

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

by Teodoro Tagliaferri (University of Naples Federico II)

No. 212  
(February 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2023)

Addition to Part I, Works by Arnold J. Toynbee

Arnold J. Toynbee, *Djemal Pasha. An Ottoman Apologia. Turkey and the West*, in «The Times», October 6, 1922, p. 6. Review of Djemal Pasha, *Memories of a Turkish Statesman, 1913-1919*, London, Hutchinson, 1922.

---

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

## THE MEMORIES OF DJEMAL PASHA.

by Arnold J. Toynbee

This book is thrown at the reader's head, without any indication of the circumstances in which it was written and translated. From internal evidence, it is obvious that it was composed after Djemal Pasha's flight from Turkey (which took place on the eve of the Armistice), and probable that the first edition was in German. The style, as reflected in the translation, is slapdash and incoherent, and gives the discomfiting (but no doubt accurate) impression of a man struggling to perform impossible tasks.

Those tasks amounted to nothing less than the salvage of the Old Ottoman Empire, then still weighed down by the burden of its Balkan and Arab provinces, which was attempted by the Committee of Union and Progress between 1908 and 1918; and Djemal Pasha was one of the notorious triumvirate in whose hands the power of the Committee was concentrated (at least, to outward appearance) during the last phase of its efforts. All three men have a bad name, and two of them, Djemal and Talaat, have come to a bad end.

## TURK AND ARMENIAN

Djemal's memoirs contribute very little to the whitewashing of the Turks. The author was not personally responsible for the deportation of the Armenians, and adopts a "know-nothing" attitude towards the responsibility of his colleagues. His defence, in this respect, practically amounts to an admission of the indictment. Indeed, when you talk to Turks about the Armenian atrocities of 1915, they seldom try to maintain that the vengeance meted out to the victims bore any proportion to the alleged injuries which Turkey had suffered at the Armenian nation's hands. What they do maintain is that the Turk is not by nature more ferocious than his neighbours; that the latter behave as badly as he does in similar circumstances; and that the main causes of the horror are not to be found in the moral constitution of the local nationalities, but in the operation of external causes over which they have little or no control.

Djemal's chapter on the Armenians is characteristic of this Turkish point of view. He dates the blood-feud between Turks and Armenians from the late sixties or early seventies of the last century, and ascribes it, in the first place, to deliberate Russian intrigues, and in the second place to the leaven of the Western ideas of democracy, revolution, and nationalism. The moral, perhaps, is *tout comprendre c'est tout condamner*. The external causes are genuine, but the original sin remains uncleansed. In certain circumstances (trying circumstances, be it granted) Near Eastern man relapses into bestiality. And Western man – is he altogether proof against the same sinister transfiguration?

### GERMANY AS ALLY

However, the book is not mainly concerned with a discussion of problems, but with a record of more or less melodramatic events and impressions. Djemal's views about the defensive and offensive alliance with Germany (which was signed *before* the outbreak of the World War) are of considerable interest. The fascination of the fact that «a mighty Empire like Germany was offering us an alliance based on equality of status» is balanced by a profound and well-justified cynicism about the motives of all the Western Powers towards Turkey in all their dealings with her, and we get glimpses of that burning resentment against Western injustice which has been the driving force behind Turkey's extraordinary power of resistance during the last dozen years.

You cannot convince the Turk that Western intervention in his affairs is due to any motives of righteousness or humanity. The West raises an outcry over the murder of Eastern Christians by Moslems, while it lets the murder of Moslems by Christians pass without a word. Nor, to the Turk's mind, is this even a case of genuine religious partiality or fanaticism. He does not believe that the Westerner feels for his Eastern Christian brother. He does believe that he exploits him as an agent in his own sordid designs. That is the picture, whatever we may think of its falsity or truth. And till that mental image in the Turk's mind is replaced by a less ugly one, we shall see little change either in our relations with him or in his relations with his minorities.