

A WORD ABOUT THE ARMENIANS.

BY HESTER DONALDSON JENKINS.

AS Armenian immigrants are coming to this country in larger and larger numbers—many of them having acquired an interest in the United States through American missionaries and schools in Turkey, and all attracted by the freedom and opportunity of our land—a brief consideration of some of the characteristics of these new citizens of ours is pertinent.

Of all the dwellers in cosmopolitan Constantinople and Asia Minor, perhaps the most thoroughly Oriental are the Armenians. Their appearance is definitely eastern; swarthy, heavy-haired, black-eyed, with acquiline features, they look more Oriental than Turk, Slav or Greek. In general type they come closer to the Jew than any other people, sharing with them the strongly marked features, prominent nose and near-set eyes, as well as some gestures that we think of as characteristically Jewish. The type is so pronounced that to those who are akin to them they seem often very handsome, while to westerners they seem rather too foreign looking. Of course the type is not always preserved; white skins, even an occasional rosy cheek may be seen, and there is a small number of blue-eyed and fair-haired Armenians.

The resemblance to the Jews does not stop with physical features, for the fate of the two peoples has been sufficiently similar to bring out common traits. Like the Jew the Armenian has been oppressed and persecuted, and has developed a strength of nationality, a love for his own people and a persistence of type rarely seen elsewhere. Like the Jew he has learned to bend, not break, before the oppressor and to succeed by artifice when opposed by force. How else has he survived? Like the Jew he has developed strong business instincts, and like him he has a talent for languages, a power of concentration and unusual artistic gifts.

These resemblances have made many scholars question whether

the two races are not akin, whether the Armenian may not be descended from the lost ten tribes of Israel, but the philological basis for such a hypothesis is lacking. The Armenian language, say scholars, is Aryan and not Semitic. It is a rich language but harsh and guttural. Its alphabet is unique, consisting of thirty-six letters, most of them looking like capital U's, with added quirks, standing right side up or upside down or on their sides.

The Armenians boast a "golden age" of literature when for a brief cycle of fifty years a millenium ago their writers burst into poetry and song, translated the Bible into Armenian, and left a



ARMENIAN GROUP AT CONSTANTINOPLE COLLEGE.*

precious heritage of literature to their descendants. This literature is still studied in all the Armenian schools, and the church services are conducted in the language of this period. There is to-day a revival of Armenian literature, modeled in part on their revered classics and in part on French and English modern writings. The Armenian has a sense of style, a flow of language that often makes for oratory and fine writing.

Armenian names illustrate the sound of the language somewhat, such names as Këghanoush, Heygouhee, Aghavni. As among

* Armenians have no distinctive national costume. The young women in these illustrations are representatives of Armenia in Constantinople College where Miss Jenkins was a teacher for some years.

all Christian folk, scriptural names are common, such as Mariam (Mary), Hagup (Jacob) and Bogos (Paul); there is also a tendency to use French names such as Madelaine and Eugénie, but the most characteristic names are those definitely Armenian, such as Armen, Krikor and Muggerditch for men, and Armenouhee, Nouvart, Astrig and Mannig for women. The use of the family name is just coming into vogue. Hitherto a man has been known as the son of his father; thus Bogos is Bogos Meenasian, *ian* meaning "son of," and his son in turn becomes Hagop Bogossian. But the tendency to keep one's grandfather's name and thus establish a



ROUMELIE HISSAR (FORTRESS OF EUROPE) ON THE BOSPHERUS.*

family name is growing in favor. Often the family name is a Turkish root with the vernacular suffix, which is also the case with Greek and Slavic subjects of Turkey. Thus *Boyadjee* means "painter" or "boot-black" in Turkish, and one finds among the Christians of Turkey the Armenian form of Boyadjian, the Bulgarian Boyadjieff, and the Greek Boyadjoglou, all meaning "the son of the painter." Shishmanian, or "son of the fat man," Shandanjian or "son of the man from Damascus," and even the rather comic name of Shishkebabian, "the son of the fat mutton-chop," are all to be found among Armenian names.

*The towers were built by Mahomet II. Constantinople College is a few miles south of this fortress.

Although most of the Armenians have lived for centuries among the Turks and many have been brought up in the Turkish rather than the Armenian language, they very seldom speak Turkish without a strong Armenian accent amounting to a mispronunciation. It is merely one of the ways in which they have preserved their national individuality. They learn many languages early, in cultured homes generally speaking French and Turkish as easily as their own tongue, and now they are eagerly taking up English for its commercial as well as for its literary value.

The Armenians boast a church which is the oldest in Christendom, having been founded by Gregory the Illuminator some years before Constantine established the church in Byzantium. The mummied hand of Gregory is still laid on the head of each bishop at his consecration, thus carrying on the most perfect apostolic succession in the world. The church services and music are naturally very primitive.

The center of the Gregorian church is at Etchmiadzin, in the Caucasus mountains, where are the sacred cathedral, the relics, and the head of the church, the Catholicos. Corresponding to archbishops in the Western church are the patriarchs in each great political state. The patriarch of Constantinople is the political and national head of the Armenians and their representative at the Porte. Thus his position is largely a political one, and it is uncommon, although not unknown, for him to be a man of religious character. He must be diplomatic and able rather than spiritual. The danger in so old a church and one so connected with politics is that it shall be spiritually dead. But the influence of Protestantism through its missionaries has been not so much to take out a body of Protestants from the national church, as to infuse a new life into this old body and awaken the Gregorian church, which is changing rapidly to a live and thoughtful institution.

The Armenians had once a kingdom among the mountains and table lands of Asia Minor, where they fought bitterly but vainly against the conquering Byzantines. Nine centuries ago they lost their independence to the Greeks despite the heroic struggles of their kings and their great national hero, Vartan. As the Byzantine conquerors were in their turn conquered, the Armenians passed under the yoke of Turkey and of Russia. In this last century when there have been so many national reversals in southern Europe; when with the aid of northern powers Greece, Roumania and the Slavic states have broken away from Turkey; when even the small body of mountaineers in Albania have been given their own govern-



ARMENIAN STUDENTS IN COSTUME FOR A "PAGEANT OF THE NATIONS."

ment, there has been little thought of establishing the Armenians as an independent power. They have revolutionaries, have had their own societies, and have joined in the Young Turk movement; they have called pitifully on Europe, especially England, to free them from oppression, but they and their sympathizers have laid no real plans for self-government.

None of the powers have any interest in reviving an independent Armenia, for it would mean simply making a gift of it to Russia, who already has a large Armenian population. Poor bewildered Albania was erected not for the benefit of her wild peas-



ARMENIAN STUDENTS IN CHEMICAL LABORATORY.

antry but for the convenience of the Triple Alliance and the discomfiture of Servia. There is no such reason for making Armenia independent.

A good many Armenians in eastern Turkey, enraged against Turkish misrule, have in these last weeks joined the Russian army. This seems short-sighted, for Turkish government is far less efficient, and hence less deadly than Russian. For centuries the Gregorian church has been maintained in complete security in Turkey, but when Russia took the Caucasus and rich Elchmiadzin fell into

her hands, she promptly looted it of its greatest treasures and suppressed much of its activity. An American missionary visiting the desecrated sanctuary ten years ago asked one of the priests:

"Don't you wish you were still under Turkey?"

"Yes," was the reply, "for Turkey lopped off our branches but Russia digs us up by the roots."

But within the last decade Russia has changed her policy and has allowed the Armenians within her borders such liberty that they have prospered greatly and now find Russian rule preferable to Turkish.

There is little if any racial antagonism between the Armenians and the Turks; had religion and politics never come in to antagonize them, they could live together in essential harmony. For centuries the Armenians were excellent citizens of Turkey and served as officials, often of the highest rank. But as Europe took up the question of reform and attempted to protect the "Rayahs," or Christian subjects of the Porte, the Turkish government grew resentful, and for political considerations and to show her independence of Europe, wreaked vengeance on the helpless Armenians. The frequent massacres of Armenians have not been the outcome of natural antipathy, nor often of religious fanaticism, but usually have been purely political, sometimes brought on by zealous Armenian revolutionaries themselves in their desire to call the attention of Europe to their wrongs.

Let us illustrate this point by the massacres of 1909. Abdul Hamid had stirred up a counter-revolution against the Young Turks. It was failing and his power was lost. In a mood such as inspired Samson to pull down the temple in his fall, he decided to discredit Young Turkey with the world by a series of massacres of the Christian population of many a district. In most cases the governors refused to execute his orders and in the case of Constantinople the army of the Young Turks arrived in time to stop it; but as all know, in Celicia the orders were executed and thousands of Armenians went like sheep to the slaughter.

The Rayahs of Turkey were peculiarly helpless to resist attack, for they were not allowed to bear arms, and instead of the military service paid to the state by all Moslems they were called on for a monetary tax called *haradj*. Thus their warlike qualities were suppressed for centuries. But with the changes brought about by the beneficent revolution of 1908, the Rayahs were put on the same footing as the Moslems and were expected to enter the army. Although this appealed to the Armenian's sense of fairness it did

not in many cases please the individual who was drafted, and complaint, evasion and emigration have followed the effort to make the untrained Armenian fight for Turkey.

The Armenian is generally deeply attached to his homeland. He has not been allowed to feel that Turkey was his country in any real sense. More than one Armenian has told how patriotic songs of other countries made him grieve, because he could not say "my country" of any state. But they say it of the district where they live, being passionately attached to the village or stretch of country in which their families have grown up, and often after coming to America they are desperately homesick for the sunshine of Turkey.

When the revolution of 1908 seemed truly a national uprising not merely of Moslems but also of Christians and Jews, when the Armenians thought they had helped to put down the Hamidian tyranny and to found a new constitutional state which was theirs as well as the Turks', their joy was touching. One of the most affecting sights I have ever seen, I witnessed on the glorious day of the opening of the first parliament in Turkey, when through the gaily decorated streets of Constantinople moved a body of Armenian men carrying banners and singing a song that one of them had composed called *Vatanum* or "My Fatherland." As one looked on the solemnly joyful faces of the singers and realized that now for the first time in nine centuries they felt that they had a fatherland, one was deeply moved.

The revolution did not bring them all they hoped, although changes in their lot have been made for the better, and now many of these people are rejoicing in the probable break-up of the Ottoman empire. But the ruin of Turkey would not bring them independence, it would simply transfer them to another and heavier yoke. I feel that the best opportunity for the Armenian would come if the Turks, possibly confined to Asia Minor, should evolve an equitable government under which their Oriental subjects, Moslem and Christian, can live happily. And I still hope that Turkey will learn her lessons in government, and that the powers will leave her a kingdom where both Turks and Armenians may pursue their natural Oriental development. I think that the Armenians are happier and more at home in the East than in America.

There has been a considerable immigration of Armenians to the United States of recent years, although during the European war it has entirely stopped. Just how many Armenians have come to our land is impossible to learn, for in all immigration statistics the

Armenians are counted as subjects of Russia or Turkey. To one who knows the persistence of their racial characteristics in the Orient, it is surprising to see how they lose themselves in this country. As a little instance of their lack of insistence on their nationality, consider the names of their four restaurants in New York City, "The Constantinople," "The Cairo," "The Bosphorus," and "The Balkan," all of them Oriental, but none specifically Armenian names.

Their numbers in New York City have been variously estimated by themselves at from five to twenty thousand, but the latter number includes residents in Hoboken, Yonkers, Jersey City and other adjoining towns. There are also a good number of Armenians in Chicago, in Boston and its neighborhood, and in California. Very few go to the South.

The majority of the immigrants are single men, some of whom send home for good Armenian wives when they have become prosperous, and some of whom marry here. But a fairly large number of families come with their husbands and fathers to this country. By far the larger part of these Armenians belong to the national Gregorian church. They have two churches in the vicinity of New York City, one on Twenty-Seventh street which has just been purchased by Armenians and the other in West Hoboken, which has long been owned by them. The Protestant Armenians, although they are a much smaller number, are a more prosperous community because they devote more time and more money to their churches than do the Gregorians.

Most of the Armenian immigrants are peasants, either used to field work, or, when they are skilled laborers, being carpenters, cabinet-makers, brass or iron workers, tinsmiths, shoemakers, blacksmiths, weavers and silk workers. Hundreds of them are employed in the silk-mills of New Jersey. The Armenians who come from the Oriental cities are prepared to be clerks, bookkeepers, house men, waiters, butlers, tailors, jewelers and rug repairers. There are a few rich Armenian firms dealing in rugs and curios in New York and other great American cities.

When the Armenian immigrant arrives at Ellis Island, he is met by some member of the Armenian Colonial Association, who sees that he gets safely into the city, then furnishes him with temporary quarters, and as soon as may be finds him employment or sends him to some western farm. This society is entirely philanthropic, conducting a labor bureau, classes in English and lectures in American and United States history, hygiene and other useful subjects. Its object is to help the Armenian immigrant and develop

him into a good American citizen. The lectures they offer on Tuesday evenings and Sunday afternoons have an average attendance of five hundred. There are also a choral society and an orchestra within this friendly Colonial Association.

On Lexington Avenue there are several blocks where one may see the unique Armenian letters in many a window, showing that this is an Armenian locality. At number 69 there is a club called "S. D. H. Armenian Club." It has pleasant quarters where its members may read, write and smoke, and a membership of one hundred persons of both sexes. Another club of which the membership is largely Armenian is the Constantinople College Alumnae Association, where with Americans, English, an occasional Bulgarian, Greek, or Turk, are found some fifty Armenian women who have been students of the American College for Girls in Constantinople. Several papers are published in Armenian in Chicago, Boston, and Fresno, California, and one in New York City called *The Gotchnag*.

As I said before, I feel that the Armenians are so Oriental that they are as a rule happier to remain in the Orient, but if they come to us, we may find them good citizens, thrifty, industrious, eager to learn our customs and ideals, and willing to adapt themselves to our religious institutions.

TREITSCHKE.

BY M. JOURDAIN.

“Thinking calms men of other nations, it inflames the Germans.”—*Madame de Staël*.

GOBINEAU characterizes Greek history as “the most elaborate of fictions of the most artistic of peoples,” and though German history cannot be described in these terms, there is in it such an element of propaganda that its influence upon the German spirit is of considerable interest. Of German historians the greatest influence was Heinrich von Treitschke—a name before the autumn of 1914 known only to a small body of historians in England and America. Before 1914 only one of his works, *What We Demand from France*, was translated into English; in the last months of 1914 and the early months of 1915 there is a rapid succession of appreciations and translations. In the first hurry his name was not always correctly spelled even in the serious periodicals, but the journalists have now taken their note from specialists, and Treitschke is now treated according to his deserts.

Treitschke—“our great national historian,” as he was usually called in Germany—was only one of a large group, Sybel, Droysen, Giesebrecht, Dahlmann, Hausser and others, who spent their learning and lives, as one of them says, “to express and justify the love and belief in the Fatherland.” His prominence in this group is my reason for drawing attention to two characteristics of his work which seem to have aroused little adverse criticism in his own country, namely, an exaggerated national bias and certain defects in his equipment as an historian,¹ notwithstanding his qualities of

¹ Heinrich von Treitschke was born at Dresden in 1834. His career as teacher began at Leipsic in 1859. In 1866, at the outbreak of war, his sympathies with Prussia were so strong that he went to Berlin and became a Prussian subject. In 1874 he was made professor at Berlin. On Sybel's death he succeeded him as editor of the *Historische Zeitschrift*. He supported the

extreme diligence and scrupulous care in the use of authorities which are conceded by historians. He is significant not so much from his historical work, but as the trumpet and interpreter of the Prussian spirit, the man who far more than any other single character in German political life was responsible for the anti-English feeling which broke into a sudden blaze during the Boer war.² Probably no German professor ever drew such audiences to his lecture-hall in Berlin. As a lecturer he appealed to his hearers by his enthusiasm and his gift of fiery speech, and a theologian applied to him the words of St. John's Gospel: "Never man spake like this man."³ People felt reminded of what other nations had related of the impression a Bernard of Clairvaux, an Abelard, an Arnold of Brescia, a John Huss had produced upon their contemporaries; "all his hearers realized that these lectures acted like iron baths."⁴ Never since the days when Germany was under the heel of Napoleon, and Fichte sent his messages of hope and patriotic ardor through the nation, had a German professor made the heart of the people throb to his utterances as it throbbed for twenty years to the words of Treitschke.⁵

The subjects of his lectures were invariably historical and political; when speaking of the past he never forgot the present; what he said of Cromwell, Gustavus Adolphus and Napoleon always had its reference to present-day England, Germany and France. He combined for the young people politics with philosophy and religion, says a biographer.⁶

Other countries have partisan historians and school text-books in which their history is seen in a becoming light. In Germany the partisan history has been long established. Just as the slovenly housemaid sweeps dust and fluff out of sight under the carpet, so

government in its attempts to subdue by repressive legislation socialists, Poles and Catholics. His "History of Germany in the Nineteenth Century," of which the first volume was published in 1879, was not completed at the time of his death in 1896. The five volumes only carry the history of Germany to the year 1847. The work is described by J. W. Headlam in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (art. "Treitschke") as "discursive and badly arranged," and the same writer adds that "notwithstanding the extreme spirit of partisanship and some faults of taste it will remain a remarkable monument of literary ability." Treitschke also wrote his *Politik*, two series of *Deutsche Kämpfe*, and *Bilder aus der deutschen Geschichte*, political essays and literary portraits.

² J. A. Cramb, *Germany and England*, London, 1914.

³ *Treitschke, his Life and Works* (translated into English for the first time), London, 1914, p. 39.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

⁵ *The Times*, Educational Supplement, Tuesday, September 1, 1914.

⁶ *Treitschke, his Life and Works*, p. 41.

the German historians contrived to hide and gloss over in their works the ugly side of Germany's records, or when the evidence was written too large in history, to extol it; while the dust-heaps of other nations were ruthlessly stirred up. Hegel's philosophy of history culminates in the choice the world-spirit makes of Germany as its resting-place and claims that the German spirit is the spirit of the new world. David Friedrich Strauss, the author of the *Leben Jesu*, declared that Prussia never made any but holy wars, and that the Franco-Prussian war of 1870 was "a work of public salubrity accomplished by Germany, France being rotten to the marrow." Treitschke went so far as to say that "pure and impartial history could never suit a proud and warlike nation," and that he was a thousand times more patriot than professor.⁷ We have now before us the result of a proud and warlike nation fed upon history which is not pure and impartial, and of Germans who are a thousand times more patriots than professors.

The history of Germany was accordingly written in the spirit of propaganda; its historians became its apologists. Professor Delbrück openly "blessed" the falsified Ems telegram, and Sybel condoned Frederick the Great's complicity in the second partition of Poland, because Prussia "thereby gained a very considerable territory," though he admits it to have been a wrong and a "violation of law in the most literal sense of the word." Ranke refused to condemn any of Frederick the Great's aggressions, while he is ready to cast his stone at France, saying: "It is peculiar to France from century to century to break through the circle of legality."

Treitschke is in line with his fellow historians and his passionate worship of Prussia and equally passionate antipathy to the actual and potential enemies of Germany constantly warp his judgment. France is disposed of by calling her Sodom and Babylon, England is the "hypocrite who, with a Bible in one hand and an opium pipe in the other, scatters over the universe the benefits of civilization." The thought of the conquered provinces of Alsace-Lorraine inspired him with the thought that "the rule of Frenchmen over a German stock was at all times a vicious thing; to-day it is a crime against the intelligence which directs human history, a subjection of free men to half-civilized barbarians." "The nation is our enemy," he writes, in 1870, "and we must draw her teeth." His hatred of England reached a height and persistence of rancor which, as Professor Cramb mildly suggests, was "in so great a man arresting, if not unique"; and the Professor heard him on an

⁷ *Treitschke, his Life and Works*, p. 43.

evening in 1895, pouring out in a company of friends "all the vitriol of his scorn, antipathy and hate for England and for the English, enduring no word of comment or contradiction."⁸ As Treitschke himself said "one only understands what one loves," his method stands self-condemned.

The leading motive of his lectures was that Germans were the chosen people,—the second time that supernatural guidance through shifting and devious ways has been claimed by an unpopular nation. To this view that to the chosen people all things must be permitted is due his saying: "The Cameroons? (on Germany's acquisition of that colony) What are we to do with this sand-box? Let us take Holland; then we shall have colonies." It will be remembered that the discreet Ranke once advised Bismarck to annex Switzerland. The theory that history should be written by patriots, that "true passion sees clearer than all the cold-blooded sophists, and only the historian writing from a party standpoint introduces us to the life of the parties and really guides us," is clearly a mischievous and provincial one, and led to Treitschke writing history for Germans, not for foreigners. "Foreign critics do not like my books? That is natural. I write for Germans, not foreigners," he once answered with impatient contempt when a friend pointed out to him the injury he did his chances of a European reputation such as Ranke's or Mommsen's. But apart from his Prussian bias, which was severely criticized in 1885 by Baumgarten in a pamphlet which contends that the great history of Germany ought to be read as "truth and fiction,"⁹ there are some curious deficiencies in his equipment as a historian.

Though his great diligence in research is well known, a carelessness in his use of oral information, surprising in the scientific historian, caused some difficulties. "Impressions of travels through all the valleys of Germany, poetry, newspaper extracts, conversation and humorous stories of friends were always at his command, and these combined with . . . information verbally received enabled him to shape his work. Considering his system of gathering information it was inevitable that occasionally he was provided with unauthentic news, for as soon as conversation arose on a subject useful to him his pocket-book appeared, and he asked to have the story put down. All sorts of protests against his anecdotes were

⁸ J. A. Cramb, *Germany and England*, p. 92. Speaking of England Treitschke said: "In this universe of ours the thing that is wholly rotten, wholly a sham, may endure for a time, but cannot endure forever." He frequently rings the changes on the "nation of shop-keepers."

⁹ *Treitschke, his Life and Works*, p. 42.

raised after each publication. It is notorious how circumstantially he subsequently had to explain or contradict the story of the silver spoon of Prince Wrede, the red order of the Eagle of Privy Councillor Schmalz and many other things; and much more frequently still he promised correction in the subsequent edition to those who had lodged complaints."¹⁰

A further defect of Treitschke's is connected with the claim that the Germans are the chosen people,—a claim for the divine guidance of Germany. His audience gathered in his lecture-hall to hear the "story of the manner in which God or the world-spirit, through shifting and devious paths, had led Germany and the Germans to their present exalted station under Prussia and the Hohenzollern."¹¹ That a small state, "necessarily materialistic," should be successful is "ludicrous";¹² that a great state, such as England or Russia, should be predominant in Europe is a "ghastly prospect, immoral and appalling."¹³ It is essential that there should be but one chosen people at a time. A citation from the New Testament seems to him conclusive as to the morality of war: "It is precisely political idealism that demands wars, while materialism condemns them. What a perversion of morality to wish to eliminate heroism from humanity! . . . All references to Christianity in this case are superfluous and perverse. The Bible says explicitly that the powers that be shall bear the sword, and it also says: 'Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.' Those who declaim this nonsense of a perpetual peace do not understand the Aryan peoples." It would be difficult to pack a greater amount of disingenuousness in a smaller compass.

Sometimes the confusion of thought reaches to absurd heights. In discussing the question of women voting Treitschke says in effect: Either female suffrage benefits the married man or it does not; both results are wrong! "In the exercise of the right [of voting] by women there are only two alternatives possible. Either the wife, or it may be the daughter, votes as the husband and father, and thereby an unwarranted privilege is granted to the married man; or wife and daughter are good-for-nothings; then they vote against the man and thus the state carries its dispute in frivolous fashion right into the peace of the home."¹⁴

¹⁰ *Treitschke, his Life and Works*, pp. 74-75.

¹¹ Cramb, *Germany and England*, p. 89.

¹² *Selections from Treitschke's Lectures on Politics*, trans. A. L. Gowans, 1914, p. 18.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

¹⁴ *Selections from Treitschke's Lectures on Politics*, p. 57.

It may be objected that these criticisms are directed at unimportant details of Treitschke's equipment, and that it is no more worth while pointing them out to-day than Carlyle's apologetics for violence, his exaggerated worship of success. But while Carlyle's influence in England is dead, Treitschke's in Germany is still living and active; and the German press and professors to-day show the worst and most dangerous qualities—the naive national egoism and carelessness of the rights of other states, uncritical acceptance of doubtful evidence—of the man who saw in history an arsenal from which to draw weapons of offense to pursue his political aims, and whose ideals and passionate rhetoric have so deeply tinged German thought. That thinking cools the heads of other nations but inflames the Germans is as true to-day as when Madame de Stael first set this phrase in her work on Germany.