

ADDITIONS, INTEGRATIONS, CORRECTIONS AND SUPPLEMENTS
TO THE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARNOLD JOSEPH TOYNBEE*

by Teodoro Tagliaferri (University of Naples Federico II)

No. 353
(October 5th, 2023)

Addition to Part I,
Works by Arnold J. Toynbee

1923

353) *Notes. Meetings of the Session*, in «Journal of the British Institute of International Affairs», II, 4 (July 1923), pp. 172-174. An address given by Toynbee at Chatham House on May 4th, 1923 (text below).

* *A Bibliography of Arnold J. Toynbee*, compiled by S. Fiona Morton, with a Foreword by Veronica M. Toynbee, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1980.

A REPORT FROM A VISIT TO TURKEY (1923)

On May 4th, Professor Toynbee, who had returned from Turkey two days earlier, gave a most interesting address on his visits to Angora and Smyrna. While at Angora, he had been able to go unrecognised among the population, and had thus acquired first-hand knowledge of their way of living and also of their attitude towards current events. He had been much struck by the cosmopolitan nature of the population of the town of Angora. He had also attended the National Assembly and had had interviews with some of the most influential members of the Nationalist Government. He had received the impression that the majority of the members of the Government carried little weight, and that the real power rested with a few men of outstanding character. On the question of the Chester Concession, he had formed the opinion that the Government did not expect to gain any advantage from it and that their attitude was merely the result of popular pressure. During his visit to Smyrna he had made careful investigations as to the responsibility for the destruction of the city. Taking into consideration the whole war area, including Smyrna and its hinterland, his conclusion was that the blame rested equally on the Turks, Greeks, and Armenians – that it was, in fact, «“six of one and half a dozen of the other”».

In the discussion which followed, Mr. Charles Dobson, British chaplain at Smyrna, drew attention to the remarkable lack of information in England and other European countries as to the driving out of the Greeks from Anatolia. He did not agree with Professor Toynbee's views as to the responsibility for the destruction of Smyrna. He and other Europeans on the spot had arrived at the deliberate conclusion, after hearing and carefully sifting the evidence of eye-witnesses, that the blame lay solely on the Turks.

Mr. Harold Spender supported Mr. Dobson's contention that the Turks had destroyed Smyrna. He compared the good treatment of Turkish prisoners in Greek hands, which was confirmed by an investigation organised by the Red Cross, with the evidence of Greek prisoners returned by the Turks, that large numbers of their comrades had been put to death

with the utmost brutality. He was of opinion that a protest ought to be made at Lausanne against the infringement by the Turks of the international laws of war.

Commander Kenworthy pointed out that atrocities had been reported from all parts of the world during the last few years, and the only conclusion possible was that these things were the direct outcome of war. The only cure for them was peace. The best hope for the future, as regarded Turkey, lay in helping to educate the coming generation. Miss Edith Durham referred to the atrocities committed against the Turks by Christian peoples in the Balkan Wars, and pointed out that the idea of revenge was universal among Eastern nations. Major Arthur Watts criticised Professor Toynbee's latent idea that there is a march of civilisation and that Turkey has reached the point at which she can participate in it. As far as commercial development was concerned, the Turks stood in their own light by trying to impose impossible conditions on foreign traders. He thought the Angora Government was less sure of its stability now than at the time of the first Lausanne Conference, and that the question of stability was largely bound up with that of the separation of the Caliphate and the Sultanate. He also referred to the lack of funds which made it impossible for the Government to pay a large number of soldiers and officials, and expressed the opinion that the real crux of the whole situation lay in the need for a loan.

Mr. Spring Rice referred to the alleged responsibility of General Torcom for the destruction of Smyrna, and suggested that the verdict on him ought to be «guilty but insane». Sir Valentine Chirol discussed the attitude of Indian Muslims towards the Kemalists and emphasised the fact that no solution of the Turkish question or the Caliphate would satisfy them which did not provide for the control of the Holy Places. Captain J. G. Bennett drew attention to the similarity between the Turkish Nationalist administration and the Bolshevik régime. He thought that the present state of mind of the Turks indicated a tendency towards a solidarity of Eastern nations against the Western, which might develop into a real danger for the world. He also raised the point as to how far the Bolshevik influence and the Western influence might be said to be welded into one force in the Turkish Nationalist movement.

Mr. John Bailey expressed the opinion that in view of the events of history it was impossible to believe in a close alliance between Turkey and Russia. He asked whether the

lecturer could throw any light on the attitude of the Greeks towards Greek atrocities and of the Turks towards Turkish atrocities. Professor Pollard, the Chairman, referred to the difficulties experienced by the Turks in dealing with their Kurdish subjects, and expressed the hope that under the new National Pact the Turks would be welded into a sufficiently homogeneous race to enable Turks to rule over Turks and thus eliminate the problems which were bound to arise when people of one race ruled over those of another race.

Professor Toynbee, in replying, said that the evidence on which he based his views as to the destruction of Smyrna was American, while he had been told of atrocities in the interior of the country by French witnesses. With regard to the statements of prisoners as to their ill-treatment, he thought it probable that most of what was heard on both sides was true. He agreed with Major Watts that there would be great difficulties in the way of Turkish commercial development for some time to come and that the need of a loan was undoubtedly urgent. That need explained the Chester Concession, and the Chester Concession explained the attitude of Turkey towards France. The Government, though it did not believe in the Concession, thought it more important to appease the Turkish people, who did believe in it, than to remain friends with France. With regard to the stability of the Angora Government, Professor Toynbee thought that it would probably last a year or two, and that in any case a change of Government would not affect the prospects of peace. He thought that there was a difference of policy between Turkish and Indian Muslims, explained by the fact that the former were Nationalists, which the latter could not be, since they were in a minority. He agreed that the Angora constitution was distinctly modelled on that of the Bolsheviks, but thought that while there had probably been a Bolshevik fashion some time ago, this was due merely to adversity having driven Turkey into the arms of Russia and that the Bolshevik influence was not likely to be a lasting one. As to the attitude of Turks and Greeks to their own atrocities, he thought that each side naturally found it more pleasant to dwell on the other's crimes, to remember the blows struck at them and to forget those they had themselves struck.