

**Online Symposium: Mass Violence in the (Post-)Ottoman Lands
University of Newcastle (Australia), Wednesday 6 September 2023**



Armenians gathered in a city prior to deportation and massacre.
Aurora Mardiganian, *Ravished Armenia: The Story of Aurora Mardiganian, the Christian Girl who Lived Through the Great Massacres*, Kingfield Press, 1918. Public Domain,
<https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=28809085>

From the late nineteenth century, the Ottoman Empire came under the increasing strains of both internal upheavals and external pressure from great power rivals, culminating in the Empire's disintegration following defeat in the First World War. Increasing acts of mass violence accompanied this political instability, most notably the Armenian Genocide. Hosted by the Centre for the Study of Violence at the University of Newcastle (Australia), this online Symposium interrogates the causes, processes and consequences of mass violence in the (Post-)Ottoman lands. It asks:

- What were the macro and micro causes of mass violence?
- Who was targeted for inclusion in the Ottoman state (and its successors), and who for exclusion?
- What methods did rival nationalists employ to achieve national homogeneity, from co-option and assimilation to exile and extermination?
- How did 'everyday' Ottoman and post-Ottoman subjects respond
- What role did civilians and other non-state actors play in mass violence?
- How have the causes of mass violence continued to resonate in post-Ottoman states? and
- What restrained mass violence at moments when conditions seemingly lent themselves to outbreaks?

Papers will be held live on Zoom (link below). Sessions will subsequently be recorded and posted to the [History@Newcastle](#) YouTube channel.

Program and abstracts: <https://www.newcastle.edu.au/research/centre/csov/conferences>

Symposium Welcome

1.45pm (UTC+10)

Session 1: Interpretations of Mass Violence

2-3.30pm (UTC+10)

Philip Dwyer (Newcastle), 'Mass Violence, Genocide, and Killing in War: Some Recent Debates'

Roger Markwick (Newcastle), 'An orientalist Marxism? Leon Trotsky on violence and imperialism in the Balkan Wars (1912-1913).'

Andrekos Varnava (Flinders), 'Post-British or Post-Ottoman: Mass Violence in Cyprus 1963-1974'

Session 2: Balkan Geographies of Violence

4-5.30pm (UTC+10)

Spyros Tsoutsoumpis (Manchester), 'The business of war: military enterprising in the late Ottoman Balkans'

Alexander Maxwell (Victoria, Wellington), 'Contingency and Nationalism in North Macedonia, Or, Why the Extirpation of Macedonian Bulgarians is not Genocide'

Sebastian Meredith and Sacha Davis (Newcastle), 'Navigating the World-System Periphery: The Recycling of Orientalist Discourse in Zhivkov's Bulgaria'

Session 3: Mass Violence in Context

6.30-8.30pm (UTC+10)

Hazal Özdemir (Northwestern, Chicago), 'Undesirable Subjects in and out of the Empire: Mobility, Nationality and Making of an Ottoman Subject'

İlkay Yılmaz, (Freie Universitaet Berlin), Mass Violence and Security Narrative During the Late Ottoman Empire (1894-1907)

Ümit Kurt (Newcastle), 'Restraint of Mass Violence: The Microdynamics of Intercommunal Relations in Late Ottoman Adapazarı on the Eve of the Balkan Wars'

Hans-Lukas Kieser (Newcastle), 'A Mental Map for Violence: Dr. Rıza Nur's Writings on Armenians and Jews'

To Join from PC, Mac, Linux, iOS or Android:

<https://uonewcastle.zoom.us/j/87040363272?pwd=QTJQait4ZFFMa1pKYVgzQzhPTHF5Zz09>

Password: 783069

NOTE: These sessions will be recorded.

Enquiries: Sacha.Davis@Newcastle.edu.au

Abstracts

Session 1: Interpretations of Mass Violence 2-3.30pm (UTC+10)

Philip Dwyer (Newcastle), 'Mass Violence, Genocide, and Killing in War: Some Recent Debates'

This year marks the 30th anniversary of Christopher Browning's seminal work about how the *ordinary* policemen of Police Battalion 101 became obedient killers in the Nazi racial-ideological cause. Browning largely dismissed ideology (and even anti-Semitism) as an unsatisfactory explanation for the participation in mass killing, focussing instead on broader social, political, and cultural structures, as well as historical context. Many historians, political scientists, and sociologists continue to dismiss ideology as an important factor in the dynamics of mass violence. In recent times, however, we have seen the resurgence of 'ideology' as a prominent explanatory framework for mass violence and killing.

How, when, and why some people became mass killers, and others did not, has been one of the most vexed questions that historians have laboured over for decades now. This paper looks at some of the key ideas in the debates around mass violence, incorporates some historical-sociological reflections, touches on civilian involvement in mass violence in the Ottoman Empire, and suggests that a combination of factors must be present before killing, mass killing, and genocide can occur.

Philip Dwyer is Professor of History and the founding Director of the Centre for the Study of Violence at the University of Newcastle, Australia. He has published widely on the Revolutionary and Napoleonic eras, including a three-volume biography of Napoleon. He is the general editor of the *Cambridge World History of Violence*, and co-editor of the *Cambridge History of the Napoleonic Wars*. He is currently writing a global history of violence from prehistory to the present.

Roger Markwick (Newcastle), 'An orientalist Marxism? Leon Trotsky on violence and imperialism in the Balkan Wars (1912-1913).'

This paper was triggered by a 'critical reading' of Leon Trotsky's *Correspondence on The Balkan Wars, 1912-13* (1980) by the renowned Bulgarian historian Maria Todorova. Trotsky was the war correspondent for the socialist newspaper *Kievskaya Mysl'* (*Kievan Thought*) from October 1912 to November 1913. In this capacity, he wrote dozens of articles widely recognised as brilliant depictions of the driving forces, key political players, and life-and-death experiences in the Balkans theatre. Todorova notes Trotsky's hostility towards Slavophilism and the imperialist machinations of the Russian Autocracy and his 'heart-rending' descriptions of wartime horror, especially atrocities perpetrated by the Serbs and Bulgarians. In so doing, Todorova accuses Trotsky of a Eurocentric contempt for the Balkans backward, peasant, *Kleinstateerei*; contempt derived from classical Marxism. Based on my

own reading of Trotsky's *War Correspondence*, this paper revisits the savagery of the war and asks to what degree, if at all, his Marxist analysis was coloured by orientalism.

Dr. Roger Markwick is Honorary Professor of Modern European History, The University of Newcastle, Australia. In 2003 he won the Alexander Nove Prize in Russian, Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies. His latest research is on socialist dissidents in the Soviet and post-Soviet states. He is also editing a biography of the Bulgarian socialist Christian Rakovsky, who became Trotsky's closest friend during the Balkan wars.

Andrekos Varnava (Flinders), 'Post-British or Post-Ottoman: Mass Violence in Cyprus 1963-1974'

From December 1963 to August 1974, Cyprus was gripped by on-and-off again political violence, involving Greek Cypriot, Turkish Cypriot, Greek and Turkish forces, which led to many casualties and the forced geographical separation (i.e. partition) of the population owing to ethnic-cleansing. The mass violence is usually classified as an example of post-British violence and partition, with the replacement of the British by the Americans from 1964, thus also through the prism of the Cold War. This paper builds on this research by adding an additional dimension, by viewing these events as also being an example of late post-Ottoman mass violence. It starts by focussing on the British colonial period to establish the post-Ottoman characteristics that evolved, before showing how many of these lingered and were at the heart of the mass violence from 1963-1974.

Andrekos Varnava, FRHistS, is Professor in British Imperial and Colonial Histories at Flinders University, South Australia and an Honorary Professor in History at De Montfort University, Leicester. He has authored four monographs, edited/co-edited 16 collections, and published over 60 articles/chapters, including in *English Historical Review* (2017), *The Historical Journal* (2014), *Journal of Modern History* (2018), *Historical Research* (2014, 2017, 2022), *Contemporary British History* (2019), *Social History of Medicine* (2020), *International History Review* (2021), *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* (2022), *Immigrants & Minorities* (2022) and *Labor History* (2023).

Session 2: Balkan Geographies of Violence 4-5.30pm (UTC+10)

Spyros Tsoutsoumpis (Manchester), 'The business of war: military enterprising in the late Ottoman Balkans'

The late Ottoman Empire witnessed an unprecedented surge of ethnic and political violence. Until recently the violence that befell the Ottoman space and the neighbouring nations has been studied through the lens of the state. More recent studies have focused on the local dynamics of violence and the role of non-state armed actors such as gangs, militias, vigilante groups. The involvement of these groups in processes of ethnic and political violence has

yielded a host of different exegeses. Some studies described them as political soldiers, while others dismissed them as apolitical criminals and/or self-seeking profiteers. Their involvement in the process of war-making, crime and politics have been accordingly analysed separately thereby generating a one-dimensional understanding of their purview, role, and impact.

The paper eschews such approaches by conceptualizing late Ottoman paramilitarism as a form of military entrepreneurship. The idea of military enterprising distinguishes their fundamental role as subcontractors of state violence while also signifying that their purview and aspirations extended beyond their immediate task of deploying force on the behest of the state and/or an ethnic agenda. Put otherwise the paper suggests that their paramilitaries were for the state but not of the state. Ideological convergence was important, but state-paramilitary alignments were equally embedded on the latter's pursuit of socio-economic benefits in an environment characterized by relative deprivation. This approach casts new light to the transformative impact of paramilitary violence by focusing on its socio-political and economic dimensions. Activities such as forceful acquisition, extraction, local governance, and protection were central to the purview of these groups. Yet, so far they have been relegated to the margins of enquiry or dismissed as the work of opportunistic thugs. The paper instead situates these forms of 'military entrepreneurship' front and centre and explores their role as motivational factors and transformative tools in the state and nation-building processes. This concept allows us to capture the ambiguity of their actions by studying military violence, political activism and economic profiteering as constituent parts of a mutually reinforcing dynamic which formed and sustained these groups.

Spyros Tsoutsoumpis is Lecturer in Modern European History at the University of Manchester and a Visiting Lecturer at Lancaster University. His first monograph, *A History of the Greek Resistance in the Second World War: The People's Armies* was published by Manchester University Press in 2016. He is currently working on a new manuscript that examines the intersection between paramilitary violence and state building in the Greek "New Lands" between the Balkan Wars and the Cold War.

Alexander Maxwell, 'Contingency and Nationalism in North Macedonia, Or, Why the Extirpation of Macedonian Bulgarians is not Genocide'

The emergence of North Macedonian nationalism illustrates contingency in nationalism. Late-nineteenth Slavic patriots in Macedonia frequently imagined themselves as Bulgarians, if within the context of widespread national indifference. Bulgarian patriots in Macedonia, however, often espoused a multi-ethnic regionalism, hoping that Macedonians of different nationality might coexist. In the interwar period, competing Serbian and Bulgarian claims to Macedonia encouraged Balkan communists to promote Macedonian ethnic separatism. The disastrous Bulgarian occupation of the Second World War ultimately spurred Macedonian particularist nationalism, which currently prevails in the Republic of North Macedonia. Even though violence has featured prominently in Balkan history, therefore, the disappearance of "Bulgarians" from Macedonia was not brought about through massacre or ethnic cleansing. Instead, Macedonian Bulgarians became persuaded by an alternate national project.

Alexander Maxwell researches national awakening the Habsburg and its successor states, and particularly Slovakia and Hungary during the long nineteenth century. He has published extensively on linguistic nationalism and the history of linguistic ideologies, the history of everyday life, particularly nationalized sexuality and the social history of clothing. He also publishes pedagogical articles about teaching history. His broader interests concern nationalism and cultural history in the Habsburg, Romanov, Hohenzollern, and Ottoman Empires and their successor states. He is the director of the Antipodean East European Study Group.

Sebastian Meredith and Sacha Davis (Newcastle), 'Navigating the World-System Periphery: The Recycling of Orientalist Discourse in Zhivkov's Bulgaria'

In the “National Revival” of the 1870s, Bulgarian nationalists deployed Orientalist rhetoric to legitimise their independence movement against the Ottoman Empire, presenting their Christian ‘Europeanness’ as in conflict with Islamic ‘Orientalism.’ In doing so, they successfully secured Great Power support, becoming a periphery of the European core. They also unleashed ethnic cleansing that halved Bulgaria’s Muslim population, while leaving large regional minorities. While the struggle against “the Turkish Yoke” remained prominent in Bulgaria’s national mythos following independence, however, Orientalism and anti-Muslim violence remained relatively dormant during the turbulence of two World Wars and the imposition of communist rule. Nonetheless, the Bulgarian Communist Party (BCP) deployed strikingly similar rhetoric against its Turkish minority during the regime’s so-called ‘Revival Process’ following the institution of the 1971 ‘Zhivkov Constitution – culminating in widespread violence and ethnic cleansing in the final years of the Zhivkov regime. Why did this recycling of Orientalist discourse and anti-Muslim violence occur a century later, in virtually opposite geopolitical circumstances? Why was anti-Muslim action so subdued in-between?

We argue that while latent Orientalism laid the foundations for anti-Muslim violence, it was Bulgaria’s shifting position in a changing world-system, and its dependence on ‘great power’ support, that determined the conditions for or against violence.

Sebastian Meredith is a PhD candidate and sessional academic at the University of Newcastle (Australia). Sebastian’s research chiefly concerns the convergent histories of the European Union and East Central Europe from the mid-20th Century into the 21st. His recent publication in *East European Politics and Societies*, “The EU, the Visegrád Group, and Southeast Europe: Conflicting Perspectives within an Enlarging ‘European Identity’,” highlights the confluence of economic processes and discourse on identity in intra-EU politics. With Dr Sacha Davis, Sebastian has also investigated the historical relationship between Bulgaria and the European ‘great powers,’ and the ways in which West European projections of ‘Easternness’ have affected Bulgaria’s long-term development and integration.

Sacha E. Davis completed his doctorate at the University of New South Wales and lectures in European history at the University of Newcastle (Australia). His primary research interests examine minority nationalism and the state in the east of Europe, with a focus on German diaspora communities (especially Transylvanian Saxons), and

coercive regimes directed at Roma, in the (post-) Habsburg lands. He has also written on the Transylvanian Saxon diaspora in North America, and is co-CI in the oral history project “German as a Heritage Language and Culture in Newcastle and the Hunter Valley.”

Session 3: Mass Violence in Context
6.30-8.30pm (UTC+10)

Hazal Özdemir (Northwestern, Chicago), ‘Undesirable Subjects in and out of the Empire: Mobility, Nationality and Making of an Ottoman Subject’

In 1896, the government of Abdülhamid II (1876-1909) began to encourage Armenians who were leaving for the United States to emigrate under the condition that they denaturalize (*terk-i tabiiyet*) and sign documents attesting that they would never return. Taking the denaturalization of Armenian transatlantic migrants as its primary case study, this paper scrutinizes who could be an Ottoman and who could not. Ottoman subject-making included extraction, expulsion, and co-optation; and this chapter delves deeper into these three methods. It first examines the extraction process within the wider framework of the Ottoman nationality regime. The Hamidian government navigated a diverse range of nationality cases in the late nineteenth century such as Muslim pilgrims who wanted to become Ottomans, Algerians who were switching between French and Ottoman allegiance, naturalizing Caucasian immigrants, and Christians and Jews emigrating to Europe. Nevertheless, among these issues, Armenian denaturalization proved to be a strong preoccupation for the government which must be contextualized among other subject-making and erasing cases in the late Ottoman Empire. This paper argues that the Hamidian government first eliminated its Armenian population with a series of anti-Armenian massacres between 1894-96. Then with the denaturalization requirement (*terk-i tabiiyet*), the government turned what began as a form of temporary sojourn for males in the late 1880s – many of whom were motivated to return after they accumulated money to take care of their families – into a permanent form. Hence the nature of mobility was also transformed, it was not only a temporary labor migration anymore, but rather a permanent resettlement, even an exile.

Secondly, building on Armenian expulsion, this chapter explores their denaturalization and the denial of the right of return as a demographic engineering project and a form of bureaucratic violence. Creating a bureaucratic apparatus for monitoring and policing the transatlantic mobility of Armenians, who had become undesirable subjects was a crucial phase of state-sanctioned violence. Although the studies on violence in Ottoman Armenian historiography have been limited to massacres and genocide, this chapter opens up the question of violence to investigate how the government utilized administrative and legal tools to set boundaries for Ottoman nationality in a crucial stage of emptying the Ottoman landscape of Armenians. Armenians’ mobility was not an exile, it started voluntary. Nevertheless, the *terk-i tabiiyet* requirement transformed this voluntary migration into a forced immobility, an exile.

Finally, this paper examines co-optation by trying to understand what was Islamic about the making of the Ottoman nationality and later Turkish citizenship. Whereas Armenians were denaturalized and banned from returning, Muslim refugees from the Balkans and the

Caucasus, and other former Ottoman territories after World War I could become members of the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic. While the state was defining its non-Muslim subjects as outsiders and making them targets of forced nationalist homogenization, assimilation, and ethnic cleansing; it allowed foreign Muslims to become Ottoman legal nationals easier.

Hazal Özdemir is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of History. She is currently writing her dissertation which explores Armenian circular mobility between the Ottoman Empire and the United States between 1896-1908. Her project contributes to the existing literature on Ottoman Armenian history and studies on Ottoman nationality by focusing on the methods devised to regulate the mobility of undesirable subjects such as denaturalization, bureaucratic forms of violence, and, photo registers. She participates in the interdisciplinary Middle East and North African Studies (MENA) Cluster. Her dissertation project was funded by institutions such as the American Research Institute in Turkey (ARIT), The Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, the Society of Armenian Studies (SAS), the National Association for Armenian Studies and Research (NAASR) and the Knights of Vartan Fund for Armenian Studies Research, and the SALT Research Institute in Turkey. Before coming to Northwestern, Hazal received a BA in History from Boğaziçi University, Turkey, and an MA in History of Art with Photography from Birkbeck, University of London.

İlkay Yılmaz, (Freie Universitaet Berlin), Mass Violence and Security Narrative During the Late Ottoman Empire (1894-1907)

This study analyzes the Ottoman narrative on mass violence against Ottoman Armenians as part of the security knowledge production. The understanding of security was generated through the historical process, which could be tracked not only via the actions of the state actors but also their discourse which indicates the political conceptualization of an issue and its transformation into a security question. This definition process comes with information gathering, conducted through different tools like diplomacy, military reports, police reports, population statistics, maps, intelligence reports, and their manipulation. This study examines the correspondence of the Ottoman Foreign Affairs, Police Ministry, and the investigation reports after the massacres, referring to concepts of “interpretive” and “implicatory denial” to discuss the Ottoman security narrative about the Armenian massacres and routinized violence towards the Armenian community.

İlkay Yılmaz is currently a DFG (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) funded research associate at Friedrich-Meinecke-Institut (department of Modern History) at Freie Universität Berlin. She was an Einstein Senior Researcher at the same department. She was a research fellow at Leibniz-Zentrum Moderner Orient between 2017-19 with Humboldt Scholarship and between 2014-15 with TUBITAK (The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey) scholarship. She was working as an assistant professor at Istanbul University from 2014 until 2017. Her articles have appeared in Journal of Historical Sociology, Middle Eastern Studies, Journal of Ottoman and Turkish Studies, Photoresearcher-Journal of European Society for History of Photography. Her research interests focus on the history of security, passport history, inter-imperial collaboration on policing, state formation and

history of violence in the late Ottoman Empire. Her book “Ottoman Passports: Security and Mobility (1876-1908)” will be published by Syracuse University Press on September 2023.

Ümit Kurt (Newcastle), ‘Restraint of Mass Violence: The Microdynamics of Intercommunal Relations in Late Ottoman Adapazarı on the Eve of the Balkan Wars’

At night on 25 February 1911, three Armenian and two Greek men who resided in the town of Adapazarı, located in north-western Turkey (connected to the sanjak of İzmit in the Ottoman Empire), were caught having intercourse with a Bosniak (*Boşnak*) Muslim prostitute in a bathhouse. After being caught, they were brought into police custody. Later, the recently appointed local prefect of Adapazarı, Hüseyin Sırrı Bey, ruled that the accused should remain in custody until they could be brought in front of a judge. In doing this, he tried to give the incident a political character. If these people were to be released, he asserted, then problems might break out between the Muslims and Christians of Adapazarı, as happened in Adana and its environs in a series of large-scale massacres of Armenians that broke out in April 1909. Muslim sentiments toward the elevated status of Christians, resentment created by increasing economic inequality, and demographic changes brought by both natural and man-made disasters hastened the arrival of conflict in Adana. The environment of rivalry resulting from the emerging national and ethnic groups and budding Armenian political freedoms gave rise to wild notions and rumours about the aspirations of Armenians in the city. The constitutionally granted right for Armenians to bear arms and Armenian leaders’ advocacy to exercise this right further inflamed the tensions. This led to accusations being lobbed at both Muslims and Armenians of a collective arms race, which the Armenians admittedly had deemed imperative, given the increasing number of Armenian murders in the community. Caucasian *muhajirs*, Muslim economic migrants, Kurds, Turcomans, and Circassians—all of whom had participated in the violent assaults on Armenians. Bedross Der Matossian, a renowned historian of the period, views the Adana massacres as part of the revolutionary process that resulted from “the erosion of social and political stability in the [Cilicia] region, the creation of weak public-sphere institutions, and the intensification of the existing economic anxieties, all of which led to the enactment of violence against the vulnerable Armenian population of Adana.” The Adana events claimed more than twenty thousand Armenian lives.

Citing his fear of similar violence, Sırrı Bey sought to sour relations between the two communities living together in fraternity and peace by creating an atmosphere of chaos and confusion. In so doing, he aimed to reinforce his political position. But social and political dynamics in Adapazarı that were different from Adana did not allow him to achieve his end. How can we account for the success of restraint in this case? What micro-mechanisms made it possible? Scholarship about genocidal activity has been largely focused on explaining the origins, causes, and macro-dynamics of large-scale, usually, state-sponsored violence against the Ottoman Christians. But generally, this literature including local studies has not investigated the micro-dynamics of restraint. Empirically rich, and especially micro-oriented studies on this subject scarcely exist. An analysis of this prostitution event offers us an important example of why mass violence, following the Adana example, seemed likely yet did not occur in Adapazarı.

Ümit Kurt is a historian of the late Ottoman Empire with a particular focus on the transformation of the imperial structures and their role in constituting the republican regime. His research and teaching are grounded on theories of state and class, social identity and ethnicity. He completed his dissertation in the Department of History at Clark University in 2016. Since then, he has held a number of postdoctoral positions in Center for Middle Eastern Studies at Harvard University in 2016-18; Polonsky Postdoctoral Fellow in the Van Leer Jerusalem Institute in 2017-22; Kazan Research Associate in Armenian Studies Program at California State University, Fresno in 2015-16. He was also Visiting Assistant Professor at Clark University in 2016-17 and Cal. State University Fresno in 2018-19. He is the author of *The Armenians of Aintab: The Economics of Genocide in an Ottoman Province* (Harvard University Press, 2021). This book has been selected as the PROSE Award Finalist in the category of World History by the Association of American Publishers in January 2022. He is also the author of *Antep 1915: Genocide and Perpetrators* (Iletisim, 2018) and the co-author *The Spirit of the Laws: The Plunder of Wealth in the Armenian Genocide* (Berghahn, 2015); co-editor of the volumes of *Armenians and Kurds in the Late Ottoman Empire* (The Press at Cal. State University Fresno, 2020) and *The Committee of Union and Progress: Founders, Ideology, and Structure* (The Press at Cal. State University, Fresno 2021). He published numerous articles in prestigious peer review journals such as *Journal of Genocide Research*, *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, *Patterns of Prejudice*, *Genocide Studies International*, *Middle Eastern Studies*, *Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, *Nations and Nationalism*, *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, *Turkish Studies*, *Ottoman and Turkish Studies Association*, *Culture and Religion*, *Armenian Review*, and *Armenian Studies*. He is also serving as the Vice Executive Secretary of International Network of Genocide Studies. His research project, *Global Patterns of Mass Violence: Ottoman Borderlands in Context, 1890-1920*, was awarded with Discovery Early Career Researcher Award.

Hans-Lukas Kieser (Newcastle), 'A Mental Map for Violence: Dr. Rıza Nur's Writings on Armenians and Jews'

Dr. Rıza Nur was a co-founder of Ankara's National Assembly in 1920 and Turkey's vice-plenipotentiary at the Lausanne Conference in 1922-23. A prolific author, popular historian, and former professor of medicine, he finalized during the Conference a manuscript on the history of the Armenians. In addition, he left extensive memoirs, poems, novels, an opera, and a 14-volume history of the Turks. His political statements are accessible in the contemporary press and the minutes of the National Assembly and the Lausanne Conference. Though side-lined by the circle of Gazi Kemal Pasha (Atatürk) after 1923, Nur largely represents the political thought of the cohort that founded Republican Turkey from 1920 to 23. This paper concentrates on his violently anti-Armenian and anti-Jewish *History of the Armenians*, a never-published manuscript in which the massacre of weaker, but insubordinate peoples is declared a 'natural law' of history, while the Turks are glorified as members of a great 'Turanian race' of rulers.

Hans-Lukas Kieser is a historian of the late Ottoman Empire, Turkey, and the post-Ottoman Middle East at the University of Newcastle, Australia. He is the author of *Nearest East: American Millennialism and the Middle East* (2010), *Talaat Pasha: Father of Modern Turkey and Architect of Genocide* (2018) and *When Democracy Died: The Middle East's Enduring Peace of Lausanne* (2023).