993).

The grizzly methods of killing are documented by Balakian (1997) in Black Dog of Fate. Balakian calls this “Dovey’s Story,” Balakian’s Aunt’s cousin, who, “last year in the hospital when [Dovey] thought she was dying, Dovey told me about some things that happened to her” (p. 210). Balakian (1997) continues “Dovey’s Story in the following:

Many of the women were praying while they moved in this slow circle. Der Voghormya, Der Voghormya. (Lord have mercy). Krisdos bada raqyal bashkhi i miji meroom. (Christ is sacrificed and shared amongst us), and occasionally they would drop the hand next to them and quickly make the sign of the cross. Their hair had come undone and their faces were wrapped up in the blood-stuck tangles of hair, so they looked like corpses of Medusa. Their clothes were now turning red. Some of them were half naked, others tried to hold their clothes together. They began to fall down and when they did they were whipped until they stood and continued their dance. Each crack of the whip and more of their clothing came off. (p. 216)

Then two soldiers pushed through the crowd swinging wooden buckets and began to douse the women with the fluid in the buckets and, in a second, I
could smell that it was kerosene. And the women screamed because the kerosene was burning their lacerations and cuts. Another soldier came forward with a torch and lit each woman by the hair. At first all I could see was smoke, and the smell grew sickening, and then I could see the fire growing off the women’s bodies, and their screaming became unbearable. The children were being whipped now furiously, as if the sight of the burning mothers had excited the soldiers, and they admonished the children to clap “faster, faster, faster,” telling them that if they stopped they too would be lit on fire. As the women began to collapse in burning heaps, oozing and black, the smell of burnt flesh made me sick. I fainted and your mother’s brother Haroutiun found me and took me home. (p. 217)

In addition, knives, hoes, axes, and hatchets, were used to kill the Armenians in these massacres (Miller & Miller, 1993). “As Ambassador Morgenthau pointed out in his memoirs, the Turks in order to save shell and powder decided to use such instruments as daggers, swords, axes, spears, and other primitive instruments thereby making dying agonizing and protracted” (Dadrian, 2000). The following methods of torture are also described in Miller and Miller (1993):

They would take them to jail and beat them up, and such torturous acts as bastinado, as they called it, were done—they would raise the feet above the body, tie them and beat under the foot until it bled. They also used to boil eggs and put them in their armpits. Other techniques included pulling out fingernails (mentioned by a survivor...who said this happened to their mailman who was accused of transporting secret letters); pulling out teeth....; pulling out beards...branding on the chest with a hot horseshoe...and hanging prisoners upside down by one foot and beating them back and forth....(p. 66)

Furthermore, Miller and Miller (1993) also explain how the Turks initiated and carried out the death marches:

When the caravans reached the city limits, the men were often separated from the group; gendarmes tied their hands and escorted them away from their families. Wives and children heard shots ring out, and then the gendarmes returned alone, forcing the remnant to resume their journey...The remaining deportees were marched in circuitous routes, through mountain passes and away from Turkish population centers. The destination for many caravans was Aleppo and, beyond that, the deserts of Syria...But the more fundamental goal of the deportations appeared to be death through attrition. Turks were not allowed to assist deportees, on pain of imprisonment. And gendarmes were often sadistic, for example refusing deportees access to water. (p. 43)
Meanwhile, during the massacres and deportations, the state was confiscating any Armenian-owned property and possessions. "The objective was to strike at the financial strength of the Armenian community which controlled a significant part of the Ottoman commerce" (Adalian, 1991, p. 73). Furthermore, if any Armenian goods and property were not confiscated, they were most surely destroyed through the burning of their homes and villages. "With the disappearance of the Armenians from their homeland, most of the symbols of their culture-schools, monasteries, artistic monuments, historical sites—were destroyed by the Ottoman government" (Adalian, 1991, p. 70). As depicted by Balakian (1997; 2003) and Adalian (1991), the cruelty and brutality of these Turkish officials targeted the Armenian people and their communities.

The description of the methods of killings in the previous passages is a portion of what makes genocide so incomprehensible. The many social and psychological explanations of how and why perpetrators (humans) can afflict this kind of brutality on another group of humans, as Staub (1989) theorizes, still does not fully explain the horrific concept of genocide and the continued denial of the Armenian Genocide. Reading these historical documents and survivor accounts make it very difficult, to question the brutalities on the Armenians during this time.

Perpetrators. Miller and Miller (1993) report that Armenians were devalued so the perpetrators no longer saw them as human, but "things" in the way of their goal—a purified Turkish nation. Staub (1989) provides a complex model for understanding the origins of genocide, the psychology of hard times and the cultural and individual characteristics of the perpetrators and includes his personal goal theory to help explain the role of motivation in genocide. The combination of certain cultural characteristics
and difficult life conditions along with elements of threat and frustration, consequently, will ignite motives to turn one group of people against another. Staub (1989) points out that the Ottoman Empire was once called the *Sick Man of Europe*, for all its losses of power and territory it had endured for the 100 years leading up to WWI. These chaotic and depressed economic conditions, led to severe psychological consequences for an entire nation. Staub (1989) therefore, concludes that when people feel threatened and frustrated they try to make themselves feel better. “The loss of power, prestige, and influence as a nation and the tremendous life problems within Turkey had to result in powerful feelings of frustration and threat in both the people and the leaders and to give rise to the needs and motives that lead a group to turn against a subgroup of society” (Staub 1989, p.175). Additionally, Staub (1989) notes, “strong nationalism sometimes originates in the experiences of shared trauma, suffering, and humiliation, which are sources of self-doubt” (p.19). Furthermore, he mentions that this self-doubt, when combined with any sense of superiority, increases the chances for genocide to occur.

Balakian (1999) theoretically examines some of the components of the Turko-Armenian conflict. He states:

The Turko-Armenian conflict did not involve a parity of strengths. Broadly speaking, the distinctly weak, if not impotent, Armenians could neither dare nor afford mounting a challenge to the dominant Turks who for centuries had been enjoying an absolute monopoly of power of every kind in the Ottoman state system. (p. 3)

*The Bystanders.* Staub (1989) describes bystanders as witnesses who are not directly affected by the actions of perpetrators, but who help shape society by their reactions. For example, the perpetrators many times would offer money and/or property to the bystanders if they went along with the persecution of the Armenians, by at least
encouraging them to turn their heads and not intervene (Staub, 1989). For example, the Ittihad would confiscate Armenians property and use it as a reward for anyone who participated in the extermination of the Armenians (Simpson, 1993, p. 28). However, as Power (2002) points out, “the sharpest challenge to the world of bystanders is posed by those who have refused to remain silent in the age of genocide” (p. xviii).

**Europe and America’s Reaction.** One of the common elements that seem to exist in the occurrence of all genocides is the passive acceptance of the massacres by other countries (Staub, 1989). Bystanders, in the need to satisfy their lack of control, have the need to join a group that exhibits strength, leadership, and power (Staub, 1989). For example, during the Armenian genocide, England recognized the atrocities, but because England feared the Russians, an ongoing enemy to the Turks, England remained an ally to Turkey (Staub, 1989). Germany, who had the influence and power to respond, was another ally to Turkey and limited their intervention (Staub, 1989). Unfortunately, the lack of international enforcement of the Armenian Reform Agreement led to the brutalities of the Armenians by exposing the vulnerability of the Armenians (Adalian, 1996).

The previous massacres of the Armenians, in the 19th and early 20th Centuries by Sultan Abdul Hamid had sparked attempted intervention from Great Britain, France, and Russia (Miller & Miller, 1993). However, this attempted intervention appeared as a threat to the Turks, fearing the possibility that the Armenians and the Russians would join forces. The Turkish fears led to the quick deployment of deportations and executions (Staub 1989; Melson, 1992). Additionally, the role of America during these massacres,
as Balakian (2003) argues was not that of bystander but one of great support for the Armenians.

Balakian (2003) argues that although the United States was unable to prevent the Turkish government from continuing the massacres, as historically documented, the United States actively supported the Armenians. Furthermore, Balakian (2000, 2003) revealed that there were many news reports, articles, and relief movements that were created to support the Armenians in the eastern provinces of Turkey. Hovannisian (1986) notes how America rallied and supported charities for the "Starving Armenians" and the U.S. officials tried to help the Armenian survivors (p. 30). However, the Ottoman government retaliated against American support for the Armenians and severed diplomatic relations during April 1917 with the United States (Hovannisian, 1986). Against this setting of diplomatic retaliation, the concept of war crimes and the trial of such crimes was a new global concept.

Trials. The concept of trials for war crimes was not formalized until WWII. The Turkish leaders tried in absentia and were punished. Dadrian (2000), in an oral presentation held at the JFK library in Boston, MA discusses the following:

As you know on May 24, 1915, the three allies, Great Britain, czarist Russia, and France made a public declaration whereby they threatened all Turkish perpetrators to take to court - punish after the end of the war. In that declaration for the first time in recorded legal history the third crime against humanity law was introduced. And remarkably that crime against humanity was adopted. ...As a result, for the first time, in addition to crimes against the customs and laws of the war the parallel concept of crimes against humanity was adopted by an international legal body so much so that in the Nuremberg doctrine article 6 paragraph C totally adopted the term crimes against humanity for the first time used in 1915 in connection with the Armenian Genocide and the framers of that concept openly explicitly acknowledge that this is in relation to the Armenian genocide. ...that the Armenian genocide became the foundation stone of the new concept of the crimes against, humanity which is used synonymously and
interchangeably, with the concept of genocide (personal communication, April 25, 2000).

Adalian (1996) discusses how the leaders of the Young Turks were tried in accordance to the domestic Ottoman laws. Adalian (1991) further mentions that these Turkish leaders, who were found guilty, fled the country. Therefore, the sentencing was unable to be carried out and was thus annulled (Adalian, 1991). Ambassador Morgenthau (1999) stated:

My failure to stop the destruction of the Armenians had made Turkey for a place of horror, and I found intolerable my further daily association with men who, however gracious and accommodating and good-natured they might have been to the American Ambassador, were still reeking the blood of nearly a million human beings. (p. 5)

Armenian Diaspora. The survivors of this genocide took refuge in various countries, no longer permitted to live in what was, for centuries, their homeland (CCIA, 1984). Hovannisian (2003) reports the following:

Armenians the world over realize that it is essential to face the future openly and freely, that the preservation of the small existing Armenian republic is vital to their own self-preservation, and that throughout history their people have recovered and advanced, not through dwelling morbidly or fatalistically on the past, but by reviving rebuilding...But the Genocide of 1915 dealt such a forceful blow that this time it thrust most survivors beyond their native lands into a diasporan existence. Armenians feel deeply that they cannot fully overcome that blow until it is acknowledged through acts of contrition and redemption. Hence, in some ways they are imprisoned by the past and their liberation is dependent on actions of the perpetrator side. (p. 2)

The United Nation’s reports estimate that as many as 400,000 Armenians survived until the end of WWI, in the Ottoman Empire (Bloxham, 2003, p. 37). At least one million of the Armenians who fled the Armenian Genocide were able to immigrate to the United States (Donahue, 1999). Consequently, as Adalian (1992) depicts, “a quietude eventually descended upon their existence as their cause was forgotten and the challenge of keeping
their offspring from completely assimilating into their host societies absorbed all their energies” (p. 90). Adalian (1992) further mentions that these Armenians, cut off from Soviet Armenia, did not, at this time have any access or connection to preserving the proper and necessary documents of the Armenian Genocide. “By 1923 the entire landmass of Asia Minor and historic West Armenia had been expunged of its Armenian population” (ANI, 2004, p. 2).

Denial of the Armenian Genocide. The Young Turks Committee of Union and Progress disbanded in 1918 (Balakian, 2003; Dadrian, 1995). An independent republic took over for two and a half years (Adalian, 2000). Armenia’s existence as an independent state ended in 1920, and a silence regarding the Armenian Genocide was initiated by the Communist government (Adalian, 2000). Aghjayan (2000) asserts the following:

The goal of the deniers is to create doubt, to build controversy and ultimately to minimize the significance of the genocidal act. What is lost in the continual attack upon our collective memory is the diminutive value placed on life by the perpetrators of genocide. The lives of the victims were worthless by the rationalizations presented. Denial is a message of hate and prejudice. Denial is a continuation of genocide, some even noting it is the final act of genocide. (p. 5)

Today, the Turkish government continued to deny that their country's leaders committed genocide against the Armenians. “…it is clear that this historically inaccurate refusal to even acknowledge the premeditated extermination between 1915 and 1923 of fully two-thirds of all Armenians by Ottoman Turkey and the exile of a nation from its historic homeland of more than 3000 years, represents another very sad chapter in the State Department’s complicity in the Turkish government’s ongoing immoral campaign to deny the Armenian Genocide” (ANCA, 2004, p. 2). The Turkish government’s response is that the Armenians, along with the Russians assistance, were planning to overthrow the
government in eastern Anatolia, and, in the attempt to do this, thousands of Turks were killed (Mozingo, 1999). Hovannisian (1999) points out that Turkey's government, following the Armenian Genocide, did not allow discussion of genocide and hoped that through time, "the survivors would pass from the scene, their children would become acculturated and assimilated in the diaspora, and the issue would be forgotten" (Hovannisian, 1999, p. 16). As Dadrian stated "denial is a function of power" (as cited in Belenkaya, 2001, p. 1). Both Dadrian (2003) and Balakian (1997, 2003) discuss the efforts of the Turkish government to destroy documents of incriminating evidence in the past.

The Turkish Government's Side of the Story

Balakian (1997) states that what is taught in Turkey about the Armenian Genocide of 1915 is that "...in 1915 Armenians were traitors who attacked and killed Turks and deserved everything they got" (p. 269). Balakian (1997) further explains how Turkey wants the public to believe that there are two sides to the story, and what the Armenians present, is a biased point of view. Adalian (1992) mentions in The Armenian Genocide: Revisionism and Denial, that small groups of Armenian terrorists, with the intent to draw attention from the world to dispute the denial by the Turks, began fighting back:

They primarily targeted the Turkish diplomatic corps. During a ten-year spree lasting from 1975 to 1985, Turkish ambassadors, consuls, attaches, and guards were shot and killed by these gunmen, whose demands were always the same: international recognition of the Armenian genocide and Turkish restitution of Armenian lands. (p. 91)

As Balakian (1997) points out, these "Armenian terrorist attacks" highlight what can be provoked by genocide and denial (p. 277).
One Turkish historian, Ackam, is one of the few to say that his country and
people did commit this genocide against the Armenians (Mozingo, 1999). Moreover, he
feels it is a necessity for the country today to admit it, so Turkey can progress as a
country and become a democracy. Furthermore, in Mozingo’s (1999) article, it mentions
how Akcam was restricted by the Turkish government from research on this subject. “He
[Akcam] relied mostly on German and American records of the massacres, he said,
because the Turks purged most references to the atrocities from their archives” (Mozingo,
1999, p. 3).

Adalian (1992) notes one short-term affect of the violence provoked by the
Armenians, lead to an intensification of the denial by the Turkish government. Adalian
(1992) further states:

With the resources of the Turkish government committed to obstructing,
obscuring, confusing, distorting, and in any and every manner denigrating the
Armenian genocide and its memory, the denial campaign became an industry.
With increasing frequency the literature challenging every aspect and recorded
fact of the genocide now reached libraries around the world. Revisionists,
deniers, and spokespersons of the Turkish government, masquerading as scholars,
historians, and specialists of one sort or another, made a living pounding away at
the body of evidence documenting the Armenian genocide. (p. 91)

Balakian (2003) notes that during the year of 1915, the New York Times published
145 articles. Balakian (2003) continues to state “the conclusive language of the reportage
was that the Turkish slaughter of the Armenians was ‘systematic,’ ‘deliberate,’
‘authorized,’ and ‘organized by government’; it was a ‘campaign of extermination’ and
of ‘systematic race extermination’” (p. xix). In a broader sense, Dadrian (1995) in his
study concludes the following:

Perhaps the most daunting lesson of the history of the Armenian genocide is the
grim evidence of consistency with which the victimization of the Armenians has
proven unpreventable but also has proven impervious to punishment. One is
faced here with the persistence of the dismal reality of impunity perversely functioning as a negative reward benefiting the camp of the perpetrators, past and present, and rendering the latter as remorseless as ever. It is within this context that the Turkish denial syndrome needs to be understood and dealt with. The impulse to deny the crime is entwined with and sustained by the reality of impunity. (p. 422)

Education and U.S. Relations with Turkey

Balakian (1997) describes how he and others wished to write a chapter in a textbook on 20th Century genocide but because of U.S. and Turkish relations, it was discouraged. Balakian states:

...the New York state Department of Education asked me to be an advisor for a textbook on twentieth-century genocide that would be used in public schools. Not long after I and a group of scholars had begun putting together the chapter on the Armenian Genocide, the Turkish Embassy got wind of the project and began harassing the Department of Education, insisting that ‘this genocide business’ was invented by Armenians, and if the chapter were included it would hurt U.S.-Turkish relations. (p. 266)

Today, there are more resources, especially on the Internet, educating not only students but also the public about the Armenian Genocide. For example, an article available on the Internet from the official site of the Armenia Diaspora Conference (2003), discusses how San Francisco Bay area ANCA website has downloadable lesson plans on the Armenian Genocide. More importantly, it discusses a curriculum that has been developed and is encouraged to be used by educators in the 2003-2004 school year in San Francisco high school history classes (Armenia Diaspora Conference, 2003).

“Teaching about genocide, including the Armenian Genocide, and issues of human rights and wrongs needs to be introduced more widely in courses in departments of education across the country” (Apsel, 2003, p. 193). Furthermore, Hovannisian, during the Zoryan Institute lecture (2003), stated “all the evidence for the Armenian Genocide has not been made available. We have an uncooperative Turkish government that perpetuates denial
of this crime" (Zoryan Institute, 2003, p. 2). Additionally, an Armenian Diaspora website revealed a group of scholars and writers in the U.S. who feel that the Turkish government is "manipulating" universities in America and supporting "fraudulent scholarship" (Rubin, 1995).

**The Heath Lowry Incident.** In 1995, a heavy publicized example of the Turks attempt to dismiss the denial of genocide was that of the *Heath Lowry Affair* (Balakian, 2003). This occurred in 1995 when Dr. Heath Lowry, a professor at Princeton University, was appointed to the Chair in Turkish Studies, a position supported financially by the Turkish Government (The Heath Lowry Affair, 1995). Balakian (2003), explains Lowry had worked for the Turkish government and became the director of the Institute for Turkish Studies, located in Washington, D.C., to continue Turkish denial of the Armenian Genocide.

Krikorian (1999) writes, in a printed interview with Henry Morgenthau III, the American Ambassador to Turkey’s great grandson, how the Turkish government are spending money for *Ataturk Professorships*. According to Rubin (1995), a group of U.S. scholars have signed a petition criticizing the Turkish government for hiring, what they say, are U.S. academics to consult Turkish officials on their response in denying the Armenian Genocide. For example, Heath Lowry is described by Morgenthau III, in Krikorian (1999), as having:

...no academic credentials at all. The only thing that he has had published actually, is a pamphlet which is called "The story behind the Ambassador Morgenthau story" which is an attempt to discredit my grandfather as a reckless journalist and a World War One Propagandist. So I think that it is necessary that the Institutions that have set up the Armenian Assembly of America need to be vigilant and active in opening up dialogue to try to have the Genocide recognized by the end of this century, and perhaps even dealt with. (p. 1A)
The following is an excerpt from *The Heath Lowry Affair* web site (1995) with reference to the Heath Lowry incident and the Turks continued denial of the Armenian Genocide:

The chair carries a requirement that the appointee have conducted research in Turkish archives. Since Turkey controls access to its archives, and has been known to ban scholars that it considers unfriendly, the Turkish government is allowed to manipulate the pool of applicants....Ten years ago, Lowry threatened an Armenian journalist with a lawsuit for printing an article about his activities. (The Situation section, ¶ 1)

Falk (1994) argues “it is a major, proactive deliberate government effort to use every possible instrument of persuasion at their disposal to keep the truth about the Armenian Genocide from general acknowledgment, especially by elites in the United States and Western Europe” (p. 1).

**Literature Review Summary**

This study is important since it strives to bring attention to the Armenian Genocide in United States higher education. It also is significant because the Turkish government still denies this genocide ever occurred, and is taking measures to prevent the United States from officially recognizing these killings as the Armenian Genocide (Balakian, 2003; Dadrian, 1995; Graber, 1996). Both Dadrian (2003) and Balakian (1997, 2003) discuss the efforts of the Turkish government to destroy documents of incriminating evidence and the continual, current political pressure imposed on the United States by the Turks, to keep the history and knowledge of this genocide from the public. Through research and analysis of this horrific event, it is the researcher’s hope that people will become more aware and knowledgeable about genocide and
consequently, be able to prevent it from occurring in the future (Freedman-Apsel, 1992; Okoomian, 2002).

The majority of research on the Armenian Genocide is devoted to exposing and documenting the historical events of the genocide as well as understanding the social, economic, and political aspects of Turkey and the Armenians from the late 1800s through World War I. Throughout the last 20 years, scholars, historians and survivors such as Dadrian (1995, 1999a, 1999b, 2003), Balakian (1997, 2000, 2003), Adalian (1991, 1992, 1996), Hovannisian (1986, 1999, 2003), Miller and Miller (1993), and Turkish historian Ackam (2001), have studied official state records proving Turkey’s governing political party’s systematic extermination of the Armenians (Balakian, 2003). There is, however, a lack of empirical and theoretical research on the inclusion of the Armenian Genocide in higher education in the United States. The significance of this study is to contribute to the understanding of whether higher education is including undergraduate course content of the Armenian Genocide. The researcher investigates this using content analysis.

Content Analysis

Neuedendorf (2002) states content analysis, in quantitative research, is one of the fastest growing methods. Neuedendorf (2002) defines content analysis as “the systematic, objective, quantitative analysis of message characteristics” (p. 1). More specifically, “it includes the careful examination of human interactions; the analysis of character portrayals in TV commercials films, and novels; the computer-driven investigation of word usage in news releases and political speeches; and so much more” (Nuedendorf, 2002 p. 1).
Baker (1999) discusses content analysis as unobtrusive, because, unlike field research, it does not intrude on a social environment. Baker (1999) also explains how content analysis requires the researcher to define “...a body of communication as the 'social field' and looks within that set of material for descriptive qualities that can be quantified” (Baker, 1999 p. 277).

Nachmias-Frankfort (1996) points out the three main applications of content analysis. The first application is “describing the attributes of the message” (Nachmias-Frankfort, 1996, p. 325). Making inferences, through analysis of the text by asking who says what to whom and why, is the second application. The third application of content analysis as presented in Nachmias-Frankfort (1996) is the inferences made by the researchers in regard to how the recipients of the messages are affected (p. 326).

One of the key elements of content analysis is its parallel to the scientific method (Neudendorf, 2002). Neudendorf (2002) emphasizes that content analysis “…conforms to the rules of science. Most closely related to the technique of survey research, it uses messages rather than human beings as its level of analysis” (p. 47). As far as variables are concerned with content analysis, they are measured “as they naturally or normally occur. No manipulation of independent variables is attempted” (Neudendorf, 2002, p. 49).

**Coding.** Neudendorf (2002) emphasizes the importance of coding using content analysis and discusses human coding vs. computer coding, the use of coders, and codebooks. An important point Neudendorf (2002) highlights is that coding done “before the fact” can be a disadvantage (p. 11). Additionally, reliability becomes intercoder reliability in that all coders need to be in agreement on the process of coding.
(Neudendorf, 2002). The researcher of this study realizes the implications of this and coded meaning as it was uncovered.

Examples of Content Analysis. The Writing@CSU Guide from Colorado State University (2004) discusses how content analysis is used in a variety of fields such as sociology, psychology, political science, literature, mass media, marketing, and many more. Content analysis has evolved from just analyzing the frequency of selected text and terms, "to explore mental models, and their linguistic, affective, cognitive, social, cultural and historical significance" (Writing@CSU, 2004, A brief history). The Writing@CSU Guide (2004) defines mental models as, "A group or network of interrelated concepts that reflect conscious or subconscious perceptions of reality. These internal mental networks of meaning are constructed as people draw inferences and gather information about the world" (Writing@CSU, 2004, Glossary of key terms).

Content analysis has been frequently used in advertising. For example, McCullough (1993) used content analysis to investigate six leisure themes in international print advertisements. McCullough (1993) analyzed 525 print advertisements from selected magazines and newspapers to determine how frequently specific leisure elements appeared in these ads. The results were presented quantitatively in a table that listed the nationality of the ad, as well as the frequency of the six leisure elements.

Content analysis has also been used in media. For example, a comparative study conducted by Moffett (1978) examines two college newspaper editors to determine how much information on Ball State University’s students was being represented by these editors on the front page of the Daily News. Moffett (1978) mentions how content
analysis has been used to compare newspapers for the last 30 years. In this study, Moffett (1978) analyzes the one editor of the paper during winter 1977 and then compares it to the new editor of the paper in the winter 1978. The analysis of this study consisted of measuring the stories with a ruler to determine how much space the articles took on the front page. A graph was used to depict the number of stories featuring Ball State University students by each of the editors during the same three months of the winter, December, January, and February. Moffett (1978) also displays the results of the number of photos featuring Ball State students with a graph.

Content analysis has also been used in literature. An historical content analysis of publications in gifted education journals by Hays (1993) was conducted to examine all articles from two journals, Gifted Child Quarterly Roepers Review, and The Journal for the Education of the Gifted from their beginning issues until 1989. As Hays (1993) states, “content analysis can provide valuable information about the persons contributing to the literature, the amount and type of research conducted, and the topics addressed in a field of study” (p. 1). Furthermore, it “is sometimes used to answer research questions about the nature of a field of study by examining the literature in that field. This type of research can address questions about a field of study’s content, authorship, and research techniques by examining its literature” (Hays, 1993, p. 1). Hays (1993) used content analysis to discover information including affiliation of authors and coauthors. Hays (1993) analyzed 1,773 journal article authors and coauthors for his study and found an overall decrease of male authors and an increase in university-affiliated authors.

An example of content analysis applied to humanities is a study by Domhoff (2002) titled Using content analysis to study dreams: Applications and implications for
the humanities. Domhoff (2002) addresses how content analysis is a new approach to studying dreams and defines it as “the use of carefully defined categories and quantitative techniques to find meaningful regularities in text” (p. 1). Domhoff (2002) points out that content analysis “is very simple in principle, but difficult to carry out in practice” (p. 1).

Domhoff (2002) presents content analysis as four steps:

1. Creating relevant categories that can be understood and applied by any researcher;
2. Tabulating frequencies for the categories;
3. Using percentages, ratios, or other statistics to transform raw frequencies into meaningful data;
4. Making comparisons with normative samples or control groups (p. 1).

The advantages of content analysis, as presented by the Writing@CSU Guide (2004) website are the following:

- Looks directly at communication via texts or transcripts, and hence gets at the central aspect of social interaction
- Can allow for both quantitative and qualitative operations
- Can provide valuable historical/cultural insights over time through analysis of texts
- Allows a closeness to text which can alternate between specific categories and relationships and also statistically analyzes the coded form of the text
- Can be used to interpret texts for purposes such as the development of expert systems (since knowledge and rules can both be coded in terms of explicit statements about the relationships among concepts)
- Is an unobtrusive means of analyzing interactions
- Provides insight into complex models of human thought and language use (p. 1).

There have not been, to this date, any content analysis studies on the inclusion of the Armenian Genocide in higher education. This content analysis study will determine how
many stand-alone undergraduate courses on the Armenian Genocide are being offered, as well as how much course content of the Armenian Genocide is embedded in undergraduate Holocaust/genocide courses in higher education. The significance of this study is to contribute to the understanding of whether higher education is including undergraduate course content on the Armenian Genocide.
Chapter Three

Methods

Purpose/Rationale

The purpose of this study was to determine how many courses, or how much course content existed in Division IA colleges/universities regarding the Armenian Genocide in undergraduate higher education throughout the United States. This study determined to what degree higher education undergraduate students are being exposed to the teachings about the Armenian Genocide. This study was important since it contributed to research on the inclusion of the Armenian Genocide in higher education. The significance of this study was to contribute to the analysis of whether higher education is including undergraduate course content of the Armenian Genocide. The method the researcher used was content analysis.

Research Method

As previously discussed in the literature review, content analysis uses both qualitative and quantitative properties. Content analysis was used to collect and analyze data from the undergraduate program catalogs of Division IA colleges/universities in the United States. This sample of Division IA colleges/universities was used since these represent the larger schools in the U.S., which frequently influence curriculum development in other U.S. colleges/universities.
Research Design

This study was appropriate since there have been no content analysis studies pertaining to the inclusion of Armenian Genocide courses in undergraduate higher education. The sample that was used for this study was Division 1A colleges/universities in the United States. This sample, which consisted of all Division 1A colleges/universities in the United States, was appropriate since Division 1A colleges/universities exemplify curriculums across all divisions of colleges and universities. Presently, there are a total 116 Division 1A colleges/universities in the United States.

Sample. There are several divisions that categorize colleges and universities based on their size in our country. Division IA, IAA, II and III reflect various sizes of universities or colleges in America. Division IA colleges/universities are the largest of all colleges/universities in the United States. These divisions represent their size and standing, as a college or university. For example, as determined by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I board of directors, all Division IA schools need to have an average attendance at their football games of at least 15,000 people at their home games, in order to keep their Division IA status (Blankenship, 2004).

All of the colleges/universities that were part of Division IA at the time this research was conducted were part of the study. While this choice of schools does not include institutions lacking athletic programs, the size and prestige of many Division IA schools places them in the position to lead curriculum development in schools across the United States. There are currently a total of 116 colleges/universities that hold a Division
IA status. Even though the majority of these Division IA schools are universities, 115 of 116, there is one college, Boston College that has this status of Division IA. Therefore the term colleges/universities must be used to describe the sample instead of just the single term, universities. All of the Division IA colleges/universities that were used as the sample for this study provided an understanding of whether or not colleges/universities in the United States are or are not offering undergraduate course content on the Armenian Genocide (see Appendix A—List of Division IA colleges/universities).

Research Questions. The research questions consist of the following:

1) How many Division IA colleges/universities in the United States offered any stand-alone undergraduate courses on the Armenian Genocide?

2) How many Division IA colleges/universities offered an undergraduate course on Holocaust/genocide in which the Armenian Genocide is included in the course content?

3) If a Division IA college/university offered an undergraduate course or course content specifically on the Armenian Genocide, in what department was this course offered?

Data Collection

Every step of this research was documented qualitatively. The data was collected by accessing every Division 1A college/university website and then researching their undergraduate program catalog for courses on the Armenian Genocide. If the college/university did not have a stand-alone course on the Armenian Genocide, then an analysis of any Holocaust and/or Genocide course offered by the Division 1A
college/university was conducted to determine if any content of the Armenian Genocide was included. Additionally, the college/university's department in which a stand-alone course on the Armenian Genocide was offered, as well as the department which offered course content of the Armenian Genocide in their Holocaust/genocide courses, was recorded and analyzed. If for any reason, the program catalog of the college/university could not be accessed electronically via the Internet, then a request was made through email or phone call to request delivery of the program catalog. Also, if, for any reason, the information could not be determined from the program catalog then a phone call to the college/university was made to contact the appropriate department to determine if they offered any courses including course content on the Armenian Genocide.

The quantitative aspect of this study consisted of computing the mean, median, and mode of the number of Division 1A colleges/universities that offered a stand-alone course on the Armenian Genocide and the number of Division 1A colleges/universities that included course content of the Armenian Genocide in their Holocaust/genocide courses. This study clearly determined if Division 1A colleges/universities offered undergraduate courses on the Armenian Genocide, or included it in undergraduate Holocaust/genocide courses. Using content analysis for this study required not only accessing and researching college/university websites, but searching deep into the college/university course descriptions. One of the aspects of content analysis is that it is a very time consuming research method (Neuendorf, 2002).

The duration of the data collection process was affected by several factors. One consideration was that it took time to become acclimated with the college/university website set-up and how to best navigate it. Another major factor was how long it took to
locate the undergraduate program catalog, and then how long it took to identify if and where stand-alone courses on the Armenian Genocide or course content on it through Holocaust/genocide courses resided in the program catalog. The main objective was to locate the program catalog and analyze the course descriptions to determine if there was any undergraduate course content on the Armenian Genocide. A review of the course titles in the historical, social and behavioral science departments of the catalog were conducted to determine where the Holocaust/Genocide courses resided in the catalog. The words “Armenian,” “genocide,” and “Holocaust,” were key search words and when found, were recorded as whether representing either a stand-alone course or an inclusion of course content in a Holocaust/genocide offering. Additionally, any pertinent observations, interpretations, or assumptions regarding the course description on the Armenian Genocide were recorded.

Data Analysis

Once all of the data was collected, a quantitative analysis was conducted on the following:

- the number of Division 1A colleges/universities that offered a stand-alone undergraduate course on the Armenian Genocide;
- the number of Division 1A colleges/universities that offered undergraduate course content on the Armenian Genocide in their Holocaust/genocide courses;
- the identification of, and number of, departments that offered a stand-alone undergraduate course on the Armenian Genocide;
• the identification of, and number of, departments that offered undergraduate Holocaust/genocide courses in which the Armenian Genocide was included.

The mean, median, and mode were computed for each. A graph was used to display these results.

The qualitative analysis, as previously mentioned, was central to this study. The researcher’s journey of this study focused on the qualitative analysis of the data collection, and also included qualitative analyses of the data results. This included any empirical ideas and/or thoughts that surface during the analysis of the data, as well as a personal review and documentation of the analysis process. If the researcher found any difficulty with organizing and presenting the data in graphs, then it was recorded and shared.

As discussed in the literature review, attempting to code before all the data has been collected and analyzed can be a disadvantage (Neudendorf, 2002). Consequently, the coding was developed as the study progressed and the information was collected. The researcher looked for themes and searched for meaning, being aware that there may not be any themes to develop. Furthermore, if it was discovered that there was additional strengths and limitations in the data collection or analysis process of this information that was observed, then this was documented as well.

Strengths and Limitations

The strengths of this research were best determined through the reliability, validity, and accuracy of the study. Any bias in relation to the accuracy of the measurement was avoided since the researcher was the only one performing the retrieval
and coding of the information. The reliability of the study demonstrated the fact that this information could be collected by others and have produced the same results. The validity of this study was determined through measuring exactly what was intended to be measured; the inclusion of the Armenian Genocide in course catalogs of Division IA colleges/universities.

A limitation to this study was that a course on Holocaust/genocide could include course content on the Armenian Genocide but not mention or describe this in the program catalog. Consequently, this would affect the results of the study in that it may have produced a lower count to research questions #2: How many colleges/universities offered an undergraduate course on Holocaust/genocide in which the Armenian Genocide was included in the course content? Another limitation to the study may be the possibility of missing and/or not observing mention of the Armenian Genocide in any course descriptions. A complex factor to this study was not knowing, before the analysis of a college/university website, which department the topic of Holocaust/genocide fell within. Therefore, the researcher needed to look closely to observe all departments and their course curriculum. It would have been unfortunate to miss and not record a school that offered course content on the Armenian Genocide, for example, in both their sociology and history department. If only the course content on the Armenian Genocide was measured and recorded from the sociology department and the history department was overlooked, the results would be biased since it was not including in the total space devoted to the Armenian Genocide. This would also result in a lower count to how many and which colleges/universities offered course content on the Armenian Genocide, as well as affecting research question #3, in regard to the department that offered stand-
alone courses or course content on the Armenian Genocide. Consequently, this affected the results of the study; how much information on the Armenian Genocide was being included in undergraduate higher education? However, the researcher was aware of these limitations and since she was the only one conducting this study, eliminated any possible bias through careful observation, analyses, and data collection methods.

This content analysis study was important for several reasons. First all, contributed to the limited number of studies on the Armenian Genocide, and therefore increased awareness and recognition. More importantly, this study created opportunities for further inquiry on the inclusion of the Armenian Genocide in colleges/universities. It was the presumption of the researcher that the first genocide of the 20th Century, the Armenian Genocide, was not universally apparent in higher education. Through research and analyses of content analysis of this event, it was intended that both the public and scholars will ask why so little coverage existed in higher education regarding the Armenian Genocide.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine how many courses exist, or how much course content exists in Division IA colleges/universities regarding the Armenian Genocide in undergraduate higher education throughout the United States. This study determined to what degree higher education students are exposed to information on the Armenian Genocide through undergraduate stand-alone courses or through course content on the Armenian Genocide through undergraduate Holocaust/genocide courses. The research method, Content Analysis was used to collect and analyze data from the
undergraduate program catalogs of Division 1A colleges/universities in the United States. The research questions consisted of the following:

(1) How many Division IA colleges/universities in the United States offered stand-alone undergraduate courses on the Armenian Genocide?

(2) How many Division IA colleges/universities offered an undergraduate course on Holocaust/genocide in which the Armenian Genocide is included in the course content?

(3) If a Division IA college/university offered an undergraduate course or course content specifically on the Armenian Genocide, in what department was this course offered?

This study was important since it contributes to research on the inclusion of the Armenian Genocide in higher education. This is most important since the Turkish government still denies the genocide occurred, and is taking measures to prevent the United States from officially recognizing these killings as the Armenian Genocide (Balakian, 2003; Dadrian, 1995; Graber, 1996;). Both Dadrian (2003) and Balakian (1997, 2003) discuss the efforts of the Turkish government to destroy documents of incriminating evidence in the past and the continual, current political pressure imposed on the United States by the Turks, that is keeping the history and knowledge of this genocide from the public. Through research and analyses on this horrific event, it is the hope that people today will become more aware and knowledgeable about genocide and consequently, be able to prevent it from occurring in the future (Freedman-Apsel, 1992; Okoomian, 2002).
The majority of research on the Armenian Genocide is devoted to exposing and documenting the historical events of the genocide as well as understanding the social, economic, and political aspects of Turkey and the Armenians from the late 1800s through World War I. Through the last 20 years, scholars, historians, and survivors such as Dadrian (1995, 1999a, 1999b, 2003), Balakian (1997, 2000, 2003), Adalian (1991, 1992, 1996), Hovannisian (1986, 1999, 2003), Miller and Miller (1993), and Turkish historian Ackam (2001), have studied official state records proving Turkey’s governing political party’s systematic methods of exterminating the Armenians (Balakian, 2003). Despite this research, there is a lack of empirical and theoretical research on the topic of the inclusion of the Armenian Genocide in higher education. The significance of this study was to contribute to the understanding of whether higher education is including undergraduate courses and/or course content of the Armenian Genocide.
Chapter Four

Results

Introduction: Analysis of Data

The purpose of this study was to determine how many courses exist, or how much course content exists in Division IA colleges/universities regarding the Armenian Genocide in undergraduate higher education throughout the United States. This study determined to what degree undergraduate higher education students are exposed to information on the Armenian Genocide through undergraduate stand-alone courses or through course content on the Armenian Genocide through undergraduate Holocaust/genocide courses. Additionally, this research analyzed the forces that deny the atrocity and how that may undermine the knowledge and understanding of the Armenian Genocide today (Belenkaya, 2001; Falk, 1994; Okoomian, 2002; Papazian, 1997).

This study determined which Division 1A universities/colleges are offering undergraduate courses on the Armenian Genocide or which include undergraduate course content on it in Holocaust/genocide courses. Using content analysis for this study required not only accessing and researching college/university websites, but searching deep into the college/university course descriptions.

The data for this study was collected by accessing every Division 1A college/university website and then researching their program catalog for courses on the Armenian Genocide. If the college/university did not have an undergraduate stand-alone course on the Armenian Genocide, then an analysis of any undergraduate Holocaust and/or genocide course offered by the Division 1A college/university was conducted to
determine if any content of the Armenian Genocide was included. Additionally, the college/university’s department in which an undergraduate stand-alone course on the Armenian Genocide was offered, as well as the department which offered course content of the Armenian Genocide in their undergraduate Holocaust/genocide courses, was recorded and analyzed. If for any reason, the program catalog of the college/university could not be accessed electronically via the Internet, then a request was made through email to request delivery of the program catalog. Also, if, for any reason, the information could not be determined from the program catalog, or if the researcher felt additional information was needed, then an email to the college/university was initiated in order to contact the appropriate department to discover if they offer any undergraduate courses including course content on the Armenian Genocide.

The quantitative aspect of this study consisted of conducting measures of central tendency, which include the mean, median, and mode (descriptive statistics) of the number of Division 1A colleges/universities that offer an undergraduate stand-alone course on the Armenian Genocide. It also included the measures of central tendency on the number of Division 1A colleges/universities that offer undergraduate course content on the Armenian Genocide in their Holocaust/genocide courses. The researcher also reported on the number of key words (Armenian, genocide, and Holocaust) included in the found undergraduate stand-alone courses and course content of the Armenian Genocide. This process of coding (using the key terms) is an important part of content analysis.

Coding. As also presented in Chapter Three, Neudendorf (2002) emphasized the importance of coding using content analysis and discussed human coding vs. computer
coding, the use of coders, and codebooks. An important point Neudendorf (2002) highlights is that coding done “before the fact” can be a disadvantage (p. 11). The researcher realized this and conducted the coding after all the data was collected and analyzed. Reliability becomes intercoder reliability in that all coders need to be in agreement with the process of coding (Neudendorf, 2002). The researcher of this study realized the importance of this and was the only one who collected the data for this study and conducted the coding of the key words. Descriptive statistics will also be computed and shared for the colleges and departments that offer stand alone courses and/or course content on the Armenian Genocide.

**Organization of Analysis of Data**

The results of the quantitative analysis on the following are presented in this section (in order):

- the number of Division 1A colleges/universities that offer a stand-alone undergraduate course on the Armenian Genocide;
- the number of Division 1A colleges/universities that offer undergraduate course content on the Armenian Genocide in their Holocaust/genocide courses;
- the number and identification of departments that offer a stand-alone undergraduate course or undergraduate course content in their Holocaust/genocide courses on the Armenian Genocide;
- the identification of, and number of key terms included in the course description of any undergraduate stand-alone course on the Armenian Genocide or any
undergraduate course content of the Armenian Genocide in Holocaust/genocide
courses.

Tables and figures will be used throughout this section to display and discuss the results
of the data, which pertain to the research questions, as well as additional observations that
were made during the study. The research questions will thoroughly be analyzed and
answered in this section as well as the actual steps in attaining the data for this research.
Any difficulties or problems that were encountered along the way of conducting this
study will also be reviewed and discussed. Moreover, any and all discoveries made along
the way are contained in this section.

Actual Steps of Data Analysis

Research Questions. The research questions consist of the following, which will
be thoroughly analyzed in this section.

(1) How many Division IA colleges/universities in the United States offer stand-alone
    undergraduate courses on the Armenian Genocide?

(2) How many Division IA colleges/universities offer an undergraduate course on
    Holocaust/genocide in which the Armenian Genocide is included in the course
    content?

(3) If a Division IA college/university offers an undergraduate course or course
    content specifically on the Armenian Genocide, in what department is this course
    offered?

The researcher used SPSS (Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences) to quantify the
results of the data gathered and compute the mean, median, and mode for each research
question.
Once a college/university's website was accessed, a search on that website was initiated to locate the school's current program catalog. This was conducted to determine if the school was currently offering a course on the Armenian Genocide or course content on the Armenian Genocide embedded in any Holocaust/genocide courses. The observed information, and the data collected for this study was first recorded in the researcher's field notes. The information was reviewed and analyzed and then transferred to a spreadsheet that consisted of several column headings (see Table 1).

Table 4-1

*Column Titles in Researcher's Spreadsheet*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Current Program Catalog</th>
<th>Stand-Alone Courses on the Armenian Genocide</th>
<th>Holocaust/Genocide Courses</th>
<th>Course Content on the Armenian Genocide</th>
<th>Need to Contact School Further</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Additional Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

First the name of the school was entered into the first column. The second column designates whether or not the current program catalog was allowed to be accessed online, indicated by a “yes” or “no.” However, all 116 (one college/fifteen university) program catalogs were accessible online. As the research progressed, additional information was added to this column, such as the year of the program catalog that was viewed (i.e. 2004-2005 or 2005-2006 program catalog), as well as the type of file in which it was viewed, for example PDF (portable document format) or HTML (hypertext markup language). The third column represents whether or not the college/university offers a stand-alone undergraduate course on the Armenian Genocide which was indicated by a “yes” or a “no.” The fourth column was included to reveal if
the school offers (in its current program catalog) undergraduate Holocaust courses, indicated by an “H”, Genocide courses, indicated by a “G” or both Holocaust and Genocide courses, indicated by “H & G.” The fifth column designates whether or not the college/university offers undergraduate course content on the Armenian Genocide, embedded in their Holocaust, genocide, or any other social science course. The sixth column identifies whether or not the school needs to be contacted for further information, and is marked with either a “yes” or a “no.”

If a college/university had to be contacted, the first step was to locate the appropriate professor, which in most cases was not difficult, using the World Wide Web. This was usually determined by clicking on the link for the department that the course in question was offered, in order to obtain the contact information of either the Chair of the department, or if included, the name of the instructor of the course. An email was then sent to the contact person (see Appendix B—Researcher’s email letter of request).

The second to last column, “completed” indicates whether or not the school’s program catalog was successfully researched, and the necessary information was collected so as to determine whether or not the school currently offers undergraduate courses or course content on the Armenian Genocide. Finally, the last column was included so that the researcher had room for additional comments observed while researching the program catalog or school’s web site.

*Difficulties Encountered Along the Way.* One of the most difficult aspects of this research was accessing the schools’ program catalog in a timely manner. This was affected by whether or not the researcher had admission to a high-speed Internet connection or was using the standard dial-up connection. This was a huge factor in
locating and analyzing the data, and the difficulty of the type of Internet connection was recorded, (at times descriptively) in the researcher’s field notes.

Another difficulty was becoming acclimated with the presentation of overall university website setup. It took accessing and researching several schools’ websites before determining the common theme and structure that most universities have used in developing their websites. Only a few schools had limited information on their website or were designed very differently than the normal college/university website template.

The typical college/university home websites contain common links and information for the user to choose from. Even though these links varied from university to university, the average template for a university website contains the links to the following departments or areas: academics, admissions, current campus news and/or events, employment, contact information and other such resources for students, families, and faculty. Additionally, most university home websites have a search option wherein the user can type in key words and phrases which can be searched for in the entire school’s website. Moreover, some of the university home websites included “quick links.” When chosen, this feature provides the user with a window of options, such as the program/course catalog, registrar, bookstore, and human resources. This was a very useful tool for searching for the school’s most current program catalog.

Many of the program catalogs were in PDF file. These program catalogs were searched by using the “find” key (or by clicking on the icon binoculars on the top of the menu in the Adobe Acrobat program that runs and supports PDF files) by entering each one of the key terms (Armenian; genocide; Holocaust) individually. This search tool allows the user to search the entire catalog for the key words in seconds. When found,
the terms are highlighted. In the beginning of the data collection process, the key words “Armenian Genocide,” “genocide,” and “Holocaust” were used. However, the Researcher realized that it was redundant and perhaps confusing to the “search” tool to search for the combined phrase “Armenian Genocide” and therefore the key search term was shortened to just “Armenian.” Consequently, the key words that were used to locate courses or course content on the Armenian Genocide in this study were “Armenian,” “genocide,” and “Holocaust.”

For example, if a university offered a course entitled Germany in 1945, this course may actually present material on the Holocaust, but what was being measured in this study was whether or not these key words/terms were mentioned in the course titles and/or descriptions. Consequently, if the course description did not contain the words Armenian, genocide, or Holocaust, then they were not observed and therefore not counted or included in the content analysis of this study.

All of the schools had some sort of “program catalog” containing a description of their departments, degrees offered, course descriptions and curricula, as well as other pertinent information regarding the university. However, it was learned that some schools titled their program catalog, a course catalog, general catalog, or bulletin. What was important to the researcher was locating the school’s “program catalog” online. The “yes” in this column represents that a program catalog was located and allowed to be analyzed online. This PDF format was the easiest, most convenient and efficient format, and allowed the researcher to search the entire university’s “program catalog” within seconds for the three key words; Armenian; genocide and Holocaust.
There was one incident in which the researcher had to contact the school, since their program catalog was not accessible, or had difficulty locating the catalog via their website. The researcher had to send a faculty member an email requesting a copy of the program catalog be sent to her home address, which at the time of analysis, was unable to be accessed online. The university responded through email with a link to their current program catalog online, as well as sending a hard copy of their 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 program catalogs to the researcher's home address within two weeks of the second request. Approximately two weeks after the first catalog was received, another catalog, the 2005-2006 was received so the researcher received two copies of the university's program catalog. However, only the most recent program catalog, 2005-2006, was used for analysis in the study.

When a program catalog was located but was in HTML text and not in PDF format, a more careful, and time-consuming search was initiated. In this instance, the researcher had to search the College of Arts and Science for example, and then the individual departments within that college, for example the history department. Depending on how the college/university set up their website, the researcher continued to search through the school's website to obtain the descriptions of currently offered courses within the appropriate departments. For example, the field notes recorded regarding the fourth school searched, contains the following:

With some difficulty and time 20 minutes found the program catalog. It was eventually discovered that they called it a "bulletin"

All indexes are listed separately which provide links to the section to download in PDF format.

a) I started with clicking on the College of Human Sciences
b) clicked on college of liberal arts
c) clicked on college of science and mathematics
As previously mentioned, the researcher learned from this analysis that some schools title their program catalog a “bulletin,” which made the future research of this study not only more extensive and complicated but also made it clearer on how and where to find a university’s program catalog on their website. Moreover, the preliminaries of the research were unfamiliar to the researcher and more time consuming. Identifying discoveries, such as those from searching this particular university’s website, made this research very interesting and undoubtedly opened doors to further research.

There was also difficulty encountered when trying to access the school’s most current program online. Before it was discovered that some program catalogs were referred to as “bulletins,” the researcher used the search word “catalog,” and consequently, nothing was returned from the website that indicated a course catalog was available to be reviewed online. However, when the researcher went back to search the university again at a later date with the knowledge of other terms for “program catalog,” the term “bulletin” was found immediately. Consequently, this educated the researcher of how university websites are designed, where certain information, such as program catalogs are more likely to be located on a school’s website, and the different terms that schools use to identify their program/course catalogs. Although templates for schools are similar, terms for core elements seem to vary.

During one of the first few program catalog or bulletin searches, the following response was returned: “A valid subscription is required to access CollegeSource®
Online catalogs. Click the following link to register for a Free Trial or learn more about the benefits of CollegeSource® Online. Free trial is only for 10 days.” At first, it appeared that the researcher would have to join this subscription, which was contemplated assuming that there might be other school’s that used this CollegeSource as well. However, the second search for the university’s program catalog was successful, although not without a few other minor complications. Moreover, the researcher did not encounter the CollegeSource® subscription message on any of the other school’s program catalog searches.

In the field notes, the word “completed” at the end of each university was inserted so that the researcher could quickly run through the field notes and determine which school’s had been analyzed and completed compared to those that were “in-progress.” This term was used to alert the researcher, when reviewing the field notes that further analysis was needed for that university to accurately complete the investigation in order to answer the research questions.

If a program catalog in PDF could not be located, then the researcher used the Microsoft Internet Explored “find” tool (indicated with a binocular icon) for the HTML text, to determine if the key words existed in the school’s program catalog. This tool searched for the indicated key terms throughout the entire open top window. For example, the researcher’s research notes for one university are the following:

Could not access program catalog pdf – but accessed program catalog and searched online with the Find tool from Microsoft Internet Explorer – to search the page for the keywords: Armenian Genocide; genocide and Holocaust.

It was not until the sixth college/university that was searched in which the researcher realized the following:
Didn’t realize the powerful tool of search in PDF files. For example, all I have to do is pull up the PDF file – click on Edit on the top menu – click on search – and then a window pops up – to search for word or phrase in the PDF document. Once the result is tabulated – you can view all the hits by clicking on Edit (menu) and then Search Result – Next – it has highlighted every time the word Holocaust is used in the program catalog. (Obviously saves a lot of time)

Limitations = could have spelled search key word wrong and therefore would not display any results – I always did searches 2 times to avoid any spelling errors.

The main concern of the researcher was that all the college/university most current program catalogs were correctly and thoroughly searched for the key words: Armenian, Genocide, and Holocaust, to determine if courses currently being offered by the school contained any mention of the Armenian Genocide. There were a few incidences where a key word was located in a course that, after further research, revealed the course was not current in the department or college. One university, for example, listed in its course descriptions “SOC 305 Racial and Cultural Minorities.” The description for the course contained one of the key search terms, “genocide.” “Comparative study of inter-ethnic relations. Problems and possibilities of genocide, oppression, integration, pluralism and equality. PREREQ: SOC 101 or PSYC 101 and upper-division standing.” Considering that this course is offered in sociology and not history alerted the researcher to doubt that this course offered any course content on the Armenian Genocide, since most course content on genocide was offered through the history department. Even though it did not appear that this course was currently being offered, the researcher, out of curiosity emailed the chair of the sociology department, to confirm. One other university was also contacted to determine if they were currently offering course content on the Armenian Genocide, after the term “genocide” was located in one or more of their course descriptions. However, both responses from these schools were that they have offered
course content on the Armenian Genocide, but for different reasons, are not currently offering this content to their students.

Another important issue was to be sure that the correct school was being searched for these key words. There were a few incidences that prompted some confusion as to whether or not the correct university in the right town and state was being searched and therefore the researcher had to make sure that the one being analyzed was included in the Division IA list.

Another difficulty was getting the university’s appropriate department or professor to email the researcher back with the requested information. The majority of schools and professors contacted responded right away. However, whether it was due to lack of keeping contact information current on their website, or just not contacting the right person, there were several schools that had to be contacted several times. For example, with one university, the researcher had emailed a professor in the Political Science department twice, where the courses that mentioned genocide were listed. After no response, an email was sent to the undergraduate Chair of the Political Science department. This professor responded that they did not offer course content on the Armenian Genocide in any of their courses and that another professor in the department, who covers genocide in their courses, should be contacted. The researcher emailed this professor for a third time and was advised by an email response that they were away for the month of May 2005. An email response was finally received from the professor, along with a syllabus that contained the inclusion of the Armenian Genocide.

In reviewing another university’s program catalog, the following course description was observed: “W HIS 454 History of Genocide (3) spring course examines
the individuals and institutions responsible for the most infamous episodes of state
sanctioned violence in the 20th Century. General Studies: G, H.” Since, the Armenian
Genocide was the first of the 20th century, this alerted the researcher, who decided to
explore the course content of this course further.

Following the review and analysis of this university’s program catalog, in which
all information was recorded in the researcher’s field notes, the researcher transferred the
information, coded it and recorded it, to the master spreadsheet. Consequently, the
researcher learned that this university has a 2004-2005 program catalog, which was
located from their website; the university does not offer any stand-alone undergraduate
courses on the Armenian Genocide (indicated by a “no”); offers both Holocaust and
genocide courses in its current curriculum (indicated by “H” for Holocaust and a “G” for
genocide); does offer course content on the Armenian Genocide (indicated by a “yes”);
did not need to be contacted further (indicated by a “no”) because a syllabus for the
course in question, HIs 454 History of Genocide, was also located online.

A final review of the researcher’s field notes revealed much more descriptive
information in the beginning of the data collection, since the whole process was
unfamiliar to the researcher. For example, such complications as technical errors and
slow dial-up connections were recorded more descriptively in the beginning of the
research than toward the end. The researcher realized, as the project continued, what
information was more important to record than others, for the purpose of the research
questions. In addition, not all school’s contained their course descriptions in the same
area or section of their online program catalog. If this was the case, the researcher had to
further search their website to locate the current courses descriptions in order to
determine if these courses listed in the program catalog contained courses or course content on the Armenian Genocide. The overall discovery regarding online program catalogs is that many college/universities set up their program catalogs much differently online than if you were to locate course descriptions through a hard copy of their program catalog.

**Description, Analysis and Interpretation of Results**

The data for this study was collected by accessing every Division 1A college/university website and then researching their program catalog for undergraduate courses or course content on the Armenian Genocide. There are a total of 116 Division 1A universities in the United States, of which only one of them, Boston College, is considered a college (see Appendix A—List of Division IA colleges/universities). In this study, only the key words, Armenian, genocide, and Holocaust, if they were present in the course description of the school’s most current program catalog were accounted for.

Research Question #1: How many Division IA institutions of higher education in the U.S. offer any stand-alone undergraduate courses on the Armenian Genocide? Of the 116 schools, only three include undergraduate stand-alone course(s) on the Armenian Genocide or 2.6% (see Table 2 and Figure 2). The mean or statistical average is 1.97; the median and mode both equaling 2 (see Table 3). Since the researcher coded every school as either 1 = yes, for have a stand alone course on the Armenian Genocide or 2 = no, for not. The results indicate the mean as 1.97, since 113 of the 116 schools
were coded with a “no.” Consequently, the median, the middle value of the distribution is 2 as well as the mode, which is the most frequently occurring value. There were no missing values (indicated with a 0), since the researcher was able to determine for all 116 school’s, whether or not they were offering any stand alone courses on the Armenian Genocide. Therefore, the valid percent is the same as the 2.6 percent (see Table 3). These three schools all offer courses specifically on the Armenian Genocide.

Table 4-2

*Universities Have Stand-Alone Undergraduate Course(s) on the Armenian Genocide*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yes  No

Stand-alone undergraduate course on the Armenian Genocide

Figure 4-1. Universities offer stand-alone undergraduate course on the Armenian Genocide.

Table 4-3

Descriptive Statistics: Universities have Stand-Alone Course on the Armenian Genocide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question # 2: How many Division IA colleges/universities offer an undergraduate course on Holocaust/genocide in which the Armenian Genocide is included in the course content?

If the three universities are excluded in the count of how many Division IA school's offer only course content on the Armenian Genocide, then the percent is 7.8% or a total of nine universities out of the 116 Division IA, which offer just course content on the Armenian Genocide (See Table 4 and Figure 3). The mean, or statistical average is 1.92; the median and mode both being 2 (see Table 5). Once again, these results indicate these numbers since all 116 school’s were coded with either a 1 for “yes” if they contained course content and a 2 for “no” if they did not.

Table 4-4

Universities Offer Course Content on the Armenian Genocide (excluding stand-alone courses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yes

Undergraduate course content on the Armenian genocide

Figure 4-2. Universities offer undergraduate course content on the Armenian Genocide.

Table 4-5

Descriptive Statistics: Universities Offer Course Content on the Armenian Genocide

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher was unable to determine if one of the universities had course content on the Armenian Genocide embedded in their Holocaust/genocide courses. After
reviewing this university’s undergraduate program catalog it was determined that it did not offer any stand-alone courses on the Armenian Genocide, and therefore the researcher was able to input a value for this school (2 for “no”). However, the researcher decided to contact a professor in the Sociology department of this school since there was a course listed in the program catalog entitled *Holocaust and Genocide* under the Sociology department. The chair of the sociology department was contacted three times with no reply. Consequently, the researcher was unable to conclude whether or not this university contained course content on the Armenian Genocide and was left blank and statistically computed as a missing variable.

If the missing data (1) from the one university is excluded, then the valid percent of the number of colleges/universities that do not offer course content on the Armenian Genocide is 92.2% and if it is included then the percent for the total of schools that do not offer course content on the Armenian Genocide is 91.4% (see Table 4). Consequently, a total of 12 of the 116 schools included either a stand-alone undergraduate course or course content on the Armenian Genocide or 10.3% (see Table 6 and Figure 4). The total percent of Division IA colleges/universities in the U.S. that do not offer any courses or course content on the Armenian Genocide is 88.8% or the valid percent of 89.6%, which excludes the missing value (see Table 6).

The importance of understanding this study is to remember that only the key words (Armenian; genocide; and Holocaust) were searched for in only the most current program catalog, the most common being either 2004-2005 or 2005-2006.
Undergraduate stand alone-course and course content on the Armenian Genocide

*Figure 4-3.* Universities offer stand-alone course and course content on the Armenian Genocide.

There were two schools in this study which indicated they offered course content on the Armenian Genocide, but were not currently offering it. However, one of these universities offered an Armenian Studies Program as well as an extensive research center that focuses on the Armenian Genocide.

Statistics were also conducted on data that was not intended to be analyzed, but found interesting enough to do after the data had been collected. For example, the researcher had collected information on whether or not the schools were currently offering a genocide/and or Holocaust class, indicated with a “G,” “H,” or “H & G” on the
Table 4-6

Universities that Offer Stand-Alone Course and Course Content on the Armenian Genocide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

spreadsheet. The purpose for doing this analysis was to determine how many schools are currently offering undergraduate courses on the subjects of Holocaust and genocide and then to determine of these, how many included stand-alone courses or course content on the Armenian Genocide.

Eighteen schools of the 116 currently offered both Holocaust/genocide courses in their current undergraduate curriculum, or 15.5%. Of the total 116 schools, 68, or 58.6%, offered just Holocaust courses; and there are no schools that offered just genocide courses. A total of 30 or 25.9% were not currently offering any courses in Holocaust and/or genocide in which the key terms were present in their course title or description of the program catalog (see Table 7 and Figure 5). After analyzing this in SPSS, the results revealed that all 12 schools that offered stand-alone courses or course content on the
Armenian genocide, also offered both Holocaust and genocide courses in their curriculum.

Table 4-7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University offers Holocaust Studies, Genocide Studies, or Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question # 3: If a Division IA college/university offers an undergraduate course specifically on the Armenian Genocide or undergraduate course content on the Armenian Genocide, in what college/department is this course offered?

All of the nine universities that offered course content on the Armenian Genocide from their Holocaust/genocide courses offered it from their History department (see Table 8). Even in the case of the one university which has a center for Holocaust and genocide peace studies program, also cross lists the course in their History department. The majority of schools that offered courses and course content on the Armenian
Figure 4-4. Universities that offer courses on Holocaust, Genocide, or both.

Genocide offered it from their history department under the College of Arts and Sciences (not all titled the same). However, one school offered an Armenian Studies program from their History department which undergraduate students could choose as a minor under the College of Letters & Science. There was only university that did not offer the course content of the Armenian Genocide out of their history department. This particular university had a separate department, *Holocaust, Genocide, and Peace Studies program (HGPS)*. The other schools tended to cross list courses so students could take them either from the Armenian studies program or from the history department, depending on the degree/qualifications they were seeking.
Another observation generated from this study was the schools that offered a discussion on the Armenian Genocide as part of a Holocaust/genocide course was many times not mentioned in the syllabus. Therefore, the professors who were contacted did not forward a syllabus, since the term Armenian Genocide was not mentioned in it. However, some colleges/universities sent back an email reporting that they do cover or include course content on the Armenian Genocide. For example, a history professor from one of the university's responded with the following:

I discuss the Armenian genocide in my lecture class on the history of Modern Europe, 1789-Present. I talk about it in my lecture on WW1 and "total war." I did not spend a week specifically on Armenia for my class on violence, mainly because I am unaware of a particularly suitable and engaging text on the subject. One of my students, however, wrote her final paper on American diplomatic responses to the Armenian genocide. Neither of the syllabi have Armenia or Armenian readings, though, so sending them won't prove much. Interestingly enough this response is that the professor “is unaware of a particularly suitable and engaging text on the subject.” This comment alludes to the question of whether or not part of the reason why the Armenian Genocide is not offered in higher education is the lack of adequate teaching resources on the subject geared for teaching the subject in colleges and universities in the United States.

Of the three universities that offered a course or courses specifically on the Armenian Genocide, two of the schools offered these courses through separate departments other than history. For example, one university has an Armenian Studies Program that offered both stand-alone undergraduate courses on the Armenian Genocide, as well as many other undergraduate courses that include course content on the Armenian Genocide. This school had a whole section devoted to Armenian studies under the College of Arts & Sciences.
The number of key words contained in the course title and course description were computed using an excel spreadsheet and then inputted into SPSS for computing the descriptive statistics. The first analysis was to determine if any of the three key words (Armenian; genocide; or Holocaust) were part of the course title. The capitalization of, or plurals of, any key words was insignificant in the observance of the number of key terms included in course titles or course descriptions. There were a total of 12 schools but two of them had missing data because there were no course descriptions. At one of these universities, the professor is on leave and did not have a current syllabus with a course description available. The other university offered the Armenian Genocide as a special topics course, but had no course description available either. Consequently, the key words, Armenian, Genocide, and Holocaust were all counted from the 10 universities that offer courses or course content of the Armenian Genocide. There were a total of 16 courses, from the colleges/universities analyzed for this study that were counted as either a stand-alone course or course content courses on the Armenian Genocide. The researcher counted the key word Armenian appearing 16 times, from these 16 course titles and description. The word genocide was located 19 times and the key word Holocaust appeared only two times. The mean for the key word Armenian is 1.60; for genocide, 1.90 and for Holocaust, .20. The median is 0 for key word Armenian; 1.5 for genocide; and .0 for Holocaust. The mode is 0 for both key terms Armenian and Holocaust, and is two for genocide (see Table 9). There were also a total of 12 universities that were contacted by the researcher for further information regarding undergraduate course content on the Armenian Genocide. All of the schools that were contacted to request further information responded except for one. Consequently, this is
Table 4-8

List of College/Department of Universities that Offer Content on the Armenian Genocide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Stand-Alone Course(s) on the Armenian Genocide</th>
<th>Holocaust/Genocide Courses</th>
<th>Course Content on the Armenian Genocide</th>
<th>Name of College</th>
<th>Department Course Offered In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>H &amp; G</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>College of Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>H &amp; G</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Armenian Studies Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>H &amp; G</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>H &amp; G</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>H &amp; G</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>H &amp; G</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>School of Humanities &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>H &amp; G</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>College of Letters &amp; Science</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>H &amp; G</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>College of Letters &amp; Science</td>
<td>History (has Armenian program within it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>H &amp; G</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>College of Literature, Science &amp; the Arts</td>
<td>Armenian Studies Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>H &amp; G</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
<td>History/Center for Holocaust &amp; Genocide Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>H &amp; G</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Holocaust, Genocide and Peace Studies Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>H &amp; G</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the only university that has missing data for this study. Moreover, there were three schools, that were sent a consent form for forwarding to the researcher course syllabi (see Appendix C—Researcher’s consent form).

Table 4-9

*The Number of Key Terms in Course Titles and Course Descriptions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Armenian</th>
<th>Genocide</th>
<th>Holocaust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Term</td>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Explanation and Discussion of Results*

Research Question #1: How many Division IA colleges/universities of higher education in the United States offered any stand-alone courses on the Armenian Genocide?

Only three schools of the 116 Division IA institutions of higher education in the United States offer a stand-alone course on the Armenian Genocide. All three of these universities are located in the western United States, perhaps related to the fact that the state of California is home to one of the largest populations of Armenians residing in the United States.
One of the universities that offered an Armenian studies program offered it in their History department in the College of Letters and Science. The university which has a Holocaust, Genocide and Peace Studies Program (HGPS), only offers a course on the Armenian Genocide through their special topics courses. However, the researcher contacted the director and professor of the program who responded with the following: "The segment on the Armenian Genocide I teach is very brief and centers on the chapter in Power's book *A Problem from Hell* and on the info of the websites from the Armenian National Institute." Even though this school has their HGPS, they still do not offer a stand-alone course on the Armenian Genocide. Moreover, there is very little course content presented on the Armenian Genocide in this program.

Research Question #2: How many universities offer a course on Holocaust/Genocide in which the Armenian Genocide is included in the course content?

One of the universities had a course listed in their program catalog under the sociology department that contained course content on the Armenian Genocide. However, after contacting a professor in the sociology department for further information, it was learned that this course, *SOC 402 Genocide*, is currently inactive. Additionally, this school has an Armenian Studies Program under the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, but is not currently offering a specific undergraduate course on the Armenian Genocide.

The possible explanations for the limited number of universities including course content on the Armenian Genocide, through their Holocaust/genocide courses, are varied. One of the reasons for this could be a lack of knowledge or resources needed to teach
students on this subject. Another possible influence as to whether or not universities and
colleges include course curriculum on the Armenian Genocide is the
professor's/instructor's discretion. If the professor is not familiar with, or values, the
events of the Armenian Genocide as currently appropriate and/or important then the
students will not be exposed to the events of the atrocity. For example, a professor from
one of the university's responded with the following:

I do not include mention of the Armenian genocide except in passing. This is not
because of any attempt to downplay its significance, rather because I have other
topics and themes that I choose to highlight in this course. One can include only
so much after all though choices such as this can be tricky.

*Resources on the Armenian Genocide.* Other interesting aspects discovered along
the way were the textbooks and resources used in the courses which include the
Armenian Genocide. One recurring book that is used is Samantha Power's; *A Problem
from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide,* which discusses genocides, one being the
Armenian Genocide, and questions why American leaders fail to prevent genocide from
occurring (Powers, 2002). This book is included in three of the universities that were
analyzed and which contained course content offerings on the Armenian Genocide.

It was interesting to see that the one university that has a Center for Holocaust,
Genocide, and Peace Studies online program, maintains a website that included links to
the Armenian Genocide as well as links to other genocides and war crimes. This is
another way to inform students, encourage and guide them to explore and access further
information on the subject. Unfortunately, out of the three links they provided, only one
was current and directed accurately to the described website.

One of the schools that were analyzed for this study offers a week of course
content on the Armenian Genocide in a freshman seminar on World War I. The resource
used for this discussion is *The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, 1915-1916*, by James Bryce and Arnold Toynbee. The course *History 167B: The Rise and Fall of the Second Reich*, also includes mention of the Armenian Genocide in both lecture and syllabus, but does not require any readings on the subject.

The syllabus that the professor sent the researcher titled *History 280 World War I: Crucible for the 20th Century* was an older version of a syllabus used for this seminar. The course description for this course could not be located online either, so the researcher used the professor’s response as the analysis which indicated inclusion of course content on the Armenian Genocide.

Research Question 3: If a Division IA college/university offers an undergraduate course specifically on the Armenian Genocide or course content on the Armenian Genocide, in what college/department is this course offered?

All of the nine schools that offer course content on the Armenian Genocide in their Holocaust/genocide courses offer or cross lists all or part of their course curriculum on the Armenian Genocide from their history department. Moreover, of the three schools that offer stand-alone courses on the Armenian Genocide, one has an Armenian studies program, and another has a Holocaust, Genocide, Peace Studies program, (which cross lists courses in their history department). This is very important, because students who are not in either of these programs, as minors or specializations, will still have the opportunity to be exposed to the knowledge and importance of the Armenian Genocide through the history department.
Summary of Results

The main goal of this study was to determine how many Division IA colleges/universities in the United States offer undergraduate stand alone courses or course content on the Armenian Genocide. The most current available online program catalog was searched at each university’s websites. The key terms Armenian, genocide, and Holocaust were used to locate any undergraduate courses that contained content on the Armenian Genocide.

There were a total of three universities or 2.6% of the 116 Division IA colleges/universities that offered stand-alone undergraduate courses on the Armenian Genocide and nine other schools or 7.8% (excluding stand-alone courses) that offered course content, through their undergraduate Holocaust/genocide courses, on the Armenian Genocide. A total of 12 or 10.3% of the 116 Division IA schools offer undergraduate stand-alone courses and/or course content on the Armenian Genocide. These three universities offer these stand-alone courses on the Armenian Genocide out of different departments. One of these three universities offers it under their Armenian studies program; the other university offers it from the history program under an Armenian studies program; and the third university that offers a stand-alone course on the Armenian Genocide offers it from their Holocaust, Genocide, and Peace Studies Program. All nine schools that offer course content on the Armenian Genocide offer these courses in their history department. The exception is one university, which has its own Armenian studies program.
The following section, Chapter 5, contains further discussion, conclusions and future recommendation regarding the inclusion of the Armenian Genocide in higher education in the United States. It also presents ideas for additional research.
Chapter Five
Findings, Conclusions, and Implications

"Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?"
(Adolf Hitler, 1939, as authenticated and cited in Bardakjian, 1985).

Introduction
April 24, 2005 marked the 90th commemoration of the Armenian Genocide in 1915. Like every April 24, politicians, actors, entertainers and Armenian-Americans rallied across the country to spread the word of the Armenian Genocide and the Turkish government’s continual denial of this atrocity (“Dean Cain,” 2005). In the previous year, on April 22, 2004, Senator John Kerry promoted the remembrance of the Armenian Genocide in allowing people to spread the word of the intolerance of crimes against humanity as well as “...working to prevent future genocides...” (Armenians for Kerry, 2004, p.1). Additionally, on April 21, 2004, Idaho Governor, Dirk Kempthorne, announced the commemoration of April 24 to be “'Idaho Day of Remembrance of the Armenian Genocide of 1915-1923'” (ANCA, 2004, p.1). This followed the Senate of the Associated Students of Boise State University (ASBSU) resolution 13, which “commemorates the Armenian Genocide and condemns those attempts made by governments as well as other entities, both public and private, to distort the historical reality and legal relevance of the Armenian Genocide to the descendants of its survivors and humanity as a whole” (ANCA, 2004, p.1)

This research extensively reviewed the literature on the Armenian Genocide and why it has been called “the forgotten genocide,” due to the Turkish denial. This study was conducted to determine if Division IA undergraduate higher education students are
Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine how many courses exist, or how much course content exists in Division IA colleges/universities regarding the Armenian Genocide in undergraduate higher education throughout the United States. This sample was chosen since Division IA colleges/universities represent the larger schools in the United States, which frequently influence curriculum development in other U.S. colleges/universities.

This study determined to what degree higher education students are exposed to information on the Armenian Genocide through undergraduate stand-alone courses or through course content on the Armenian Genocide through Holocaust/genocide courses. Additionally, this research analyzed the forces that deny the atrocity and how those forces may undermine the knowledge and understanding of the Armenian Genocide today (Belenkaya, 2001; Falk, 1995; Okoomian, 2002; Papazian, 1997).

Armenians throughout the world commemorate the genocide of 1915 on April 24 each year to remember the slaughter and displacement of the thousands of Armenians during the rule of the Ottoman Empire (Balakian, 2003; Hovannisian, 1986; Melson, 1992; Miller & Miller, 1993). The Ottoman Empire succeeded in killing an estimated 1.5 million Armenians and eliminated the possibility of their living as a group in their
homeland that they inhabited for 3000 years (Boyajian & Grigorian, 1998; Dadrian, 1995).

As presented in this research, there are numerous, scholarly historical analyses and survivor accounts that contend the Turks desire to exterminate the Armenian race (Balakian 1997, 2003; Dadrian, 1995; Hartunian, 1968; Jernazian, 1990; Miller & Miller, 1993). However, the most unbelievable aspect of this particular genocide is that the Turkish government has yet to admit their guilt or responsibility for these killings (Balakian, 1997, 2003; Dadrian, 1995, 1999a, 1999b, 2003). More recently, in May 2003, the Armenian National Committee of America (ANCA) posted a press release entitled, “Turkish Education Minister Mandates Teaching of Armenian Genocide Denial in All Schools.” This press release states “the Turkish Government has dramatically escalated its official campaign of genocide denial, requiring, at the direction of its Education Minister Huseyin Celik, that all students in Turkish schools be taught to deny the Armenian Genocide” (Armenian National Committee of America [ANCA], 2003). Moreover, the United States has failed to recognize this genocide, which as many argue, is also an impediment to dissemination of the knowledge and understanding of this horrific event (Belenkaya, 2001; Falk, 1995).

The number of Division I A universities/colleges that offered undergraduate courses on the Armenian Genocide or which include undergraduate course content on it in Holocaust/genocide courses, as well as the department in which the courses or course content was offered in, was quantitatively and qualitatively analyzed in this study. Using content analysis for this study required not only accessing and researching the
college/university websites, but searching deep into the college/university course
descriptions.

The data for this study was collected by accessing every Division 1A
college/university website and then researching their program catalog for undergraduate
courses on the Armenian Genocide. If the college/university did not have an
undergraduate stand-alone course on the Armenian Genocide, then an analysis of any
undergraduate Holocaust and/or genocide course offered by the Division 1A
college/university was conducted to determine if any content of the Armenian Genocide
was included. Additionally, the college/university department in which a stand-alone
course on the Armenian Genocide was offered, as well as the department which offered
course content of the Armenian Genocide in their Holocaust/genocide courses, was
recorded and analyzed. If for any reason the program catalog of the college/university
could not be accessed electronically via the Internet, a request was made through email
for delivery of the program catalog. Also, if, for any reason, the information could not be
determined from the program catalog, or if the researcher felt additional information was
needed, then an email to the college/university was initiated to contact the appropriate
department to discover if they offered any courses including undergraduate course
content on the Armenian Genocide.

The quantitative aspect of this study consisted of conducting measures of central
tendency, which included the mean, median, and mode (descriptive statistics) of the
number of Division 1A colleges/universities that offered a stand-alone course on the
Armenian Genocide. It also included measures of central tendency on the number of
Division 1A colleges/universities that offered course content on the Armenian Genocide
in their Holocaust/genocide courses. The researcher also decided to report on the number of key words (Armenian, genocide and Holocaust) included in the undergraduate stand-alone courses and course content of the Armenian Genocide. The research questions for this study were the following:

1) How many Division IA colleges/universities in the United States offer any stand-alone undergraduate courses on the Armenian Genocide?

2) How many Division IA colleges/universities offer an undergraduate course on Holocaust/genocide in which the Armenian Genocide is included in the course content?

3) If a Division IA college/university offers a course or course content specifically on the Armenian Genocide, in what college/department is this course offered?

The researcher used SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) to quantify the results of the data gathered and to compute the mean, median, and mode for each research question.

There were a total of three universities, 2.6% of the 116, that offered undergraduate stand-alone courses on the Armenian Genocide and nine other schools, or 7.8% that offered course content, through their undergraduate Holocaust/genocide courses, on the Armenian Genocide. The total percent of Division IA colleges/universities that offered stand-alone courses and course content on the Armenian Genocide is 10.3% or a total of 12. Of these three schools that offered undergraduate stand-alone courses on the Armenian Genocide, one of the universities offered both stand-alone courses and course content on the Armenian Genocide through an Armenian
studies program. These courses were indicated in the program catalog as “ARMS” and their undergraduate stand-alone course on the Armenian Genocide was also indicated with “HIST,” indicating the History department. The second university that had an Armenian studies program offered it through the History department. The third university offered a stand-alone course on the Armenian Genocide, which was a special topics course, under their Holocaust, Genocide, and Peace Studies Program (HGPS).

There were a total of nine school’s, 7.8% that offered only undergraduate course content on the Armenian Genocide embedded in their Holocaust/genocide course curriculum. There was one other university that had an Armenian Studies Program (which also cross listed with the History department), but the researcher was unable to locate an undergraduate stand-alone course on the Armenian Genocide in their current program catalog. Consequently, this school was included in the nine schools that offer undergraduate course content on the Armenian Genocide.

The project objectives, including both the qualitative and quantitative analyses for this study, have all been achieved.

- the number of Division IA colleges/universities that offer as stand-alone undergraduate course on the Armenian Genocide
- the number of Division IA colleges/universities that offer undergraduate course content on the Armenian Genocide in their Holocaust/genocide courses
- the identification of and number of departments that offer a stand-alone undergraduate course and/or undergraduate course content on the Armenian Genocide.
• the identification of and number of key words included in the course title and
description of any undergraduate stand-alone course or any undergraduate course
content on the Armenian Genocide in Holocaust/genocide courses.

Even though this study reveals several limitations that are discussed later, it has
contributed to the knowledge of whether or not undergraduate students in the United
States are being exposed to the teachings of one of the most horrific and historical events
in the 20th Century. Extrapolating from this study, it can be presumed that the total
number of all higher education schools in the United States will result in a similarly low
number of undergraduate stand-alone courses and course content on the Armenian
Genocide. Only through studies such as this that provoke recognition of and knowledge
of this atrocity, will undergraduate students and other groups of people come to realize
the precedence that this genocide set for the 20th Century genocides and why it needs to
be studied and known by all.

Conclusions

Why does there appear to be a disconnect between the amount of documented
information on the Armenian Genocide and the number of courses and course content on
it in undergraduate higher education in the United States? Now that the denial of the
Armenian Genocide by the Turkish government has been established, it is time to
encourage not only recognition of the Armenian Genocide, but the importance of
educating and understanding the concepts of genocide, to prevent genocide from
happening in the future. Politicians, entertainers, human rights organizations, history
professors and all educators can and do play the active role of educating the public on the
importance of remembering and having knowledge of one of history's most tragic events. One such film director did such this.

The movie \textit{Ararat}, released in 2002 and directed by Academy Award nominated Armenian-Canadian Atom Egoyan, was a huge step toward educating people on the Armenian Genocide as well as the controversial issues surrounding it today (ANCA, 2002). The film presented this tragic event, the continued denial by the Turkish government, and the people's desire for the truth. The ANCA (2002) press release on \textit{Ararat} mentions how director Egoyan spoke to members of Congress, human rights organizations and both American and foreign diplomats on how the denial of the Armenian Genocide by the Turkish government is the "final stage of the barbaric process" (p. 2) Egoyan responded to those that argued the film \textit{Ararat} is a chronicle of history, that the film focuses on the present, not on the past, since the responsibility is with each of us living today (ANCA, 2002).

Even though negative, the Heath Lowry Affair instigated discussion on the events of the Armenian Genocide and the denial of it by the Turks. The goal of teaching the Armenian Genocide should not be to promote a negative view of the Turkish people or government. However, the information on this topic should include what historians and scholars have uncovered and documented, including the many eyewitness accounts from bystanders and survivors. Instruction on the Armenian Genocide needs to introduce the students to the social, political, and cultural conditions that provoke genocide; the roles of the victims, bystanders and perpetrators; and such concepts as denial, and elements of crimes against humanity. It is only through this type of analysis on genocide that students, and thus society, will be able to understand the cruelties against humanity and
what so far, has been done and what can be done to prevent genocide in the future. There should be no doubt that there is a need to teach students concepts of crimes against humanity and to instill in them a sense of empathy toward people and the countries that they perceive as different. As Israel Charney (1997) states:

Obviously, it is the simple nature of humans that we care more about ourselves first of all. Each of us cares selfishly about our own survival first, next for our loved ones, and then for our people, but we also should not be indifferent to the plight of others and the tragedies of their losses of life. In any case, it is also a matter of self-interest to care about the genocide of others. In cases of genocide of peoples other than our own, it should be obvious to us that any and every event of mass murder, to any and every people, also opens the door to greater possibilities of further genocidal massacres of additional peoples, perhaps, again, including our own people. (p. xiv)

The Postcard Campaign and Recognition of the Armenian Genocide.

Organizations such as the Armenian National Committee of America (ANCA) publish press releases on their website that update the U.S. support and action of the recognition of the Armenian Genocide (ANCA, 2003). Quoted in a recent press release from ANCA (2003), California democratic representative, also known as a genocide recognition leader, Adam Schiff, stated:

The ANC and I share a common goal: to finally have the United States officially recognize the slaughter of 1.5 million Armenian, men, women and children for what it was – genocide . . . I join the ANC in support of this grassroots post-card campaign and urge everyone to write Speaker Hastert and Senate Majority Leader Frist to let them know how very important H.R. 193 is to human rights both here in the U.S. and around the world. (p. 1)

This post-card campaign targeted Congressional offices regarding the recognition of the Armenian genocide, and House Resolution 193 (H. Res. 193), which requests the Congress to commemorate the inclusion of “the United Nations’ Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocides” (ANCA, 2003, p.2). This ANCA press release stated that the goal of this campaign is to have Congress commemorate the inclusion of
the United Nations' Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocides 15 years ago. This H. Res. 193 was introduced by Representatives Adam Schiff (D-Glendale) and Representative George Radanovich (R-Fresno) in 2003 (ACNA, 2003). This new postcard campaign asked House Speaker Dennis Hastert to set up H. Res. 193 for a vote by Congress (ANCA, 2003). Representative Radanovich is also quoted in this press release saying "as Americans, we have an obligation to educate and familiarize the world on the Armenian Genocide...in fact, we must ensure that the legacy of the genocide is remembered, so that this human tragedy will not be repeated" (ANCA, 2003, p. 2). Moreover, musical groups, such as System of A Down, which consist of all Armenian musicians, has publicly campaigned for this resolution (ANCA, 2003).

**Role of University Professor/Chair Holders.** The ANCA has been actively calling for Congressional hearings on foreign manipulation in academia in the United States regarding the denial of the Armenian Genocide from the Turkish government. One of their press releases, entitled "Fight Turkish government manipulation of American scholarship on the Armenian genocide," states how, "the Turkish government and the governments of other undemocratic countries spend millions of dollars very year to manipulate scholarship in American universities. The Turkish government’s efforts in this area have been directed almost entirely to denying the Armenian genocide" (ANCA, 2000, p. 1).

In Mamigonian’s (2002) National Association for Armenian Studies and Research conference report, the chairholder at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) for many years, Professor Richard G. Hovannisian stated, “Armenian studies is very
insular; we are very isolated even in the field of Middle Eastern Studies, and Armenian Studies is not regarded as equally important” (Need to Overcome Isolation section, ¶ 1).

Professor Dickran Kouymajian, Chair in Armenian Studies at California State University at Fresno, presented the following concern at Harvard as reported in the Conference Report (Mamigonian, 2002):

A key element in the growth of Armenian Studies in America and the establishing of the chairs has been ‘the failure of Armenians as a group to receive aid or encouragement from the international community of nations in their quest for justice. Perhaps, some thought, by supporting university level studies, knowledge about the Armenian Genocide and the culture that was destroyed by it would be advanced.’ “...full recognition has not been realized through the creation of the chairs, the ‘clear and documented historical record of what happened {which} is fundamental for coherent and effective political action’ has been generated by them; and as such the chairs remain a focal point of the Armenian community’s various concerns. (Chairs as Part of Diaspora section, ¶ 2)

Professor Robert W. Thomson defines Armenian Studies as “the investigation of the past or present with a view to gaining a better understanding of the meaning of that experience in as broad a perspective as possible” (Mamigonian 2002, Need for a Broad Perspective section ¶ 1). Consequently, it is apparent that the role of chairholder’s in Armenian Studies needs to be established and expanded in American universities to not only properly and accurately instill the importance of educating students on this horrific event, but given the monetary and political support from governments all over the world, in order to do so.

An issue expressed by Rouben Adalian at this 2002 Harvard conference was the problem of the fundamentals of accessing and presenting the information regarding the present state of Armenia as well as the historical information on the Armenian Genocide. As reported by Mamigonian (2002), Rouben Adalian stated:
The quantity of information about Armenia is quite considerable; and hence, how to navigate it, how to locate the knowledge [and] the scholarship that has application to the situations that arise in Washington is the crucial issues, since "the demand for basic information about Armenia, Armenia issues, and in the case of ANI the Armenian Genocide itself, it quite staggering. (Dissemination of Reliable Information section, ¶ 1)

Since this conference, great strides have been made regarding the dissemination of information on both the present state of Armenia and the history of the Armenian Genocide. One only has to access the internet and type in the term "Armenian Genocide" to realize the numerous websites devoted to this tragedy. There are many Armenian and Armenian-American organizations that have updated their websites for the most prolific and accurate presentation of the political and historical issues of the importance of recognizing this genocide. However, one of the most fundamental and challenging aspects facing this conference back in 2002 was, "...getting knowledge of Armenian issues to non-Armenians - even basic information such as where Armenia is, the Armenian Genocide, the blockade by Turkey and Azerbaijan, and U.S. policy toward Armenia and the region (Getting Out of "the Ghetto" section, ¶ 2).

Although the chairs must continue to be supported, research centers with trained scholars should be the wave of the future, along with exploiting the vast potential of the internet. The field is still in its infancy, ...great progress has been made; but future development depends on cooperation and collaboration both in the U.S. and abroad (Some Goals Reached, Others Remain section, ¶ 2).

The Role of Technology and the Internet. The expansion of the Internet has allowed people from all over the world to promote and exchange information regarding the Jewish Holocaust, genocides, and most importantly on the Armenian "forgotten" genocide (Mamigonian, 2002). The director and founder of the Armenian Research Center in Dearborn, Michigan, Professor Dennis Papazian, focused on the role of organizations in creating Armenian scholarship throughout universities in America, at the
Harvard conference on Armenian Studies (Mamigonian, 2002). As mentioned in this article, “Papazian stressed the vital role the world wide web will play in the future development of the research centers, which ‘must establish web sites and make as much material available as possible’” (Mamigonian, 2002, Importance of World Wide Web section, ¶ 2).

The ANCA is one of the largest and most influential political organizations in the United States, and the use of the Internet has been able to keep the America public, and the world, educated on the most current congressional activities regarding the Turkish campaign on the denial of the Armenian Genocide. On July 15, 2004 the ANCA released breaking news that the United States House of Representatives adopted the Schiff Amendment on the Armenian Genocide. This amendment prohibits “the Turkish government from using U.S. foreign assistance in its multi-million dollar campaign to defeat legislation (H. Res. 193) recognizing the Armenian Genocide” (ANCA, 2004, p.1). This is a great victory for not only Armenians throughout the world, but especially for those in the United States. This act will, hopefully, lead to an official recognition of this genocide.

Teaching about the Armenian Genocide. Belie (2000) reports on a conference in which Hovannisian discusses how the Armenian Genocide was a prototype for the genocides that followed throughout the 20th Century. Another member at the conference, Jacobs, who is from Temple B’nai Shalom in Alabama stated, “we who are scholars of this horror have a responsibility to educate” (Belie, 2000, p. 2).

The Armenia Diaspora Conference official site explains how the San Francisco Bay area Armenian National Committee has developed a framework, the basis for
Within the context of human rights and genocide, students should learn of the Ottoman government’s planned mass deportation and systematic annihilation of the Armenian population in 1915. Students should also examine the reactions of other governments, including that of the United States, and world opinion during and after the Armenian genocide. They should examine the effects of the genocide on the remaining Armenian people, who were deprived of their historic homeland, and the ways in which it became a prototype of subsequent genocides.

One study, conducted by Foss (1989), surveyed readers of the international newsletter, *Internet on the Holocaust and Genocide*, to determine what subject they were teaching, what approach they used, and in what department they taught in. The results concluded that very few courses were including genocide and the majority of courses only covered the Holocaust (Freedman-Apsel & Fein, 1992). Consequently, Foss (1992) questioned what constitutes a Holocaust course? Is it strictly Holocaust or does it include genocide as a whole? Does it only introduce the concept of genocide or Holocaust broadly? As Foss (1992) states, “everyone knows what the Holocaust was; there is no doubt about the definition. But there is enormous discussion of what genocide is, and how much should be included in the term” (p. 2). It appears, from the results of this study that 68 of the 116 schools (more than half; or 58.6%) offer only Holocaust courses and that even 15 years later, the subject of the Holocaust is still more prevalently taught in colleges/universities in the United States.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, on August, 10, 1998, enacted a law under the Massachusetts Legislature and Governor requiring specific instructions on teaching
the following (Center of Holocaust and Genocide Studies, 1999):

Learning about genocide in history and its persistence into the present day is
important for today’s students. Although most students learn about the Nazi
Holocaust, they may regard it as an isolated phenomenon, and do not learn that
many such incidents of intentional mass killings have occurred all over the world
and throughout history. Genocides in the modern era have often been sanctioned
by specific governments and based on ideologies that legitimize prejudice and
violence. It is important that students have factual knowledge about these issues,
and that they understand how other governments, organizations, and individuals
work to preserve and protect human rights. It is also important that students
understand how genocides and other human rights violations have contributed to
immigration patterns in history. Learning about the history of genocides can lead
the Commonwealth’s students to understand the histories of the families in their
schools, communities, and in the nation as a whole. (p. ¶ 2)

Balakian (2003) discusses how the Association of Genocide Scholars and Holocaust
scholars asserted that the massacres and extermination of the Armenians was indeed
genocide. Balakian (2003) further explains that these scholars are bothered by the
Turkish denial campaign of this event and consequently had the following printed in the
New York Times: “126 Holocaust Scholars Affirm the Incontestable Fact of the Armenian
Genocide and Urge Western Democracies to Officially Recognize it” (p. xix). Why then,
has the United States not officially recognized this atrocity as genocide?

Politically the United States has strong ties with Turkey. Balakian (2003)
discusses how the military aid Turkey has provided, and continues to provide, the United
States tends to always be used as a threat from the Turkish government regarding the
recognition of the Armenian Genocide. The more the United States lobbyists pushed for
recognition, the stronger the Turks denial of the genocide. Dadrian (2003) summarizes
the actions of the Turkish denial and refers to the United States reason for lack of
recognition.
This denial has been sustained by deliberate propaganda, lying and coverups, forging documents, suppression of archives, and bribing scholars. The west, especially the United States, has colluded by not referring to the massacres in the United Nations, ignoring memorial ceremonies, and surrendering to Turkish pressure in NATO and other strategic arenas of cooperation (p. 269).

When France recognized the Armenian Genocide in 2001, Turkey threatened them and temporarily withdrew their Prime Minister as well canceling several multi-million business deals. Thomet (2001) describes the following:

France recently became the first Western country to brand as genocide the killing of Armenians in 1915. As a result of that Jan. 18 resolution - opposed by the French executive branch but passed by its National Assembly - Alcatel of France lost a $149 million deal to sell a spy satellite to Turkey and another company was excluded from competing to sell Turkey tanks worth up to $7 billion. (p. 1)

Both President Clinton and current President Bush have failed to honor their original campaign promise to recognize the Armenian Genocide. An ANCA (2004) press release on April 24, 2004 stated:

We do appreciate that President Bush has, once again taken the time to mark April 24th as a day of remembrance. Armenian Americans, however, remain deeply troubled that for the fourth year in a row, despite his repeated calls for “moral calamity” in the conduct of our international affairs, he has allowed pressure by a foreign government to reduce the President of the United States to using evasive and euphemistic terminology to avoid properly identifying the Armenian Genocide – an important chapter in America’s emergence as an international humanitarian power – as what is was: a genocide...the President’s failure to honor his campaign promise to recognize the Armenian Genocide is compounded by the fact that, in this statement, he commended the thoroughly discredited Turkish-Armenian Reconciliation Commission, a transparent partnership between the U.S. State Department and the Turkish government to block the growing international recognition of and justice for Turkey’s crime against the Armenian nation. (p. 1)

On October 19, 2000, the ANCA posted a press release regarding President Clinton’s consideration of House Resolution 596 (H. Res. 596) that would, “...ensure that the foreign policy of the United States reflects appropriate understanding and sensitivity concerning issues related to human rights, ethnic cleansing, and genocide documented in
country in the world has yet to recognize officially this genocide that took place 90 years ago.

*Armenia and Turkey Today.* When the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991, the urban and rural areas of Armenia were deeply affected. Factories were shut down in the cities and farms were destroyed, since Armenia no longer had economic assistance from the Soviet Union (Hughes, 2005). Independent Armenia did not have the political and economic education and resources to sustain the necessities of life, such as telephones, water, and electricity. Furthermore, of the other two boarding countries of Armenia that became independent in 1991, Georgia and Azerbaijan, Armenia has the least natural and man-made resources (Library of Congress, 1994).

Today, Armenian struggles with the vast differences of modern growth from the capital city of Yerevan to prairie existence in villages, where most Armenians are struggling to survive agriculturally. Many of the Armenians living in villages today rely on relatives who have immigrated to other countries, such as Russia, who send them money (Hughes, 2005). With a population of almost 3 million, Armenia continues to struggle political, economically and socially (Hughes, 2005).

The Republic of Armenia today, or *Hayastan* as Armenians call it, is plagued by many hardships including their climate (in the city it can be sunny and the villages banked by snow) and the fact that it is a landlocked country with continued blockades against them from their neighbors Turkey and Azerbaijan. Armenia and Azerbaijan have been through years of conflict over the mountainous area of Nagorno-Karabakh, which is within the borders of Azerbaijan, but is controlled by Armenians (Sachs, 2004). Turkey is an ally to Azerbaijan and refuses to remove their blockades against Armenia, until
the United States record relating to the Armenian Genocide....” (Armenian News Network, 2000) (See Appendix E—Transcript of President Clinton’s Letter). The ANCA (2000) presents the following:

Speaker Hastert, in an announcement explaining his decision, noted that, based on the concerns raised by the President, he was removing the resolution from the legislative schedule of the House. The Speaker said that President Clinton had raised "grave national security concerns" over the resolution, stressing that even the measure's consideration would pose a threat to American lives. The President, in a letter to the Speaker dated today, noted that bringing the resolution to the House floor "could have far-reaching negative consequences for the United States" (p. 1).

Who will be the first president to officially recognize the Armenian Genocide for the United States? Will they always succumb to Turkish political pressure?

In 1985, at Geneva, Switzerland, Paul Laurin of the International Federation of Human Rights reported on the Armenian Genocide during a session from the United Nations SubCommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. Laurin (1985) asserts the following:

The Armenians are still suffering from the tragedy that befell them at the beginning of the century, since they are still deprived the right to their history. . . . To recognize the right of a people to its history is also to recognize its right to existence, and the concept should form part of the overall concept of human rights and the rights of peoples (p. 1).

One of the foremost tasks of the United Nations is to prevent the crime of genocide, with particular reference to the crimes committed prior to its establishment. Prevention is difficult unless past crimes of genocide are acknowledged by the international community. (p. 2)

Even though throughout the past 20 years, 19 countries have officially recognized the Armenian Genocide (Balakian, personal communication, 2005), it is a terrible deprivation for not only the Armenians but for genocide itself that the most powerful
Armenia removes their troops from this area (Sachs, 2004). One of the effects of Turkey and Azerbaijan’s closed borders to Armenia is the stifling of the Armenian economy due to high transportation costs (AAA, 2002).

*Turkey and the European Union.* To look at this matter optimistically is important since there are current negotiations regarding the improvement of Armenian and Turkish relations. Powers around the world are encouraging Turkey and Armenia to work together, to benefit not only these two countries, economically and politically, but global relations as well. Additionally, Turkey is closer than ever to joining the European Union. Turkey’s human rights record and its barbaric penal system are a few obstacles presently preventing their membership into the European Union (EU) (Brand, 2004; Frankel 2004; Stoyanova-Yerburgh). These reforms will be required to comply with the EU standards, which have already been passed by the Turkish Parliament (Stoyanova-Yerburgh, 2004). The current prime Minister of Turkey, Erdogan, elected in 2002, has been working toward these reforms hoping they will become part of the EU by 2015 (Brand, 2004; Stoyanova-Yerburgh, 2004).

Will the European Union accept Turkey without their removal of current blockades on Armenia? Will the European Union accept Turkey without the ceasing of their denial campaign on the Armenian Genocide? Even though Turkey has a large population of Muslims, a fear of some countries in the EU, it appears that if they modernize their human rights issues, and update their policies to EU’s requirements, Turkey will aid in economic growth and add employment to an aging Europe (Brand, 2004; Stoyanova-Yerburgh, 2004). However, the Armenians request for Turkey’s
removal of land blockades, before discussions began of Turkey entering the EU, has obviously been denied. This is just another stumbling block for Armenian progress.

Such organizations as The Armenian General Benevolent Union (AGBU), The Armenian American Assembly (AAA), The Armenian National Committee of America (ANCA), and so many more, are working toward rebuilding Armenia today. How will students understand the present condition of countries like Armenia without the knowledge and understanding of such significant historical events of the Armenian Genocide and all that it encompasses?

There appears to be a lack of knowledge and sufficient resources reaching higher education instructors and professors regarding the teaching of the Armenian Genocide in higher education in the United States. The researcher’s hope is to participate in the development of and distribution of teaching materials on the Armenian Genocide in higher education. The denial of the Armenian Genocide and Turkey’s position in prohibiting the teaching of this subject in Turkish schools has been addressed by political organizations such as the ANCA. The executive director of the ANCA, Hamparian stated in May 2003 the following (ANCA, 2003):

We have shared news of this development with the State Department and explained the urgent need for our government to immediately protest this policy directly to the Turkish government in the strongest possible terms…it is absolutely disgraceful for Turkey to seek to poison its school children with its hateful message of genocide denial. (¶ 2)

According to the abundance of historical data, and the many survivor and witness accounts of this event, it is unimaginable to conclude that this genocide did not take place in 1915, and was the first to occur in the 20th Century. College students should have the opportunity to access, review, and discuss this tragic historical and political event in a
scholarly environment. However, as genocide continued throughout the 20th Century, it makes intellectual and historical sense to include the review and discussion of the Armenian Genocide of 1915 in undergraduate higher education in one of the most powerful and influential countries of the world.

The crimes against humanity all took place in the 20th century (Armenian Genocide 1915; Jewish Holocaust; Cambodian Genocide 1978; and Rwandan Genocide 1994) need to be remembered and understood historically and politically to prevent another atrocity in the future. Balakian (2003) proposes the following provocative questions:

What is the role of the most powerful nation in the world when the ultimate crime is being perpetrated in plain view? Why was there no U.S. activist response to the Holocaust or to Pol Pot’s genocide in Cambodia in 1978, or to the Rwandan genocide in 1994, when in fact the State Department, media, and general public often knew what was happening in those killing fields? Why is U.S. policy evasive, sluggish, resistant to action (of various and creative kinds, not simply or only military intervention), and often tinged with denial? Why has there been so little political will at the top when media coverage and popular knowledge and empathy are often large and dramatic? A deeper understanding of these questions and of the history of America’s confrontation with genocide must begin with a study of the Armenian Genocide. (p. xiv)

Balakian (2003) continues to state that scholars and historians on this subject, including Yehuda Bauer, Robert Melson, and Samantha Power, refer to the Armenian Genocide as “the template for most of the genocide that followed in the twentieth century” (Balakian, 2003, p. xiv). Balakian (2003) further suggests that since the destruction of the twin towers in New York City on September, 11, 2001, “Americans and U.S. leaders may find that the Armenian lesson has much to teach about the moral accountability of bystanders, trauma and survivor experience, and the immediate and far-reaching impact of mass violence committed against innocent civilians” (Balakian, 2003, p. xiv).
Limitations of the study. One of the more obvious limitations to this study is that not every college and university in the United States was part of this sample used in this research. Although all Division IA colleges/universities were researched, not all schools were contacted and therefore could cover content on the Armenian Genocide but not mention it in the course description of the program catalog. Another limitation of this study was the schools that were contacted were done so at the discretion of the researcher. If all Division IA colleges/universities were contacted, it might have affected the result of the total number of schools that offer course content on the Armenian Genocide.

The bias of instructors is another limitation of this study. If the professor teaching the course is not knowledgeable or does not have adequate resources, the Armenian Genocide will not be included in the course discussion on genocide. Another limitation to this study is course content changes due to current events. For example, the recent genocidal-type occurrences in Sudan may have taken precedence by the instructor and therefore be discussed instead of the Armenian Genocide of 1915.

Recommendations for Further Research

A recommendation for further research is to conduct a research analysis of all colleges and universities in the United States to determine just how much course content of the Armenian Genocide is currently being covered in all higher education departments. This would include undergraduate, graduate, and post-graduate groups of students. Moreover, it would be advantageous to determine how many scholars on this subject are teaching the subject in higher education school in the United States. Do instructors and
professors feel that they have access to the most useful resources to teach on the subject? An interview of the professors who teach the subject of Holocaust and genocide should be conducted to determine their qualifications and personal review of their comfort and knowledge on the teaching of the Armenian Genocide.

More needs to be accomplished in the area of comprehensive lesson guides and other resources available for higher education professors and instructors on this subject. A study on the resources available and review of their appropriateness for educating undergraduate higher education students would highly contribute to the knowledge on the inclusion of the Armenian Genocide in higher education in the United States. It is the hope of the researcher to create a teaching resource guide on the subject of genocide specifically targeted for undergraduate higher education.

This research can also be expanded through an analysis of current and previous undergraduate higher education program catalogs to determine if the Armenian Genocide had been included at some time but then discontinued or to determine if there are any patterns in the offering of crimes against humanity and the Armenian Genocide with relation to current events.

Due to the results of this study, it could be assumed that areas with higher populations of Armenians in the United States, such as California, have a higher course content of the Armenian Genocide in higher education undergraduate history classes than in areas with low or no population of Armenians. Consequently, a comparative study on the higher education school’s that currently offer or do not offer course content on genocide, especially the Armenian Genocide, with school’s after teaching resource
materials have been sent to history departments, to determine if there is an increase on the inclusion of the Armenian Genocide in undergraduate higher education.

**Implications**

As stated by Schloss & Smith (1999), “Historical studies involve the interpretation of past events in light of current issues or events. The idea is examining the past can increase our understanding of present conditions” (p. 87). In this research, the understanding of the social, cultural, political, and psychological issues of the Armenian Genocide progressing from the 1915 onward, may shed light on why this historical atrocity is or is not covered in higher education today. There is a definite need to explore the “why” of this issue further. There is a lack of theoretical and methodological research on the topic of the inclusion of the Armenian Genocide in higher education. The assumption and hope of the researcher is that as international and Middle East peace talks and negotiations progress, there will be less denial and obstruction in academia from the Turkish government regarding the Armenian Genocide of 1915. “In many ways...the Armenian Genocide emerges as a landmark event—and one that deserves its proper place in modern history” (Balakian, 2003, p. xx).

**Family History**

Boyajian and Grigorian (1998) state the following:

With rare exception there is no [Armenian] family that did not suffer grievous loss through the Genocide and there is not a family that has not lost its traditional homeland. One has to understand that the magnitude of the disaster that befell the Armenian people during World War I represents not just death and destruction but the destruction of a civilization, namely Western Armenian, where most of the world’s Armenians lived. (p. 513)
The researcher’s father’s family was one of the more fortunate Armenians who were deported to Aleppo, Syria, during the genocide, ironically, through the help of a well-known Turkish doctor. According to family documents, there were no killings at that time of the Armenians in Syria, under the rule of the “bloody” Sultan Abdul Hamid.

In 1895, Sultan Abdul Hamid perpetrated massacres on Armenians all over Turkey where 300,000 Armenians were killed and their homes and businesses were looted. After the massacres during 1894-1896, when conditions calmed, the researcher’s great grandfather, Nazar Berejaklian, returned to Berejik in 1900 to investigate the origin of the family, which came from the town of Berejik and then moved to Aintab, Cilicia (Turkey) in 1750. He found a manuscript from relatives that still resided in Aintab that traced the family’s history back to 1100 A.D. From this, Nazar made a book on the family history of 800 years, 1100 A.D. to 1900. In 1915, nobody knew that genocide was planned and the Armenians, including Nazar and his family were deported and left their homes in horse-driven carriages. Nazar Berejaklian hid his valuables in a small cave in his house; among them the family history book, hoping to return back soon. In the evening on the day they left, they reached a railroad station and rested at night in fixed tents. A train passed by taking Armenians to their destination, they were yelling “soo, soo” which means water, water. They left them without water to be tortured and die. Nazar said, “who knows what is waiting for us in the hands of Turks.” But the Berejaklians were among the fortunate ones who were deported to Aleppo, Syria, and Hama where there were no killings and where the Arab people were merciful. A million and a half Armenians were deported to deserts and killed mercilessly, some children were adopted by Arabs; their face tattooed so they could become Arabs.
In 1917, Nazar Bereklian died before he had the chance to return home to Aintab. One year later, in 1918, Turkey was defeated and British troops occupied Cilicia. The survivors of genocide returned to their homes. The researcher’s grandfather, Armenac Berejiklian, Nazar Berejiklian’s son, and his family returned to Aintab in 1918 where they found their home and all other Armenian homes in bad shape. “All the doors, windows, side rails were gone and the hidden place in Nazar’s home was discovered and all the valuables and the family history book was gone.”

In 1919 the British army left Cilicia and the French army replaced them. Mustafa Kemal Ataturk was forming the new government and declared that Turkey is only for Turks and wanted all foreign elements out.

In 1920 the Berejiklian family was deported once again to Aleppo, Syria. The researcher’s father, Nubar Berian (his name shortened for business purposes later in life in the United States) was born in 1929 in Aleppo, Syria. He was one of 10 children. The family moved to Lebanon, Beirut in 1936. One of the researcher’s father’s sister, Aunt Isabel Kasayan, who was born in 1919 stated, “my whole family suffered, luckily they weren’t killed, but it was miserable, we didn’t like to talk about it.” Her father, the researcher’s grandfather, Armenac Berejiklian, lost everything, his home, his land, his family jewels and many gold bars, when the family was deported in 1915. In the family it is said he died from misery; from a broken heart. The Berejiklian family eventually immigrated, one by one, to France and then to the United States, to New York, beginning in 1947.
Final Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine how many courses exist, or how much course content exists in Division IA colleges/universities regarding the Armenian Genocide in undergraduate higher education throughout the United States. Armenians throughout the world commemorate the genocide of 1915 on April 24 each year to remember the slaughter and displacement of the thousands of Armenians during the rule of the Ottoman Empire (Balakian, 2003; Hovannisian, 1986; Melson, 1992; Miller & Miller, 1993). The Ottoman Empire succeeded in killing an estimated 1.5 million Armenians and eliminated the possibility of their living as a group in their homeland that they inhabited for three thousand years (Boyajian & Grigorian, 1998; Dadrian, 1995).

As presented in this research, there are numerous, scholarly historical analyses and survivor accounts that contend the Turks desire to exterminate the Armenian race (Balakian 1997, 2003; Dadrian, 1995; Hartunian, 1968; Jernazian, 1990; Miller & Miller, 1993). However, the most unbelievable aspect of this particular genocide is that the Turkish government has yet to admit their guilt or responsibility for these killings (Balakian, 1997, 2003; Dadrian, 1995, 1999a, 1999b, 2003).

The data for this study was collected by accessing every Division 1A college/university website and then researching their program catalog for courses on the Armenian Genocide. There were a total of three universities or 2.6 % of the 116 Division IA colleges/universities that offered stand-alone undergraduate courses on the Armenian Genocide and nine other schools or 7.8% (excluding stand-alone courses) that offered course content, through their undergraduate Holocaust/genocide courses, on the
Armenian Genocide. A total of 12 or 10.3% of the 116 Division IA schools offer undergraduate stand alone courses and/or course content on the Armenian Genocide.

This research has thoughtfully and intellectually discussed the possible reasons as to why this horrific event is presently not covered in college/university curricular programs in the United States. The question now is, why, since this topic, this atrocity, which was so massive and so controversial historically and politically, the Armenian Genocide is not being reviewed and discussed in a scholarly environment such as higher education in the United State of America?
APPENDIX A

List of Division IA Colleges/Universities
Arizona State University
San Diego State University
Arkansas State University
Auburn University
Ball State University
Baylor University
Boise State University
Boston College
Bowling Green State University
Brigham Young University
California State University, Fresno
Central Michigan University
Clemson University
Colorado State University
Duke University
East Carolina University
Eastern Michigan University
Florida State University
Georgia Institute of Technology
Indiana University, Bloomington
Iowa State University
Kansas State University
Kent State University
Louisiana State University
Louisiana Tech University
Marshall University
Miami University (Ohio)
Michigan State University
Middle Tennessee State University
Mississippi State University
New Mexico State University
North Carolina State University
Northern Illinois University
Northwestern University
Ohio State University
Ohio University
Oklahoma State University
Oregon State University
Pennsylvania State University
Purdue University
Rice University
Rutgers, State University of New Jersey
| University of Alabama at Birmingham          | University of Memphs |
| University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa            | University of Miami (Florida) |
| University of Arizona                        | University of Michigan |
| University of Arkansas, Fayetteville         | University of Minnesota, Twin Cities |
| University of California, Berkeley           | University of Mississippi |
| University of California, Los Angeles        | University of Missouri, Columbia |
| University of Central Florida                | University of Nebraska, Lincoln |
| San Jose State University                    | University of Connecticut |
| Southern Methodist University                | University of Florida |
| Sanford University                           | University of Georgia |
| Syracuse University                          | University of Hawaii, Manoa |
| Temple University                            | University of Houston |
| Texas A&M University, College Station        | University of Idaho |
| Texas Christian University                   | University of Illinois, Champaign |
| Texas Tech University                        | University of Iowa |
| Tulane University                            | University of Kansas |
| U.S. Air Force Academy                       | University of Kentucky |
| U.S. Military Academy                        | University of Louisiana at Lafayette |
| U.S. Naval Academy                           | University of Louisiana at Monroe |
| University of Buffalo, New York               | University of Louisville |
| University of Akron                          | University of Maryland, College Park |
| University of Arkansas                        | University of Nebraska, Lincoln |
| University of California, Berkeley           | University of Mississippi |
| University of California, Los Angeles        | University of Missouri, Columbia |
| University of Central Florida                | University of Nebraska, Lincoln |
APPENDIX B

Researcher’s Email Letter of Request to Contacted Professors of Division IA

Colleges and Universities
Dear Prof. <name>

I am a Ph.D. student at Lynn University in Boca Raton, Florida. I am researching the inclusion of courses and course content on the Armenian Genocide in Higher Education.

Through researching <name of college/university> online program catalog, I noticed that you offer <"name of course(s)" >

If you include the Armenian Genocide in this or any of your other current course offerings, could you please email me a copy of your syllabus? I will then mail to you two copies of my consent form; one for you to sign and mail back to me (in a self-addressed, stamped envelope) and one for your records. (I have also attached a copy of the consent form for your review).

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Christina Berian Pelosky
<email address>
<mailing address>
<telephone number>
APPENDIX C

Researcher's Consent Form
Lynn University

THIS DOCUMENT SHALL ONLY BE USED TO PROVIDE AUTHORIZATION FOR VOLUNTARY CONSENT

PROJECT TITLE: A content analysis of the inclusion of courses and course content on the Armenian genocide in higher education
Project IRB Number: 2005-002 Lynn University 3601 N. Military Trail Boca Raton, Florida 33431

Directions for the Participant:

I, Christina Berian Pelosky, am a doctoral student at Lynn University. I am studying Global Leadership, with a specialization in Organizational Management. Part of my education is to conduct a research study. You are being asked to participate in my research study.

Please read this carefully. This form provides you with information about the study. The Principal Investigator, Christina Berian Pelosky, will answer all of your questions. Ask questions about anything you don’t understand before deciding whether or not to participate. You are free to ask questions at any time before, during, or after your participation in this study. Your participation is entirely voluntary and you can refuse to participate without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

PURPOSE OF THIS RESEARCH STUDY:

The purpose of this study is to determine how much information on the Armenian genocide is being included in higher education Holocaust/Genocide courses throughout the United States. This study should also determine if higher education students are being exposed to the teachings of the Armenian genocide. The research method, Content Analysis will be used to collect and analyze data from the program catalogs of all Division 1A colleges/universities in the United States.

PROCEDURES:

Participants are asked to sign one consent form and return it to the Principle Investigator in the self-addressed stamped envelope. The other consent form is for the participant to keep for their records. Participants are to send syllabi on courses currently being offered on the Armenian
genocide, or on any Holocaust/genocide course in which the Armenian genocide is included. The syllabi and any other related course information shall be sent via email to the Principal Investigator, Christina Berian Pelosky, at [redacted]. If you should need to send information via the United States Postal Service, please email the principal investigator, and a self-addressed stamped envelope will be sent to you.

TIME REQUIRED:

The amount of time a participant can plan on investing in this study is 15-30 minutes. This includes the time it will take to sign and return the consent form, collect the required syllabi or related course information, and the actual submission of the information via email or regular UPS mail.

POSSIBLE RISKS OR DISCOMFORT:

There are minimal anticipated risks or discomforts from participating in this study. In addition, participation in this study requires a minimal amount of your time and effort.

POSSIBLE BENEFITS:

There may be no direct benefit to you in participating in this research. But knowledge may be gained which may help contribute to the awareness and recognition of the Armenian genocide in higher education in the United States.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:

There is no financial compensation for your participation in this research. There are no costs to you as a result of your participation in this study.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Every effort will be made to maintain the confidentiality. Your identity in this study will be treated as confidential. Only the principle investigator, Christina Berian Pelosky will know who you are. All the data gathered during this study, which were previously described, will be kept strictly confidential. Data will be stored in locked files for five years and then be destroyed. All information will be held in strict confidence and may not be disclosed unless required by law or regulation.

The results of this study may be published in a dissertation, scientific journals or presented at professional meetings. In addition, your individual privacy will be maintained in all publications or presentations resulting from this study.

RIGHT TO WITHDRAW:

You are free to choose whether or not to participate in this study. There will be no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled if you choose not to participate.
CONTACTS FOR QUESTIONS/ACCESS TO CONSENT FORM:

Any further questions you have about this study or your participation in it, either now or any time in the future, will be answered by Christina Berian Pelosky (Principal Investigator) who may be reached at: and Dr. Richard Cohen, faculty advisor who may be reached at: . For any questions regarding your rights as a research subject, you may call Dr. Farideh Farazmand, Chair of the Lynn University Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, at . If any problems arise as a result of your participation in this study, please call the Principal Investigator Christina Berian Pelosky and the faculty advisor Dr. Richard Cohen immediately.

AUTHORIZATION FOR VOLUNTARY CONSENT:

I have read and understand this consent form. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions, and all my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I have been assured that any future questions that may arise will be answered. I understand that all aspects of this project will be carried out in the strictest of confidence, and in a manner in which my rights as a human subject are protected. I have been informed of the risks and benefits. I have been informed in advance as to what my task(s) will be and what procedures will be followed.

I voluntarily choose to participate. I know that I can withdraw this consent to participate at any time without penalty or prejudice. I understand that by signing this form I have not waived any of my legal rights. I further understand that nothing in this consent form is intended to replace any applicable Federal, state, or local laws. I understand that I will receive a copy of this form.

Participant's printed name

Participant's signature Date

INVESTIGATOR'S AFFIDAVIT:

I have carefully explained to the subject the nature of the above project. I hereby certify that to the best of my knowledge the person who is signing this consent form understands clearly the nature, demands, benefits, and risks involved in his/her participation and his/her signature is legally valid. A medical problem or language or educational barrier has not precluded this understanding.

Signature of Investigator Date of IRB Approval: 2/10/05
Appendix D

IRB Approval Letter
Principal Investigator: Christina Berian Pelosky

Project Title: A content analysis of the inclusion of courses and course content on Armenian Genocide in higher education.

IRB Project Number: 2005-002 Request For Expedited Review of Application and Research Protocol for a New Project

IRB ACTION:

Expedited Review of Application and Research Protocol and Request for Expedited Review (FORM 3):
Approved X; Approved w/provision(s) ___

COMMENTS
Consent Required: No ____ Yes X Not Applicable _____ Written X Signed X

Consent forms must bear the research protocol expiration date of 2/10/2006

Application to Continue/Renew is due:
(1) For an Expedited IRB Review, one month prior to the due date for renewal X

Name of IRB Chair (Print) Farideh Farazmand
Signature of IRB Chair Date: 2/10/05

Cc. Dr. Cohen

Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects
Lynn University
3601 N. Military Trail Boca Raton, Florida 33431
APPENDIX E

Transcript of President Clinton's Letter
Transcript of President Clinton's Letter to Speaker Hastert Regarding the Armenian Genocide Resolution

October 19, 2000

Dear Mr. Speaker:

I am writing to express my deep concern about H. Res. 596, dealing with the tragic events in eastern Anatolia under the Ottoman rule in the years 1915-1923.

Every year on April 24, I have commemorated Armenian Remembrance Day, mourning the deportations and massacres of innocent Armenians during that era. And every year, I have challenged all Americans to recommit themselves to ensuring that such horrors never occur again.

However, I am deeply concerned that consideration of H. Res. 596 at this time could have far-reaching negative consequences for the United States. We have significant interests in this troubled region of the world: containing the threat posed by Saddam Hussein; working for peace and stability in the Middle East and Central Asia; stabilizing the Balkans; and developing new sources of energy. Consideration of the resolution at this sensitive time will negatively affect those interests and could undermine efforts to encourage improved relations between Armenia and Turkey — the very goal the sponsors of this Resolution seek to advance.

I fully understand how strongly both Turkey and Armenia feel about this issue. Ultimately, this painful matter can only be resolved by both sides examining the past together.

I urge you in the strongest terms not to bring this Resolution to the floor at this time.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton
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