A continuous and inescapable fact in the course of the history of organizations is the indifference of their members toward the activities of the organization. Therefore, we must admit to the fact that our organization is no exception; it, too, has its own group of indifferent members.

Thus, we have recently been confronted by a new current, a disease, which leads our members to not only criticize each other, but even the efforts of higher bodies of the organization.

Criticism can be considered acceptable or so-called valid “beyond a reasonable doubt” only when it is given under the appropriate circumstances. This means that it must be given only at the right time, at the right place.

The present situation is a painful one, when we see members, who have been taken by this “new innovation” and who have abandoned their certain trusted efforts, begin to center their efforts on senselessly criticizing this or that member or body. And this is not done with a constructive goal, but rather, only to justify their own indifference. They begin their act of criticism for no other reason but to hide or lessen the ugly appearance of their own lazy attitude. And still, they do not realize that by forgetting their unnecessary rumors, they must begin to work and in a collective effort, must advance and raise the quality of first themselves, then the quality of the manner and conduct of organizational bodies. Thus, let us make our criticism constructive rather than destructive. Most important, we must wait for the proper time to criticize.

Meanwhile, we invite our members to return and to continue along our path leading toward our goals together.
CONFLICTS BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND THE C.I.A.

The Central Intelligence Agency is an independent bureau of the United States government that was created in 1947 by the National Security Act. The C.I.A. basically concerns itself with United States security abroad, while the FBI (Federal Bureau of Investigation) is generally concerned with national security within American borders. The C.I.A. also involves itself in the internal affairs of foreign countries to impede the growth of communism. It has often been accused, with good reason, of overstepping its limits because rather than execute American policy, it has very often formulated its own policies.

In 1975, a congressional “Church” Committee was formed and instructed to determine “the extent, if any, to which illegal, improper, or unethical activities were engaged in by the governmental intelligence agencies. One main reason that instigated the formation of this Committee is the controversial surveillance by the C.I.A. of Americans. The origins and disposition of the Huston Plan, a Nixon White House scheme to authorize illegal surveillance of Americans, was also to be investigated by the Senate Committee. After a lengthy and thorough investigation, the Committee presented a report of its findings to Congress. A summary of this report follows:

“Too many people have been spied upon by too many government agencies and too much information has been collected. The government has often undertaken the secret surveillance of citizens on the basis of their political beliefs, even when those beliefs posed no threat of violence or illegal acts on behalf of a hostile foreign power. The government, operating primarily through secret information, but also using other intrusive techniques such as wiretaps, microphone “bugs”, surreptitious mail opening, and break-ins, has swept in vast amounts of information about the personal lives, views, and associations of American citizens. Investigations of groups deemed potentially dangerous — and even of groups suspected of associating with potentially dangerous organizations — have continued for decades, despite the fact that those groups did not engage in unlawful activity. Groups and individuals have been harassed and disrupted because of their political views and their lifestyles. Investigations have been based upon vague standards whose breadth made excessive collection inevitable. Unsavory and vicious tactics have been employed — including anonymous attempts to break up marriages, disrupt meetings, ostracize persons from their professions, and provoke target groups into rivalries that might result in deaths. Intelligence agencies have served the political and personal objectives of presidents and other high officials. While the agencies often committed excesses in response to pressure from high officials in the Executive branch and Congress, they also occasionally initiated improper activities and then concealed them from officials whom they had a duty to perform.”

In 1974, the Hughes-Ryan amendment was passed after a series of attempted assassinations, secret wars, lethal drug experiments, pimping, bribery, and conspiracies against elected governments by the C.I.A. was exposed. The amendment required that a few more committees be informed in advance of C.I.A. covert operations, although their approval was not needed. The Carter Administration advocates a repeal of this amendment, pointing out that the crises in Iran and Afghanistan are reasons for eliminating this reform.

Another reform by the Carter Administration attempting to annual restrictions on C.I.A. actions is the National Intelligence Act of 1980. The act has provisions authorizing surveillance of Americans at home and abroad. The act provides many authorizations and few restrictions and the C.I.A. is allowed to put Americans under surveillance based upon their political beliefs even if they do not pose a threat to the government. These surveillances are implemented through secret informants and secret searches. However, secret searches, although authorized according to the act, are prohibited by the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution. There can be no “national security exception” to these constitutional rules.

The Freedom of Information and Privacy Acts, passed some years ago, enable the American people to make the C.I.A. more accountable. According to these acts, an individual can request personal files from the C.I.A. and FBI. These agencies, under the laws, are required to provide any information requested.

In the conclusion of its report, the Senate Church Committee warned that “unless new and tighter controls are established by legislation, domestic intelligence activities threaten to undermine our democratic society and fundamentally alter its nature.”

Apparently, there is a conflict as to whether or not American intelligence agencies, unlike those of other nations, should be restricted and accountable, or whether they should be allowed to carry on their activities with relative freedom, many authorizations, and few restrictions.
A LOOK AT THE SOCIAL-POLITICAL SYSTEM OF ISLAM

During recent times, the sudden rebirth of Islam in various countries such as Iran, Afghanistan, Syria, and Pakistan gives us reason to think about the social-political philosophy of this religion. Based on this, the following research has been done in this direction. We must say, however, that this article is simply a presentation of this system and not an analysis.

The base for the social-political system of Islam forms that principle which states that all realistic events in the world spring from God. Furthermore, according to the Koran, Creation is subject to God's will, whatever is necessary for a natural adjustment to the limits of conditions and rules of God. The unescapable result of this fact is the gap which is established between God and His followers. Therefore, the only tie between them is the tie of faith which unites God, the only Creator, and man, the only conscious witness to this steadfast rule.

Happiness, which man seeks the world over, is confused with the established rules set by God. In other words, it consists of God's worship and the submission to His will. Thus, even this submission is considered to be subject to God's whims because He can mislead whomever He pleases, whatever can put an end to the strength of the will of mankind. In this way, man's will is strong only as long as he works according to God's verified direction.

Also, according to the Koran, the only religion which is accepted by God and which man puts on the uncompromising, unexplainable, and unrectifiable road to God's sanctioned will is the Islam religion.

The activity of God is expressed through an organized classification in man's individual life, social and even political position. This lasting intervention, even to the very last detail, is proof of man's inability to arrange anything. He is unarmed in God's perseverant presence, and he has blind trust in God's will. It is in this way that the mohammedan believes in predestination; in other words, he believes in destiny and rejects any form of self-determination or possibility of making a choice — that is, freedom. Man's every effort to come out of his own situation (which, to him, is the correct situation) is already condemned to failure from the very beginning. First of all, his will is unable to match God's will, and secondly, because God's established position is the most advantageous, the most perfect. Therefore, the question of achieving a better or more perfect situation naturally never is a problem. Thus, in this way, man lives with a lost "independence", he continues his existence, and he thinks and works only as a believer — subject to the ultimate rules of the Koran and the docile and obedient implementor of God's will.

Aside from this, man, society, and the government unite to strive for the same goal: to save the man who lives in society, to assure his obedience to the government (which, incidentally, is said to be organized by God) where from the beginning, every enterprise and initiative is already condemned. The assumption of every hypothesis about the various social and political possibilities is inconceivable because God represents the only truth. Consequently, religion, society, and government function together because the world, with its organization, must reflect God's absoluteness. Faith is not only a religious factor, but it is also the base for a system of society. Community - nation - government are the three basic ideals for religious governments in the world.

Western political mentality considers the base for the establishment of society to be a collective agreement to live according to nature's condition, where everyone was equal and free to live in society, where every effort is made so that they remain free and equal. For the Islamic mentality, society exists regardless of the collective agreement. It is organized by an "a priori" supreme force. Consequently, social belonging assumes the undertaking of an already existing and unchangeable system. An undertaking which also includes rights and obligations and which, in reality, is a contract signed by God and man. According to this contract, man promises to have blind trust in God's arrangements, including perfect obedience toward His rules. The man who honors this agreement becomes a believer. Every believer is constantly obligated to express his faith through his actions and not through his words. For the Christian, however, to live as a Christian is an issue for the conscience, and for the mohammedan, to live as a Moslem is an obligation. Here we must remember the big difference between the Christian Lent and the Moslem Ramadan.

The "Oumma", the believers' collectivism, is a single and unique aspect because as God's people, it is the best, the matchless. It has no limits because the ideal of limits is unacceptable in the Islam religion. Truth has no bounds.

In the West, the emotional value of the soil causes a tie between it and man, and it becomes the fatherland. In Islam, there is no tie between man and the soil because "Oumma", before everything, is a moral conception which values that which leans toward it, which dissolves within it. According to the Koran, because Islam is the most virtuous religion, the entire world must join the "Oumma". It is in this direction which the Holy War (Jihad) is thrusted. As a collective faith, the ideal of equality can only depend upon the faith in "Oumma". No non-mohammedan may enjoy social-political autonomy. Islam accepts no co-existence, if co-existence means autonomy and equality. In relation to this issue, there are three possible solutions: first, the "Oumma", within itself, dissolves "disbelievers"; second, it resists the physical presence of those disbelievers; and third, it destroys them because any dispersal, whether it be cultural, political or social, is absolutely inconceivable. Here we can recall the situation of specifically those peoples which have fallen under Islamic rule. Furthermore, Khalifa promised that all those who accepted the new religion would receive tax cuts, regardless of their class. If this didn't succeed, he would bind them strongly under difficult conditions.
Meanwhile, in the West, the existence of supreme rule as a result of elections materializes the collective desire; in the case of Islam, that supreme rule belongs to God. He is the sole ruler of “Oumma” because the believer of the original contract has accepted Him as the Sole Strength. Still, according to the Koran, He is the arbitrary Master of his established kingdom. It is He who has organized society according to His desire, strength, wisdom. Thus, it is possible for Him to transfer His rule over time to special people who will represent His will. These are the Khalifas. However, in reality, that Khalifa can have no real authority as long as he is the tool of a kingdom which does not belong to him. This view explains and even justifies certain injustices. No one can establish a new empire with a governmental blow simple because God’s rule is solid. A governmental blow immediately causes an assumption of “God’s hand”.

The Koran is the constitution of the Islamic people, it has a primary role in the political and social life of Moslems because it materializes God’s will. The rules it includes descend directly from God, so it is also eternal.

In dealing with secularism, it is inconceivable for Islam. The split between religion and rule displaces the entire system of Islam. Also, secularism attempts to establish a new system which does not assume the Koran and against which it is impossible to resist because the system established by God is final, steadfast, and complete.

GARIN ZEITLIAN

THE FARCE: “THE HOLOCAUST COUNCIL”

Two years after his election, President Carter established a Research Commission whose purpose, it was to study holocausts which have occurred throughout history and to suggest methods and means to prevent possible attempts at future genocides. This Commission completed its research in fall of ’79. A Holocaust Council was appointed in May of this year whose duty it was to implement the previously researched plans which included the establishment of a museum. Incidentally, Mr. Set Momjian represents the Armenian-American population in this Council.

Here it must be pointed out that until now, it is doubtful that the Armenian genocide will be accepted by this Council. The Turkish ambassador has met with the chairman of the Council, Monroe Friedman, to express anti-Armenian feelings.

It is altogether unacceptable and ridiculous to us that the Armenian people must struggle to make an historical fact accepted. This is evidence for us to realize just how the corruption in political life can lead to the end of justice and honesty.

It is true that the political world is harsh. Taking all of this into consideration, we will struggle until victory.

Every time he tries to draw his portrait...
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During the late 1890’s, the Armenian Revolutionary Federation put many terrorist acts into effect in order to seek propaganda and revenge for the many atrocious crimes committed by the Turks.

One major attempt at attracting world wide attention was the seizure of the Ottoman Bank in Istanbul, Turkey.

The reason that the Ottoman Bank was decided upon, was because it held top secret papers and treasures of the European powers. This attack was sure to attract the attention of world public opinion.

The decided day and time upon which the bank was to be taken over was August 14, 1896, at 6.00 p.m.

There were six groups of revolutionaries that were to participate. Each group consisted of 3 to 10 people.

On August 13, the night before the attack, all of the participating revolutionaries gathered at one unger’s house for a last time. Papken Suni, at 18 years of age, was the youngest participant and one of the leaders of the planned action. Realizing that he was going to die, his only wish was that the remaining survivors continue to struggle, until their sacred lands were returned.

The day arrived. The revolutionaries were to wait outside of the building, until they heard a gunshot. That would be the signal to storm the building.

It was 6.00 p.m. All of the revolutionaries were ready and eagerly waiting for the signal.

At 6:30 the gunshot was heard. The crowds in the streets were running to save their own lives, thus making it difficult for the revolutionaries to storm the building. As each person ran in, they yelled out “Azadoutoun” and took their previously assigned positions at every door and window. They were ready to rebel against the authorities attempting to cease the attack.

Hratch, who was on the top floor, took his position and at the same time, gave a signal to another revolutionary (who was hiding in a far away house) to go to the six different governments (to the embassies) and declare the demands of the A.R.F.

The attack was successful. The A.R.F. had taken over the Ottoman Bank.

While throwing two grenades, Papken Suni was shot in the stomach. He was not seriously wounded, but the two grenades that he began to throw were going to blow up and kill his fellow ungers. Since he was already wounded, he decided to save the lives of his companions. As he fell to his knees, he plunged his body unto the grenades. He was spontaneously killed.

In the meantime, Hratch went from room to room taking the names of the ungers that did not survive. As he saw Papken lying at the bottom of the stairs, he began to shake. Papken’s body and face were lying in a puddle of blood. His two hands were hanging from his arms like broken appendages.

The Armenians were in the bank for a long time. The Turkish government then gave the revolutionaries an ultimatum. Either they were to surrender to the Turkish government, or the Turks were going to bomb the bank. But the ultimatum fell through because the European powers were enraged with the threat.

Finally, delegates from all of the embassies met to discuss the embarrassing dilemma. It was decided that the Russian embassy was to negotiate with the Armenians. The Russian ambassador stated hat if the Armenians remain in the bank, it would be a threat to the Armenian Cause.

The A.R.F. then realized that remaining in the bank would be harmful to the Armenians.

After 13 long hours in the bank, the revolutionaries left. They had already achieved their goal.

The seizure of the Ottoman Bank left 3 killed, and 6 others wounded.

We, the Armenians of today, have yet to fulfill Papken Suni’s only wish: the wish for our sacred lands to once again belong to us.
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Վիկտոր Պետրոսյան, փարոս էկսպրեսիան, փարոսեր ամենահին և ամենախիտ, միայն վերջինը է։

Վիկտոր Պետրոսյան, փարոս էկսպրեսիան, փարոսեր ամենահին և ամենախիտ, միայն վերջինը է։

Վիկտոր Պետրոսյան, փարոս էկսպրեսիան, փարոսեր ամենահին և ամենախիտ, միայն վերջինը է։

Վիկտոր Պետրոսյան, փարոս էկսպրեսիան, փարոսեր ամենահին և ամենախիտ, միայն վերջինը է։

Վիկտոր Պետրոսյան, փարոս էկսպրեսիան, փարոսեր ամենահին և ամենախիտ, միայն վերջինը է։

Վիկտոր Պետրոսյան, փարոս էկսպրեսիան, փարոսեր ամենահին և ամենախիտ, միայն վերջինը է։
STRATEGY AND TACTICS

The knowledge and art of using the economic, diplomatic, psychological, and military strength of a people is called strategy.

During a struggle, the practical methods used to conquer the enemy are called tactics.

These two terms are used very often and have received a wide meaning, especially after the second world war (even during a game, a player thinks about his strategic possibilities and decides on the best one). Previously the word “strategy” was used in its actual meaning, literally meaning “generalship” or “the art of the general”, the profession of the general.

Strategy is a plan to reach a goal and it is not subject to change over a long period of time. However, tactics are constantly subject to change, and their goal is to attack and to conduct operations successfully. Thus, it is the clear method to struggle used over a short period of time.

Tactics differ from strategy in that tactical steps have less importance on the general outcome of a war. We must also remember that tactics are subject to strategy and put the strategy into action. Despite the fact that tactics, constantly change, and always reach the ultimate goal through the implementation of different routes, if it happens to occur that tactics draw further and further from the basic strategy over a long period of time, the tactics themselves become the strategy. This is something that must never occur.

In conclusion, it may be said that the tactic is the fight itself, while the strategy is the plan which outlines “how” and “where” he fighting must take place. However, the details of the “how” are past the limits of strategic plans.

SONA DABANDIJAN
"What is that inner strength? Which is that irresistible and unconquerable incentive, that god-like spark which pushes men towards death, towards self-denial?"

"It is the national feeling. The forces are race and nationality, one of the levers which changes the history of mankind, and perhaps not even in a small way."

KAREKIN KHAJAG
"What is Nationality?"

Families form races, and before the assimilation of many races come people who all have the same origin. After living in the same region for many years, the character, culture, customs, history, traditions, language, and religion of the people forms.

A people which develops and grows from the above-mentioned nourishment within a certain region known as the fatherland eventually gives birth to a nationality.

The race, therefore, is an objective existence, a subject which consists of men and a fatherland, while the nationality is the national spirit which unites the members of the race, the knowledge which belongs only to that race, and finally, it is the incentive which pushes individuals toward self-denial and sacrifice for the benefit of all.

No matter how much the character, culture and traditions of a race are important for its individuality, it is the strength of the national self-knowledge which gives it its resistance.

The fatherland is one important portion of a race, but the race and fatherland together are one totality. Without a race, there can be no fatherland, and without a fatherland, there can be no race. There are, and have been, races who have remained, for a time, without a homeland, but it is the love of the homeland which preserves the people as one nation.

"No violence, no persecution, no limit can separate one people, it is soaked with the knowledge of all and if it has the firm will to fight."

Kristapor Mikaelian
"Thoughts of a Revolutionary"
SONA DABANDJIAN
WHY ALL OF THIS?

A revolution, whether it be a social one or one for national liberation, is carried out by an entire collective unit which, not being able to withstand its surrounding circumstances (a poor economic situation, oppression of political-social or national rights, etc.), rebels, defies and struggles, to bring about certain changes within its or its country's system. Naturally, therefore, as do all movements, a revolution needs revolutionaries who will awaken and lead the people and who will present to the people a certain plan and practical tactics and strategies.

It is correct to say that the above has been the case of the Armenian people. During the 1800's, Armenians, wherever they were to be found, oppressed by the Turks, Persians, or Russians, definitely felt the need for change; thus, the road to revolution began. And there, from Parisian and other European universities and influenced by the ideals of "freedom, equality, and brotherhood" from the French Revolution, came young Turkish-Armenians who began to sow the seeds of Renaissance before the actual revolutionary efforts began. And on the boundary's other side, young Russian-Armenian students from Moscow and St. Petersburg universities, became extremely influenced by ideals of movements of the "narodnik" or people, and quickly began to spread ideas of justice, independence, and socialism within the Armenian people.

During this time, in Hamidian (or even Ittihadian) Turkey, the enslaved Turkish-Armenian population was living an intolerable life. On an economic level, the Armenian individual — usually a villager — strangled by the unbelievable and enormous taxes enforced by Turkish governors and pashas, lived under hellish financial circumstances, meanwhile witnessing the lavish ways of life of wealthy Armenians living in Constantinople from whom the odor of exploited blood and sweat came. On a political level, the situation of the Armenians was unenviable. Under the label of a lone religious minority, the Armenian population had lost all national rights. Not only did the Armenian have no representation within the government — in the future, there were some Armenian representatives in the Sultan's "Mejlis", but they were, useless —, but as second-class subjects, the Armenians witnessed the persecution of their social and human rights, honor, and self-pride.

In the Caucasus, despite the relatively tolerable relations with the Russian (tsarist government, the life of the Russian-Armenian did not differ much from the life of his Turkish-Armenian brother. Due to the country's own situation, the economic life was not good, there were no political rights whatsoever, and in this case, if the oppressor of the Armenian was not the Turk or Kurd robber, it was the Russian Cossack.

Piecing together the above conceptions of Turkish-Armenia and Russian-Armenia, we can say that generally, Armenians who had lost their freedom and independence, had the potential to complete the necessary conditions needed for a revolutionary people. And, during the late 1800's, the Armenian people gave birth to revolutionaries and revolutionary organizations. Therefore, the Armenian people appeared to the Armenian revolutionary to be an unchallenged and wide field for revolutionary efforts. At this time, the efforts of the Armenian revolutionary branched off into three basic directions:

a) Direct struggle against the enemy. This was implemented through terrorism and Haytougs (Fedayees), for example, the Khatasor Expedition of 1897 or the assassination of Prince Nagashizhez in 1905.

b) Propaganda for the outside world. To attract international attention, various acts such as Bank Ottoman in 1896 or Babe Ali Demonstration would be carried out, and "Pro Armenia" papers were put to use.

c) Propaganda even within the Armenian people itself. The Armenian population, oppressed and stripped of its basic rights, listened to what the Armenian revolutionaries had to say. Despite the fact that the Armenian, usually due to fear or the concern for finding his daily bread, did not rush to the streets to protest or wave his fist, but in his own way, contributed to the efforts of the Armenian revolutionaries and helped the freedom fighters financially and morally. Except for some wealthy Armenians living in Constantinople, Baku, Tiflis and some other areas, there was no poisonous attitude toward the Armenian revolution.

Taking all of this into consideration, we will now similarly analyze today's Armenian-American community and attempt to find out what the role of the Armenian revolutionary is and what the possibilities for his efforts are. Economically, the average Armenian living in America lives a well-to-do life.

As a result of an entire history of misery and financial insecurity, the Armenian individual primarily pursues financial security and profits for himself, believing that "Only the financially successful individual can effectively serve his people." This alone is not something to scoff at. It is natural to be concerned with achieving success, but too often the individual's concern becomes his goal and the national and collective success becomes completely forgotten. Thus, the individual, so taken by his own personal success, automatically becomes a strict conservative and anti-revolutionary (it is clear that the individual who is satisfied with his situation and who neglects collective efforts will not desire a revolution or subversion of circumstances) and he influences his children to believe in his conviction that "you go to school, get an education, become somebody, and your people will bow at your feet."

On the political level, during a very short period of time, the same Armenian who has become more of an American than the Americans themselves, enjoys the freedoms of a so-called democracy. Once again with his personal freedoms becoming so important for him and the possibilities for participation in the political life of the "world's most free" country becoming so overwhelming,
the Armenian feels the "need" to infiltrate the American political machine to advance the Armenian Cause there. Armed with this naive conviction, the same Armenian sees any revolutionary success as a part of a dream-world, while he considers working within the political system of a country whose very existence and imperialist policies are indirectly already against the most basic efforts of the Armenian Cause to be realistic. In reality, this conservative attitude is surely an indirect effect of the individual's egotistical mentality and warm comfort which can raise the beginnings of a revolution into the air.

And in this way, the Armenian revolutionary continues to struggle under such circumstances. The efforts of the revolutionary continue to keep their three branches of direction.

a) Periodically on an international level, the direct struggle against the enemy is still used. Terrorist acts continue to form the backbone for the Armenian revolutionary struggle. For example, in various European centers, the "Justice Commandos for the Armenian Genocide" continue their terrorist appearances.

b) On both international and local levels, efforts continue to attract the attention of the international public opinion. Propaganda, through demonstrations, memorandums, and diplomacy, coupled with terrorist acts, have enlisted certain successes. For example, ANC offices work on strict propaganda grounds in several nations of the world and in the U.S.

c) Propaganda even within the Armenian people. Propaganda for a revolutionary mentality for the sake of a revolutionized way of thought, way of work, and way of life. The most fine, most vital and undoubtedly the most difficult of the three types of effort, the work for propaganda is faced constantly with certain obstacles. The sometimes pitiful Armenian villager who was in a deep sleep, the Armenian which not only did not poison the attitude of the Armenian revolutionary but rather helped and supported him, is today pensive no longer in a deep sleep, but with his conservative-defeatist manner does not only delay he realization of collective gains, but also poisons — even unknowingly — the efforts made in that direction. This same individual wants to "play the Hai Tad game" from up above, that is, without "getting his hands dirty." For him, the Armenian Cause has lost its ideological and sentimental values and has become not political, but an issue of obligation and politics, similar to a presidential race.

It is under these circumstances which the Armenian revolutionary struggles. Thus, in relation to these circumstances, the Armenian revolutionary must add to his efforts a fourth front which is to struggle against every kind of cowardice and indifference which delays the revolutionary victory, even if the Armenian is the subject of the effort.

This is unfortunate, but it is the bitter truth.

HRTZIK
WHAT IS EXPECTED OF OUR YOUTH?

There is a change in expression which began in 1968. This change can be explained by the gap created through the cultural-civilizational crisis. The new relationships imposed by science and production forced new accommodations on classical processes. The novelty of those days has now become classical in its turn. The generation of 1968 has now matured. But still lingering are clichés, the cheapest and most common of which are “the youth want” or “the youth think.”

Naturally, this “want” and “think” have found currency among us.

It is often said that “youth” has become so elastic that almost everyone may consider himself young. Some talk about youth-by-disposition, others about youth-by-ideas, while some even stretch youth to the age of forty, fifty, and the limits of retirement.

And because we consider our young people (or our youth) as indispensable parts of society, our society, instead of using the antiquated “our youth want” or “our youth think” formula, we will try to invert the question: “What is expected of our youth, or what can be expected of our youth?” If the antiquated forms were justified, so is this.

It is true that we cannot force on young Armenian people ways of feeling, seeing, and doing which are fundamentally different from those of their contemporary peers. But can or should the youth of a people who have unresolved cases afford to be satisfied with remaining in the path of life and manners of their contemporaries? It is undeniable that they cannot avoid living the life of their times. But should this serve as a reason for parenthesizing the past and continuing political, cultural and social pressures to which their collectivity is subjected? How will it be possible to reconcile the problems of a generation with those of the nation? How does one link the problems arising from citizenship forced on us with the Armenian National question?

We are not placing the shortcomings, wrong judgments, or the mistakes under the limelight. The question is one of approach, of a change in viewpoint.

And since young Armenians are not pastless and self-produced phenomena, and since they have been born and formed in Armenian Communities, we must see also what that community expects or can expect from them. This expectation may not have any relationship with parental-individual wishes and may even be in contradiction with them.

If our youth are not (or do not want to be) mere images of their contemporaries in the countries of their residence (and we don’t want them to be) then they must become familiar with our old and specially new contemporary history. Our contemporary history is essentially political as is our present situation. Therefore, our youth must learn (or we should have taught them) our history as a background for our political cause, not as a point of knowledge or mere interest.

If our youth want to continue an Armenian national existence, they must learn our language (or we should have taught them) not merely as a means of communication, but for the acquisition and enrichment of our culture. They may not know the language or may not have the culture, but it is improbable that they will remain so after reaching a level of national consciousness. They should not be satisfied with bubble.

If our youth are true witnesses to their times, if they see the liberation of nations and peoples, if they know and through what means that takes place, then, to remain faithful to them they must undertake their responsibilities, without undue noise and demagoguery, and they must refuse to be satisfied with words and slogans.

It is expected that our youth not sacrifice our Armenian national concerns for local ones; that they not exploit the various pressures applied for the pursuit of their own purposes. We are not advocating xenophobia, but rather a jealous defense of the rights of their own people.

It is expected that our youth not follow the general course of history which takes us into the closet of oblivion.

Furthermore, it is expected that we think of others, as much as those others think about us.

If our youth will continue the work and if an atmosphere of confidence is necessary for it, the confidence can be generated when we enter the path of the realization of the expectations.

Otherwise we merely talk and shout. Soap bubbles.

H. BALIAN
Most of us recall the many demonstrations and protests against Professor Stanford Shaw of U.C.L.A. two years ago. We were all enraged that the Professor dared to teach his students that there was no Armenian Genocide. He even went so far as to say that the Armenians massacred the Turks during World War I! And, as a result of our enraged, our demonstrations, and our protests, Prof. Shaw left U.C.L.A. to "do research in Turkey". Unfortunately, however, the Professor's leave lasted only one year. He is now back at U.C.L.A. and is planning to teach the History III series this fall. We were not surprised to learn that the course he is offering, a seminar-type class, is based on instructor approval only.

Professor Shaw is in his office at U.C.L.A. for only one hour each day. While he was in his office on August 12, 1980, he was asked about his seminar class. After giving the details about his class, the subject of the Armenians subtly came up. Incidentally, Prof. Shaw made it perfectly clear that he would include no mention of the Armenians in his lectures. "I stay completely silent on that subject. It upsets the Armenians when I tell the story how I think it was, and that's why I no longer include in my lectures any mention of the Armenians." The Professor agreed that it is not good to exclude parts of history, but what can he do? "It upsets them."

According to the Professor himself, the bomb threats last year against him and his class caused him to cancel one of his classes. "It's fine if they want to think I'm wrong, but they should not try to prevent me from saying it. This is a free country and I should be able to say how I believe it happened - even if it is wrong." Apparently, Prof. Shaw realizes the "possibility" that he may be wrong, but there are several reasons that prevent him from changing his tune:

1. His wife is a Turk.
2. He is the author of several textbooks which all include the same theory that the Armenians massacred the Turks. To admit now that he is wrong would be to jeopardize his reputation as a historian.
3. Prof. Shaw receives many grants and financial aid from the Turkish government to support his research of Turkish History through sources in Turkish archives.

These reasons are obviously strong enough to cause the Professor to continue his distortion of facts. However, there is an even greater problem which we must deal with; not only does Prof. Shaw distort historical facts, but as a result, his students are taught falsely. For example, we know of at least one professor, Dr. Justin McCarthy, a historian at the University of Louisiana, who was a student of Prof. Shaw and who now teaches his students the same falsehoods. This particular situation is especially troublesome because there is no Armenian population in Louisiana to protest as there is here in Los Angeles.

As much as we hate to admit, Prof. Shaw does have an influence on his students which is uncontrollable.

Dr. James J. Reid, history lecturer at U.C.L.A. and also a former student of Prof. Shaw, strongly believes that the Armenian Cause is a valid one and that there are many faults in Shaw's work. Contrary to Shaw's teachings, Dr. Reid stated that the Armenian massacres by the Turkish government did indeed occur and had been occurring for centuries. "The only reason," Reid said, "that we recognize 1896 and 1915 as the dates of the Armenian massacres is that it was in these years that the massacres were carried out on the largest scale. The Armenians were used to such treatment by the Turks."

Professor Shaw strongly denies that any of the above ever occurred. He does admit that the Armenians were driven out of Turkey and suffered a great deal during WWI, but "there were reasons for it and when I try to explain, they get angry." According to Shaw, there was some massacring, but the Armenians "ignore the fact that the Turks were also being massacred by the Armenians. There were about 4 million Turks massacred during WWI by the Greeks, Armenians, Russians, French, and Serbs. Everyone was massacring everyone else. They say the Turkish government plotted to massacre them, and I say there was no Turkish government plot or plan to massacre anybody." Shaw states that according to his research done in the Turkish archives, there is no denial on the part of the Turks that there were atrocities. "In fact," Shaw continued, "there was not only no planned massacres, but the Ottoman government actually tried to stop some of it. There were trials and hangings for certain individuals convicted of atrocities. Their efforts failed, but they did try." How ironic it is that all the witnesses of these "hangings" say that the men who hung from the noose were not Turks convicted of atrocities, but Armenian intellectuals - leaders of the Armenian community - who would have influenced the naive people not to flock like sheep toward their deaths.

When confronted with the question as to where the Armenians get their proof for their claims, Shaw arrogantly replied that the facts are simply "made up. I can find no evidence of any of their claims. The Armenians have developed their own mythology - for figures and facts - out of their hatred of the Turks. They want everyone else to hate the Turks too." But how can one rely on sources in Turkish archives to find evidence of the Turkish government massacring the Armenians? Naturally, therefore, Prof. Shaw "can find no evidence of any of their claims." To somehow justify his statement, Prof. Shaw did say that "The British archives talk about
the suffering of the Armenians, but..." That is quite a justification, is it not? And even after all of this, "Professor," Shaw confidently goes on saying that although the Armenians say that they numbered 3 million before the First World War, he has gathered from his "research" only 1 million. "During the war, 500,000 were driven out, 200,000-300,000 remained, so the rest, about 200,000 were killed." There is a considerable difference between a few hundred thousand and 1 1/2 to 2 million. But, of course, we must remember, that Prof. Shaw has proof because he has done his homework in the Turkish archives, whereas all we have are eyewitness accounts, photographs, official statements by foreign diplomats in Turkey at the time, and international treaties (which, incidentally, were never put into effect). It is quite obvious which source is more reliable.

Realizing that no agreement could possibly be reached in dealing with past history, the topic of conversation gradually moved on to the issue of an Armenian homeland. Probably the only accurate statement in reference to the Armenians that Shaw made was that the Armenians want to establish their own free lands... "and that's fine — everyone wants that." Shaw is aware that there are several Armenian national parties existing with different outlooks. "Some are happy under Russian rule, others are anticomunist and want freedom from the Russians and also the Eastern Anatolian lands back." According to Shaw, the strongest party, the Tashnags, sponsored the demonstrations against him. As for the Armenian State in Russia, Shaw believes that the Armenians have a considerable amount of freedom there. They carry on their culture and their religion in an atheistic country. When asked about the past existence of an Armenian Republic, Shaw was very reluctant to even admit that it existed during this century. Even when he did admit it, he falsely stated that it existed for a very short time "between World War I and the Russian Revolution."

Obviously, Professor Shaw is in no position to change his attitude toward the Armenian issues. If he does dare to admit his faults, he will jeopardize his generous financial support from the same Turkish government which he defends and protects so devoutly. Just as Prof. Shaw is in no position to correct his falsifications, the Armenian people are in no position to casually accept the ridiculous distortion of the darkest moments in their history. We cannot and must not assent to Shaw's apparent influence on so many vulnerable students of history. If Prof. Shaw will not change his tune, we must change it for him. If we succeeded in ridding a respectable university of a misguided and misleading "educator" for one year, we can succeed in ridding the entire student community of him forever. As long as we stand as one voice of protest against this unthinkable farce, we can succeed.

And now, this message:

Dear Prof. Shaw,

On behalf of our 1 1/2 million martyrs who died at the hands of the government which you so strongly support and obediently serve, we guarantee you that you will hear from us.

By R. PARNAGIAN and
N. KALEBDIJIAN
Այս փոստը ճարտարապետելու համար Արամասի քաղաքից տարածքի վրա գտնվող ճարտարապետության դեկորատիվ ճարտարապետական ձևերով է ձևավորված, իսկ վառ լուսանկարներ, վարակներ, նկարներ ու տեքստեր Արամասի քաղաքից տարածքի վրա գտնվող ճարտարապետության ձևերով է ձևավորված:

***

Պատմության ընթացքում հնագույնը համարվում է համարվում քաղաքի անցյալի վրա կատարված ճարտարապետական ձևերով: Այս փոստը ճարտարապետելու համար Արամասի քաղաքից տարածքի վրա գտնվող ճարտարապետության դեկորատիվ ճարտարապետական ձևերով է ձևավորված, իսկ վարակ, նկար, տեքստեր ու տեքստեր Արամասի քաղաքից տարածքի վրա գտնվող ճարտարապետության ձևերով է ձևավորված:

Այս փոստը ճարտարապետելու համար Արամասի քաղաքից տարածքի վրա գտնվող ճարտարապետության դեկորատիվ ճարտարապետական ձևերով է ձևավորված, իսկ վարակ, նկար, տեքստեր ու տեքստեր Արամասի քաղաքից տարածքի վրա գտնվող ճարտարապետության ձևերով է ձևավորված:
EXCLUSIVE SEMINAR

Glendale, August 9, 1980 — After letters sent by C.E. to all Los Angeles area chapters (3 of which never reached the membership), and 17 individual members, 11 A.Y.F. members were present at a Seminar conducted as a precedent to the A.R.F. Youth conference to be held in Beirut, Lebanon, in September, 1980. Two delegates from this region will be present at that conference.

The agenda included subjects identical to those of the upcoming conference. Several specific questions were discussed from each of these major issues: National Issues (concerning Armenian national problems and relations with Armenia S.S.R.), National liberation struggles, A.R.F. ideology, involvement of the Armenian Youth and its education, and he pursuance of the Armenian Cause and Propaganda.

1 — As far as national issues were concerned, those present agreed that assimilation is the main problem and fighting against it is especially difficult for Armenians, particularly in this region. The standard of living here and the individualism and materialism common to the American way of life promote assimilation at a much quicker rate. It was brought up that to fight directly against assimilation should not be the solution, but in fighting directly for a free and independent Armenia, the battle against assimilation would follow.

2 — Another aspect of the Armenian culture brought up was the issue dealing with relations between the Diaspora and Armenia S.S.R. It was concluded that we should, by all means, promote Soviet Armenia and that by creating ties between the organizations and Armenia S.S.R., we can more effectively promote our Cause.

3 — During the discussion about non-Armenian issues, the group concluded that the A.R.F. should support other national liberation struggles as long as the support is proportional and practical. In other words, we must not give our support — financial and physical — to other national causes unless we receive a proportional amount of support in return.

4 — In discussing the issue of ideology, the group generally agreed that it is necessary to pursue our ideology through education. It was suggested that a National Educational Council be formed consisting of representatives from all parties. The purpose of this Council would be to educate the youth within schools and camps by presenting the ideologies of all political parties equally. In this way, young Armenians would be given a chance to choose that ideology which they deemed most acceptable.

As to dealing with tactical changes, the group came to the conclusion that tactical changes, so long as they
are deemed necessary, are acceptable. Compromises must be made only if there is a threat to physical security. In other words, compromises must be made only in such cases in which not compromising would cause more harm.

5 — A major problem, especially in this particular region, is the indifference of the Armenian youth. This issue was discussed by the group and it was concluded that in order to involve the Armenian youth, we must first attract them through the use of scholarships and other inspirational initiatives. However, a main difficulty in involving our youth is that there are so many luxuries and distractions in the United States, that young Armenians stay away from their national heritage. It is a “burden” to be Armenian and to be actively involved. However, in order to overcome these distractions, the youth must first be educated in the home. Environment plays a major role in the character of a person. The youth must have some motivation to become involved and probably choose to stay away because they receive no immediate satisfaction from being involved.

It was argued that the youth must be given a certain amount of leadership and responsibility within the community. Some argued that the youth has never been given the chance to prove itself, while others argued that the youth has not proven that it can handle any responsibility.

6 — In pursuing the Armenian Cause and propaganda, the group concluded that the use of the media is the most effective method of propaganda. Some members agreed that exhibitionary acts must be implemented in the United States, while others thought that the Armenian Cause must be pursued “passively” in this country. It was generally thought that joint activities with all organizations must be organized to assure the best and most successful propaganda.

Although the turn-out at the Seminar was not successful, the group succeeded in coming to many conclusions and giving suggestions to be used at the Youth Conference in Beirut.

AN OBSERVER

ԱՄՆ-ի ՀՀ ՀԱՅԱՍԴԱՆ ՊԱՏՐԻOTS ԿԱՏԵՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ

ՀԱՅԱՍՏԱՆԻ ՀԱՅԱՍՏԱՆԸ

ԱՄՆ-ի ՀՀ ՀԱՅԱՍԴԱՆ ՊԱՏՐԻOTS ԿԱՏԵՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ

1974-ին, Hughes-Ryan-ի ամառային քարոզիական խաղաղության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմության համար այս պատմմ
ԱՐՏԱՄՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԱՌՄՓՆՆԵՐԸ

Օգոստոս 9, 1980, Զատարերդյուն ժողովուրդների համար ՀՀ Հայաստանի Հանրապետության Հանրապետական Ժողովուրդների Առաջին Լեզուի՝ համագույն համագույն երազանցության (որոշում այնպիսի համագույն երազանցությունների արտահանման համար) և 17 ամսականում, 11 ժամերում հրաման տալով հակասական զորագրություն եզրափակելու համար խորհրդարանի անդամներին, որոնք ուշադրության նպատակով միաձառուցիչ ՀՀ ԱԺ երգի տեղեկատվություններ, 2-րդ հատոր, 2-րդ թարգմանական խմբագրական, այս ժամանակ հարց արձանիք շուրջ հարցվում էր ՀՀ Հայաստանի Հանրապետության ԱՀՀ ժողովուրդների համար։

Արտամության որոշակները իր ձևով են Պետության համար դիտելով կազմված։ Որոշում կարողանան են երգ կազմել։ Այս ժամանակ, երգալման համար կան տարբեր կազմակերպություններ, ինչպիսիք են այնպիսի կազմակերպություններ, 2-րդ հատոր, երգային խմբագրական, և այլ կազմակերպություններ, որոնք ենթադրվում են հայրենիքի երգերի։ ՀՀ Հայաստանի Հանրապետության ԱՀՀ ժողովուրդների, 2-րդ հատոր, երգային խմբագրական, և այլ կազմակերպություններ, որոնք ենթադրվում են հայրենիքի երգերի։

1 - Արտամության համար երգերի, այդպիսով մասնաճյուղերով են Պետության երգերի կառուցվում են։ Այդպիսով համար ենթադրվում են հայրենիքի երգերի։ Այս ժամանակ համար կան տարբեր կազմակերպություններ, ինչպիսիք են այնպիսի կազմակերպություններ, 2-րդ հատոր, երգային խմբագրական, և այլ կազմակերպություններ, որոնք ենթադրվում են հայրենիքի երգերի։

2 - Արտամության համար երգերի, այդպիսով մասնաճյուղերով են Պետության երգերի կառուցվում են։ Այդպիսով համար կան տարբեր կազմակերպություններ, ինչպիսիք են այնպիսի կազմակերպություններ, 2-րդ հատոր, երգային խմբագրական, և այլ կազմակերպություններ, որոնք ենթադրվում են հայրենիքի երգերի։

3 - Արտամության համար երգերի, այդպիսով մասնաճյուղերով են Պետության երգերի կառուցվում են։ Այդպիսով համար կան տարբեր կազմակերպություններ, ինչպիսիք են այնպիսի կազմակերպություններ, 2-րդ հատոր, երգային խմբագրական, և այլ կազմակերպություններ, որոնք ենթադրվում են հայրենիքի երգերի։

4 - Արտամության համար երգերի, այդպիսով պատասխանատու կազմակերպություններ, որոնք ենթադրվում են հայրենիքի երգերի։

5 - Արտամության համար երգերի, այդպիսով կան տարբեր կազմակերպություններ, ինչպիսիք են այնպիսի կազմակերպություններ, 2-րդ հատոր, երգային խմբագրական, և այլ կազմակերպություններ, որոնք ենթադրվում են հայրենիքի երգերի։
LOCAL ISSUES

1. YOUR POSITION ON THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT(ERA) IS THAT....
   a. You are opposed to it because you feel that a woman's place is in the home. [ ]
   b. You favor it because you believe in social equality. [ ]
   c. You don't care. [ ]

2. YOUR ATTITUDE TOWARD THE NAACP IS THAT....
   a. You support it because you believe in the equality of all men and are opposed to any type of racism. [ ]
   b. You are against it because you feel that "All men are equal", but that "Some are more equal than others". [ ]
   c. None of the above. [ ]

3. YOUR POSITION ON THE RECENT DRAFT ISSUE IS THAT....
   a. You are in favor of a draft because you believe in American supremacy over other nations of the world. [ ]
   b. You are against it because you feel that a draft is the stepping stone to war. [ ]
   c. No comment. [ ]

INTERNATIONAL ISSUES

1. YOUR OPINION OF THE SOVIET INVASION OF AFGHANISTAN IS THAT....
   a. You support it because you believe in the spread of communism. [ ]
   b. You are against it because you believe in the self-determination of all nations. [ ]
   c. Undecided. [ ]

2. YOUR POSITION ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN AUTONOMOUS PALESTINIAN HOMELAND IS THAT....
   a. You support it because you believe that all peoples should have their own independent states. [ ]

3. YOUR POSITION ON THE EXISTENCE OF A JEWISH HOMELAND IS THAT....
   a. You support it for the same reason as Question #2.a. [ ]
   b. You oppose it because not only are the Jews sly, but at the same time, they are Zionists. [ ]
   c. Whether it exists or not, it doesn't matter. [ ]

4. YOUR ATTITUDE TOWARD A RELIGIOUS TOTALITARIANISM IN IRAN IS THAT....
   a. You are in favor of it. [ ]
   b. You are opposed to it. [ ]

NATIONAL ISSUES

1. YOUR ATTITUDE TOWARD THE INCORPORATION OF THE ARMENIAN POLITICAL PARTIES IS THAT....
   a. You favor it because you believe that there is strength in unity. [ ]
   b. You are against it because although you believe that there is strength in unity, at the same time, you respect the different ideologies. [ ]

2. YOUR OPINION ON TERRORISM AS A MEANS FOR POLITICAL ACHIEVEMENT IS THAT....
   a. You oppose it because terrorist acts are inhumane. [ ]
   b. You are in favor of it only as long as it serves as a means, not as a purpose. [ ]