During the 1800s, American missionary activity spread to the Ottoman Empire. Over the next century, the missionaries became established in the area, providing medical care, education, and aid whenever violence broke out between the Ottomans and the Armenians. American women who were missionaries would play an important role before, during, and after the Armenian Genocide. When diplomatic relations between the Ottoman Empire and the United States government broke down during World War I, missionaries became the main source of aid to the Armenians as well as eye-witness accounts of the events taking place. Missionaries also began to deal more with Ottoman authorities. The missionaries, especially the women were able to use their relationships with the Ottomans that had been developed over the decades to their advantage. American missionary women also had a unique ability to successfully appeal for sympathy from the American public, and Ottoman authorities were of that. Recognizing the advantages of dealing with the missionary women and the benefits they might receive from assisting them, as well as the consequences of harming them, also used the women to serve their own ends.

The position of the female missionaries was unique. They had few political ties but had daily contact with soldiers and civilians on all sides. They were often left alone for long periods of time with little to no protections since the men were often out on official business. Because of this, they could appeal to a sense of chivalry in the men they encountered. Also, relations with the women were less contentious because they had less protection and did not pose a physical threat.

A group of American women missionaries running an orphanage in the town of Hadjin witnessed the 1909 Adana massacres, the genocide beginning in 1915, and the aftershocks of violence in 1919 and 1920 under the new government of Mustafa Kemal. Memoirs that several

of the women have written, such as *At the Mercy of Turkish Brigands* by Blanche Eby and *Hadjin and the Armenian Massacres* by Rose Lambert show their precarious relationship with Ottoman and, later, Turkish forces. At times, they were friendly, and this helped form relationships that the missionaries used to their advantage later. At other times, the Turks were distrustful of the missionaries and felt a need to show that they were in charge and that the missionary women were there "at their mercy." In 1920, as the missionaries were trying to help those Armenians who had survived the genocide to rebuild their lives by providing shelter and work as well as caring for approximately 300 orphans, violence broke out again between Turkish Nationalist forces and Armenians. The events that followed showed just how deeply involved the missionaries had become and the limits of their influence.

Protestant Diplomacy and the Near East: Missionary Influence on American Policy, 1810-1927 by Joseph L. Grabill focuses on the relationship between missionaries and the government. This book also includes statistical information about the missionaries and why so many of them were stationed in the region. While focusing on the good work of missionaries, both American and otherwise, he also makes note of the culturally superior feelings the missionaries had towards Muslim Turks and members of the Armenian Apostolic Church, which missionaries had been trying to reform since arriving in the area in the early nineteenth century.[1]

Peter Balakian's *The Burning Tigris: The Armenian Genocide and America's Response* analyzes the role American politicians, missionaries, aid workers, and public played in the Armenian Genocide. He also discusses the smaller scale massacres that occurred in the nineteenth century. These massacres show a history of tense relations between Turks and Armenians and also set the stage for what was to come on a much larger and more brutal scale in

[1] Joseph L. Grabill, *Protestant Diplomacy and the Near East: Missionary Influence on American Policy, 1810-1927* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1971).

the next century. The late nineteenth century massacres also established a precedent of U.S. relief work. Balakian emphasizes that role that public opinion played in the situation and why America had always had an interest in Armenians. Public outcry and protest against the genocide was prevalent in America at the time, especially in New England and among former abolitionists and their children. While the book mentions the importance of female missionaries, he mostly examines the work of the Red Cross. Balakian also focuses on the continued denial of the genocide and the consequences of America's complicity with the Turkish government in refusing to recognize this part of history.[2]

"The Armenian Genocide and American Missionary Relief Efforts" by Suzanne E. Moranian and focuses on American missionary work. These essays provide statistics about how many missionaries were there, where they were located, and what kind of work they did before, during, and after the genocide. Moranian also focuses on the importance of missionary eye-witness accounts and fundraising. Also included in the essays are some first hand accounts and letters from the missionaries.[3]

The Burning Tigris, the essays in *America and the Armenian Genocide of 1915,* and *Protestant Diplomacy and the Near East* all note the role that American missionaries played in education and other aspects of the lives of Christian Armenians prior to the genocide. They also discuss how active missionaries were in helping to protect Armenians, even at the risk of their own lives, from certain death during the actual genocide. They further note that missionaries provided a substantial number of eye-witness accounts that are crucial as more and more about this subject is being studied. A common theme throughout all three books is how missionaries and the American public were involved, while the government never took any action.

---

[2] Peter Balakian, *The Burning Tigris: The Armenian Genocide and America's Response* (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 2003).

Beyond providing eye-witness accounts and aid, what I will deal with more specifically is the relationship between the American women missionaries and the Turks. While the books mention women and don't diminish the role they played, the role that males played was discussed in more detail because men were able to hold higher positions than women were, such as being doctors or ministers. Men were also more likely to be in contact with government officials and because of this their letters and other writings are more easily accessible and more widely distributed. The books also deal with the relationship between the missionaries and the American government. I am going to focus on the influence women missionaries were able to have on the Turks. It is important to discuss the relationship between not just the women missionaries and the Christians they were caring for, but the unlikely relationship they established with Turkish forces, how it was maintained, and its effects.

The nineteenth century was a time of growing activism in America, especially in the New England area. As a result, the missionary movement was born with the goal of bringing Christianity to the world. The most important missionary organization to be created was the American Board of Foreign Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Most of the missionaries were students of private Protestant colleges and theological seminaries.[4]

One of the areas that was chosen for missionary activity was the Ottoman Empire. By the twentieth century American missionaries were operating 12 stations and 270 outstations in Asiatic Turkey that were managed by 145 missionaries and hundreds of local inhabitants.[5] The main interest of the missionaries was to convert the Muslims and Jews living in the area. However, neither group showed much interest in this. A shaky relationship was established

---

[3] *America and the Armenian Genocide of 1915*, ed. Jay Winter (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
[4] Grabill, 5.
[5] Suzanna E. Moranian, "The Armenian Genocide and American Missionary Relief Efforts," in *America and the Armenian Genocide of 1915*, 186.

between the American missionaries and the Ottomans since any Muslim showing interest in Christianity was punished; nevertheless, they were allowed to seek out missionaries for medical assistance.[6] One missionary, Blanche Eby, illustrates the spectrum of feelings towards the Turks by Americans in her memoir. At one end, opinion toward the Turks stresses their religious and cultural inferiority, with Eby stating that:

> The bitter, undying hatred of the Turk for all Christians is born of religious fanaticism. No amount of education or civilization will ever rid him of this feeling. . . Five hundred years of contact with the civilization of Europe, since that time, has not changed the Turk. And no change can be expected until there is a change in his religion. The change must begin in his heart. He must accept the religion of Jesus Christ. That is the only remedy. [7]

At the other end, missionaries at times showed a semblance of respect for the Turks, with Eby stating after a conversation with a gendarme about the simple life that the Turks preferred, "What would life simplified to this extent mean to the people of America? Surely it might at least be simplified to some extent. It would mean more time to use for better things. This lesson might be learned from the Turk."[8]

As a result of Muslim and Jewish disinterest, the Americans turned their interests to the Christian minorities of the Ottoman Empire. The missionaries focused mostly on the Armenian Apostolic Church, but they were also interested in Greek, Maronite, and Syrian Christians. Joseph Grabill states that "seeing that the millennial idea about evangelizing Muslims and Jews was for the time illusory, the American Board in 1831 shifted to the spiritual enlightenment of what it called the 'degenerate churches of the East.'"[9] Also, Americans had always felt a certain sympathy for the Armenians. By focusing on the area's Christians, the missionaries found a

---

[6] Moranian, 187.
[7] Blanche Remington Eby, *At the Mercy of Turkish Brigands: A True Story* (New Carlisle, Ohio: Bethel Publishing, 1922), 43.
[8] Eby, 55.
[9] Grabill, 8.

level of support that led to an establishment of missionary authority and power as well as an adversarial relationship with the Ottoman government. The missionaries became involved in church reform, with growing support from the Armenian population, much to the dismay of the Armenian clergy.

The clergy, wary of losing the power they had wielded for centuries, took severe measures against the new evangelicals and the conflict came to a head when all evangelical supporters were excommunicated from the Church in 1846.[10] Soon after, the missionaries helped to establish the Armenian Evangelical Church.

American female missionaries were often in the background compared to their male counterparts, but their contributions were no less significant. The women numbered about half the missionaries in the area but suffered a greater mortality rate.[10] Most fatalities occurred as a result of diseases such as typhus and cholera. Most of them were college graduates and many were married. However, some were single and this was a great sacrifice since, according to Suzanne Moranian, "service in foreign fields for these women was tantamount to taking a vow of celibacy," because there was little opportunity of finding a husband.[11]

Missionary women never received as much notoriety or status because they were not able to hold positions of high power, such as doctors or pastors. Their government contacts were also limited. However, their role in the everyday lives of Armenians and Turks as teachers and nurses ensured that they became established members of the communities they lived in.

Female missionaries most often worked in schools and orphanages. They housed both boys and girls but usually separated the two groups. By the twentieth century, missionaries were

[10] Moranian, 188.
[11] Moranian, 189.

educating 60,000 students at 132 high grade and 1,100 low grade schools.[12] The schools offered prayer and Bible study everyday, and the missionaries were respectful enough of the culture to offer services in both Armenian and English.[13] Later on, Armenian children who had been taken into Turkish homes and lost their identities were brought to these orphanages and the missionaries made sure to re-teach them the Armenian language and Armenian history.[14] Since almost all of the teachers at the mission-run schools were females with college degrees, girl orphans at missionary schools were encouraged to pursue their education in a way they might not have been able to otherwise. Once they left the orphanages, many of the Armenian girls, seeing that they had options other than conforming to traditional Armenian gender roles, went on to become nurses or teachers themselves.[14]

Missionary orphanages most often housed Armenian children who had lost their parents in earlier violence between the Ottomans and the Armenians, but also included a small number of Turkish and Kurdish children as well. Obviously, the vast majority of the students were Armenians or other Christians even though the missionaries would have welcomed in Muslim children. The missionaries at Hadjin were told by a Kurd soldier that they did not send their children to the schools because they feared their children would be converted through the influence of the missionaries.[15]

American missionaries were first introduced to the large scale violence that accompanied Ottoman persecution of the Armenians during the massacres of the 1890s under Sultan Abdul Hamid II. He was known as the "Red Sultan" or "Bloody Sultan" because of these massacres

---

[12] Moranian, 186.
[13] Ephraim K. Jernazian, *Judment Unto Truth: Witnessing the Armenian Genocide*, trans. Alice Haig (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1990), 17.
[14] Donald E. Miller and Lorna Touryan Miller, *Survivors: An Oral History of the Armenian Genocide* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993), 122.
[15] Eby, 125.

and often used special troops called the "Hamideye" to carry out attacks on Armenian villages.[16] As a result of these massacres, thousands of Armenian children were orphaned and left in the care of missionary-run orphanages.[17]

The history of relations between Ottomans and Armenians was marked by tension, mutual distrust, and intermittent persecution. The Ottoman Empire had been struggling for centuries with poor leadership and economic crises. Despite the Empire's troubles, the Armenians were an upwardly mobile minority that was heavily involved in the business of the empire. American ambassador to the Ottoman Empire Leslie Davis estimated that 95% of deposits in banks belonged to Armenians.[18] He emphasizes the importance of the Armenians to the economy of the empire by listing off their many contributions as "bankers, doctors, dentists, lawyers, carpenters, brick-layers, tile-makers, tinsmiths, bakers, tailors, shoe-makers."[18] The social mobility of Armenians can be partly attributed to the assistance of missionaries, since they were receiving a superior education and being exposed to more ideas than an average villager might have been.

The influence of these ideas on Armenians thought increased nationalist sentiments in the community. Armenians wanted a homeland outside of the control of the Ottoman Empire.[19] The issue of an autonomous Armenian nation became the Armenian Question that would be debated among Armenian and Ottoman leaders alike. Revolutionary ideals gained the most support from Russian Armenians. Not surprisingly, many Armenians felt more comfortable aligning

---

[16] G. S. Graber, *Caravans to Oblivion: The Armenian Genocide, 1915* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1996), 29.
[17] Jernazian, 16.
[18] Leslie A. Davis, *The Slaughterhouse Province: An American Diplomat's Report on the Armenian Genocide, 1915-1917*, ed. Susan K. Blair (New Rochelle, NY: Aristide D. Caratzas, 1989), 59.
[19] Anahide Ter Minassian, "Nationalism and Socialism in the Armenian Revolutionary Movement (1887-1912)," trans. A.M. Berret, in *Transcaucasia, Nationalism and Social Change: Essays in the History of Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia*, ed. Ronald Grigor Suny (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1999), 141.

themselves with a Christian authority, even though Russian rule was often no less beneficial to the Armenians than Ottoman rule.[20] Several revolts broke out in the 1860s and small revolutionary groups influenced by Russian and Western intelligentsia such as the Hunchak and Dashnak Parties were formed in the late 1800s.[21] The improved status of the Armenians as well as the growing nationalist and revolutionary sentiment of a formerly loyal minority exacerbated tensions and increased animosity towards Armenians in the Ottoman Empire.

The Young Turk regime overthrew Sultan Abdul Hamid in 1908 and the period immediately following their takeover gave rise to new hope that all ethnic and religious groups of the empire might be able to co-exist.[22] However, the Young Turks did not immediately produce the results they had promised. This, of course created a need for a scapegoat. Increased religious zeal corresponded with an increase in anti-Armenian sentiment. In 1909, violence broke out in the Adana region, not far from the missionary compound at Hadjin.

Hadjin was located in the Cilician province of the Ottoman Empire near the Mediterranean Sea. The village was surrounded by mountains and had a population of around 25,000 that was predominantly Armenian.[23] The mission had been running an orphanage for about 300 boys and girls for 10 years.[24] Several pastors, deacons, and teachers had gone to a conference in Adana when violence broke out there and spread towards Hadjin, leaving only four women with few men to protect them. Missionary Rose Lambert recounted her experience in her memoir *Hadjin and the Armenian Massacres.*

A number of Turkish villagers began gathering on the mountains above the city, with more and more arriving each day. They were being incited and encouraged by false reports that

---

[20] Minassian, 146.
[21] Minassian, 147.
[22] Graber, 45.
[23] Eby, 12.

the Armenians were revolting, a common theme that would be used to justify even more violence in the years to come. Ottoman soldiers that were sent from Fekka to protect Hadjin ended up joining with the villagers to attack the town.[25] The missionary women attempted to send telegrams in secret during the night to American consuls and ambassadors asking for assistance and protection, but very few got through as most messages were being suppressed.[26] Many Armenians in Hadjin immediately ran to the mission compound for safety and it was soon overcrowded.[27]

For two weeks, the soldiers and villagers drew closer and closer without launching a full scale attack. The reason for this hesitation shows the influence that simply being an American had in the Ottoman Empire. Rose Lambert believed that she and her fellow missionaries were the only thing preventing the Turks from destroying the city before the regiments arrived.[28] This was possibly because they feared that if Americans were harmed, the repercussions would have been more severe than if they just killed Armenians. Violence against Americans, especially Christian women, would have created the risk of international intervention or at the very least, attention. Many of the surrounding houses were burned but the compound itself was not severely damaged.[29] Whatever the reason, Lambert figured that had the missionaries not been there, the Armenians would have been in much greater danger. At the end of the two weeks, government regiments finally showed up and the Turkish villagers were ordered to disperse. They were all given pardons by the authorities because they used the excuse that the attacks had been instigated by false reports from a man named Memoush Oghlou that the Armenians were

---

[24] Rose Lambert, *Hadjin and the Armenian Massacres* (New York: Fleming H. Revill Co., 1911), 28.
[25] Lambert, 60.
[26] "American Women in Peril at Hadjin," *The New York Times,* April 23, 1909.
[27] Lambert, 52.
[28] Lambert, 75.
[29] Lambert, 53.

revolting.[30]

After the tension died down, the women learned the full extent of what had happened in Hadjin and Adana. Seventy-six ministers, deacons, and teachers affiliated with the mission had been killed.[31] 3,000 Armenian men had been killed outside of Hadjin leaving behind 1,043 widows and causing the number of orphans in the mission to swell to 1,100.[32] This experience in 1909 would prove valuable to the women in the future. They realized that outside help could not be counted on and that friendly relations with the Turks would be necessary. They also realized that they had an impact on the actions of the Ottomans and that impact could be used to prevent further violence and save lives.

When World War I broke out, it offered a cover for the Young Turks' solution to the "Armenian Question." Propaganda against the Armenians increased. One of the common excuses to incite fear among Turkish villages was the accusation of weapons hoarding by the Armenians.[33] They were now accused of siding with the Russians since some Armenians had voluntarily joined the Russian army and this became an excuse for deporting them as a matter of security, an excuse used to this day in Turkish denials of the genocide.

On April 24, 1915 Armenian cultural, intellectual, and community leaders were gathered in Istanbul and killed, a pattern that would continue in regions all over the Ottoman Empire throughout the year.[34] This date is usually noted as the official beginning of the Armenian Genocide. Whereas previous violence was usually impulsive and disorganized, this marked the beginning of the official policy of systematically deporting and exterminating all Armenians from the Ottoman Empire.

---

[30] Lambert, 82.
[31] Lambert, 88.
[32] Lambert, 96.
[33] Davis, 48.

In the coming years, Armenians across the Ottoman Empire would be killed in a similar pattern. Estimates vary on just how many were killed but most put the number at around 1.5 million. Armenian men were conscripted into the Ottoman army only to be murdered or worked to death doing manual labor such as building railroads.[35] Women, children, and the elderly left behind in the villages with little to no protection would then be given the order that they were to be deported. They were then taken on long marches through the desert where they were robbed, raped, kidnapped or they died of starvation, exhaustion, or murder.

Missionaries all over the Ottoman Empire became instrumental in informing the American public about the events taking place. The American Board communicated information about the genocide to newspapers such as the *New York Times*. The Board, however, refrained from saying they received this information from their missionaries. In my opinion, they did receive the information from missionaries but did not say so to ensure their safety and avoid drawing any negative attention from the Ottoman government. The missionaries had to be careful because the Young Turks were very concerned with how the situation would be portrayed in the international press and wanted to control all the information that was getting out. I get this impression from a statement of the Board stating that the missionaries "write briefly and of their own affairs; they refrain from discussing political affairs. They seek to maintain a neutral attitude in this time of strife."[36] The memoirs of the missionaries, however, show a distinct prejudice against the Turks as being inferior and vicious and an overwhelming sympathy for the Armenians.

The Young Turks' meticulous propaganda campaign against the Armenians is evidence

---

[34] Balakian, 211.
[35] Jernazian, 44.
[36] "Mission Board Told of Turkish Horrors," *The New York Times*, September 17, 1915, in *Armenian Genocide: News Accounts from the American Press: 1915-1922,* ed. Richard D. Kloian (Berkeley: Anto Printing, 1985), 32.

of their concern for covering up or minimizing what was taking place. This was a trend that would continue with the takeover of the Nationalists later on. Turks made a concerted effort to have at least civil interactions with Americans because of their importance in informing American public opinion and their ability to appeal to the sympathies of Americans in order to gain support and financial aid. Women had always played a central role in this aspect of American activism, especially missionary women who used religious grounds to gain support for their causes. Missionaries posed a problem to the Young Turks because they were witnesses to the atrocities and also disproved claims by the regime that the Armenians were a subversive element that needed to be dealt with in such a violent manner in the interest of security. They exposed the sexual violence perpetrated against the women as well as the murder of children.

Missionaries were careful to at least appear to be neutral to avoid drawing the attention of the Young Turks. The Board was right to be cautious since the danger to missionaries was often quite real. Suzanne E. Moranian notes that several missionaries died under suspicious circumstances and missionaries reported back to the Board that they felt that the Turks were responsible.[37] Missionaries were also frequently arrested or deported on charges of conspiring with the Armenians.[38] These examples are indicative of the fact that American missionaries constantly had to maintain a balance between their desire to protect Armenians and their need to make sure they gave no reason for the Ottoman government to throw them out so they could continue to offer such protection and record what was happening.

While missionary eye-witness accounts are important because of their historical value today, at the time they were important for their ability to raise funds. Americans who were

---

[37] Suzanne E. Moranian, "Bearing Witness: The Missionary Archives as Evidence of the Armenian Genocide," reproduced in *The Armenian Genocide: History, Politics, Ethics*, ed. Richard G. Hovannisian (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992), 109.

[38] Moranian, "Bearing Witness,"110.

supportive of the Armenian cause gave speeches, held demonstrations, wrote letters to government officials, and donated money.[39] During the genocide, missionary orphanages were overrun with Armenians looking for refuge and resources were scarce so missionaries needed to raise as much money as they could. Eye-witness accounts from missionary run colleges inspired substantial financial donations to the newly formed American Committee on Atrocities in Armenia, including $30,000 from the Rockefeller Foundation.[40] Other organizations, such as the American Committee for Armenian and Syrian Relief, meant to aid Armenians were also formed. Churches and schools were all deeply involved in the cause for Armenian aid and the appeal was mostly on religious grounds. The American response to the Armenian Genocide was unprecedented in the history of American charity. U.S. President Herbert Hoover wrote in his memoirs that "Probably Armenia was known to the American school child in 1919 only a little less than England."[41] By 1919, missionary and other organizations had managed to raise $20 million to aid the Armenians.[42]

The authority of the missionaries in the Ottoman Empire expanded at this time because of tensions between the government of the United States and the Young Turks. Germany was a close ally of the Ottoman Empire and once the United States severed diplomatic ties with Germany in February of 1917, it became much more difficult for American diplomats to get any work done. Their letters were censored and they were unable to communicate exactly what was happening.[43] Relations between missionaries, especially female missionaries, and the Turks were much less strained because they had little to no political ties and, as evidenced in the *New*

---

[39] Mark Malkasian, "The Disintegration of the Armenian Cause in the United States, 1918-1927" *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 16, no. 3 (Aug., 1984), 349.
[40] "Already Has $75,000 to Help Armenians," *The New York Times,* October 7, 1915; reproduced in Kloian, 62.
[41] Malkasian, 350.
[42] Miller, 120.
[43] Davis, 101.

York Times article, they had been very careful not to alienate the Turks throughout the years of violence so they were under less scrutiny.

The orphanage at Hadjin did not play a significant role during the period between 1915 and 1919. The Armenians of Hadjin had been deported and most of the missionaries were assigned elsewhere. Only one unnamed woman stayed at the mission during this time. She was permitted to keep a few girls and hid one boy.[44] She built up the defensive wall around the compound and managed to get back mission buildings that the Ottoman government had seized at the outbreak of war.[45] Although the Armenians were gone, she was not without work to do since refugees from the Balkan States were relocated to Hadjin by the Ottomans and she "healed their sick, fed the hungry, and was a living gospel message to all in the city during those sad years."[46]

All of the information about the events that took place at Hadjin comes from Blanche Remington Eby's memoir *At the Mercy of Turkish Brigands* and several articles in *The New York Times.* During the years 1919 and 1920, there were five women, including Eby herself, and one man, Eby's husband D. C. The four women besides Eby were mentioned in her dedication as Miss (Edith) Cold, Miss (Katherine) Bredemus, Miss (Alice) Clark, and Miss (Mary) Super. In the memoir itself, she refers to herself in third person as The Married One and the others as The Doctor Lady, The Other One, The Tall One, and The Little Lady. She refers to her husband as Meudir Effendi, meaning Mr. Director. These names are what the Turkish brigands called them.[47]

---

[44] Eby, 58.
[45] Eby, 58.
[46] Eby, 59.
[47] By comparing the states of origin given by Eby to those given by an article in *The New York Times,* I was able to identify Edith Cold as The Little Lady, Alice Clark as The Tall One, and Mary Super as The Doctor Lady, and Katherine Bredemus as the Other One. According to Eby, the names given to them by the Turkish brigands were

One of the outcomes of World War I for the Ottoman Empire was foreign occupation by the Allied forces. The Cilician region of the Ottoman Empire, where Hadjin was located, was under French civil control and British military control. The arrival of Allied forces had saved the lives of many Armenians and in 1919 the few survivors embarked on the journey back from exile. As I said before, only one missionary had stayed in Hadjin but after the Armistice the five other missionaries returned. Rose Lambert, who had been at the mission in Hadjin during 1909, was not among this group. The 8,000 Armenian survivors returning to Hadjin were in miserable condition. All were destitute and most families had either been split up or were almost entirely gone save for one or two survivors.[48] Turkish families who had taken in Armenian children were ordered to return them to the orphanage, although many of the children no longer remembered their Armenian names or how to speak the language.[49] The orphanage filled quickly and the missionaries frequently had to turn people away, including very young children who were living on the streets.[50]

The missionaries quickly set to work helping the survivors to rebuild their lives. They were helped in their efforts by the fact that the American public, especially women, still had an interest in helping the Armenian cause. A February 1920 article in *Good Housekeeping* asked that all women's clubs in America adopt and sponsor an Armenian child and also encouraged continued support for Armenia from all Americans.[51] The girls' orphanage had to be rebuilt and school started again with meager supplies.[52] Besides their work with children, the women also tried to find work for the adults. They started up work rooms for sewing or weaving rugs.[52]

---

often assumed names so there is also little way of knowing which military officers they came in contact with.

[48] Eby, 50.

[49] Eby, 50.

[50] Eby, 58.

[51] Montaryne Perry, "How Armenia Held the Line," *Good Housekeeping,* February 1920; reproduced in Kloian, 338.

Although it was a difficult time, everyone was optimistic that with protection from the Allies and the "normally industrious and thrifty" nature of the Armenians that they would soon be self-supporting and prospering again.[53] Relations between the missionaries and the Turks in the village at this time were limited yet cordial because everyone was trying to avoid more conflict.

However, the revival of Hadjin would be short lived. Unbeknownst to the missionaries, who had little means of receiving communication of events outside Hadjin, Mustafa Kemal Ataturk and the Nationalists had staged a successful revolution. The Ottoman Empire was now officially the nation of Turkey. One of Kemal's main goals was to end foreign occupation.[54] This was worrisome to the Armenians because foreign occupation was the only source of protection they had. Towards the end of 1919, Armenians in Hadjin again became fearful that the events of 1915 were about to be repeated.[55] They were especially concerned that an attack was more likely once the British withdrew their troops and the French were on their own.[56]

Those fears were realized in January of 1920, violence broke out in the village of Marash, where it was reported to Hadjin that 10,000 Armenians were killed.[57] Turkish brigands sent word to Hadjin that they meant to drive out the French troops and that they would not be harmed if they remained neutral. The Armenians, eager to defend themselves this time, sent word back that there were no French in the village and that if they passed it by there would be no trouble.[58] Feeling that it was unlikely that the Turks would do so, the men of Hadjin immediately began taking measures in the event of an attack. The French promised to land in the village to help, but that assistance never arrived. Although aid from the American public was still coming, it was

---

[52] Eby, 65.
[53] Eby, 85.
[54] Grabel, 168.
[55] Eby, 93.
[56] Eby, 99.
[57] Eby, 95.

weakening and would continue to weaken over the coming years due to conflicts within and between organizations.[57] Political struggle and the beginning of Soviet aid to Armenians also made help from the U.S. government unlikely.[59] Eventually, Turkish forces began to gather on the mountains outside the village and intermittent fighting broke out.[60]

For their part, the missionaries mostly tried to go on with their day-to-day activities so as not to scare the children and to provide work where they could as a distraction for everyone else.[61] They were spread out over several buildings, but on the advice of the Armenians, the missionaries moved themselves and their charges into the compound closer inside the city.[62] Soon after, the real fighting broke out and the village was under siege.

Around Easter of 1920, the Turkish brigands finally made contact with the American missionaries. A delegation of three Kurdish chiefs and two Turkish brigands arrived at the missonaries. When asked what their purpose was, the men replied that they were *chetes,* or brigands whose purpose was to drive out the French.[63] Blanche Eby recalled a conversation with one of the men in which "Courteous, but restrained, he insinuated that the Nationalists were in power now, and gave the Americans to understand that they were only there in sufferance."[64] The women and Eby's husband were also explicitly told that they were guests of Turkey and to be wary of trespassing on their hospitality.[64] The early contact between the women and the Turks was decidedly tense as the soldiers were distrustful of the Americans at first.[65]

To protect their position and their orphans, the Americans realized in order to do so they

---

[58] Eby, 100.
[59] Malkasian, 354.
[60] Eby, 107.
[61] Eby, 109.
[62] Eby, 110.
[63] Eby, 118.
[64] Eby, 119.
[65] "American Women Made Turks Obey," *The New York Times,* July 7, 1920.

would have to befriend them despite any misgivings they might have had. However, the relationship was shaky at best and their treatment by the Turks was constantly changing. As the conflict dragged out over the months, the women were able to befriend many of the brigands and gain a degree of trust by providing medical assistance as well as other small favors when needed. Turks, Kurds, and Circassians were frequent guests of the missionaries. Eby describes her and the women as being "kept busy entertaining visitors from early morning until dusk each day. The officers came in order to pass the time pleasantly, the men came out of curiosity."[66] The women provided medical care, entertained the men with a music box, dyed their shoes, and cooked.[67] The soldiers gained a respect for the women because they healed so many sick and wounded as well as providing entertainment, and the women, in turn, protected themselves and their orphans by appealing to "Turk gallantry" according to *The New York Times*.[67] Alice Clark informed the newspaper that the women attempted to gain the trust of the men by emphasizing that they posed no threat, only had one gun, and were depending on "Turk honor" to ensure their safety.[65]

However, despite outward friendliness and cordiality, the missionaries were aware that they were being watched at all times. Subsequent events show the power struggle the missionaries and the brigands were locked in, a struggle the brigands almost always won. Suspicion of the Americans fluctuated and vandalism of the compound was frequent as tensions peaked. Thinking they had a friendly enough relationship with a brigand leader, Jevan Bey, they sent a letter of protest only to be told that if they continued in their "unfriendly attitude," the compound would be the next building attacked.[68] In addition to this, every so often the Americans would be accused of hiding soldiers in the compound or aiding the Armenians

---

[66] Eby, 129.
[67] "American Women Made Turks Obey," *The New York Times (1857-Current File),* July 7, 1920.

through underground tunnels. When this happened, the whole compound would be searched and each orphan would have to be counted to ensure that the number stayed constant.[69] Sharp shooters often took aim at the compound, at one point purposely killing a young orphan boy in missionary care.[70]

The women were always quick to use the fact that they were Americans to help them whenever suspicions rose. Attacking an American would be harmful to Turkey's image in the world, attacking unarmed American women missionaries would be devastating. During one of the searches, Edith Cold attempted to reassure the brigands and also informed them that if the Turks did not take them at their word that they were not hiding anything, American honor would be injured.[71] Alice Clark reported that the women had "relied on the United States flag to save us."[71] Despite some tense moments, the American female missionaries continued to appear neutral and friendly in case their efforts might pay off in the future.

Despite the inconsistencies of the relationship, the Turks needed American help almost as much as the Americans needed theirs. In May, after the fighting had been going on for nearly five months, the brigands approached the missionaries to act as go-betweens in peace talks. They had suffered heavy losses in the fighting and taking over Hadjin had not been as easy as they anticipated.[72] In order to avoid even more losses, the Turks wanted to arrange an armistice. The missionaries were their only option because there was so much animosity between the Turks and the Armenians that negotiations would have likely just ended in more violence.

Edith Cold, The Little Lady from Ohio, was chosen to go with D. C. Eby, Meudir Effendi, during a five hour cease fire to reach a compromise with the Armenians. This attempt

---

[68] Eby, 139.
[69] Eby, 145.
[70] Eby 156.
[71] "American Women Made Turks Obey," *The New York Times,* July 7, 1920.

was unsuccessful. The Nationalist government's response as reprinted in *The New York Times* on May 6, 1920, differs from that of the female missionaries and is evidence of Turkey's desire to show a positive relationship with the Americans. The message was sent by a prominent female in the Nationalist government, Halide Edib Hanem, and was written by Togan, the commander of Nationalist forces at Hadjin. It states that Cold went on the mission without being asked to. The message further states that Edith Cold was under special protection from the Nationalists and that "even though I knew the Armenians would insist upon continuing their attack upon the Moslems, I wanted to let an American try for peace."[73] The message gives the impression that the Americans and Turks were interacting harmoniously, even though the opposite was often the case. In her memoir, Blanche Eby states that the truce was not successful because the Turks wanted the Armenians to turn over their arms and the Armenians refused to do so in the event they needed to defend themselves.[74]

Several more peace attempts were made but none were successful. All attempts were initiated by the Turks but the Armenians were fearful and had little trust that their enemies would keep their word even if agreement was reached. By June, the fighting grew worse and came closer and closer to the compound. Armenian forces moved into the compound and, realizing that they were no longer able to protect the orphans, the children fled into other parts of the city.[75] The battle reached the compound in early June with the end result being that the Turks recaptured it. It was at this time that earlier efforts to befriend the Turks worked to their advantage. Enver Bey, a Turkish commander whom Mary Super had treated, delayed the others

---

[72] Eby, 163.
[73] "American Woman Goes with Flag of Truce," *The New York Times,* May 6, 1920.
[74] Eby, 163.
[75] Eby, 216.

from destroying the compound until they were sure the missionaries were not inside.[76]

After the fighting outside the compound, although not in the city itself, had died down, the missionaries met up with the Turks under a white flag of truce. In the general Cilician region, Nationalist forces had successfully driven out all foreign troops. The Americans were taken into the Nationalist camp. At this time, however, even cordial relations with the Turks were not possible anymore. They were told that they had betrayed the Turks and that the French and Americans were no longer welcome in Turkey.[77] However, Enver Bey assisted them in escaping the city, although the brigands robbed them of almost everything they owned in the process.[78] However, even this act of kindness was not without motive. Enver asked the missionaries for a paper stating that he had saved them, which he intended to use to gain entry into America should he ever have to escape Turkey.[79]

The group was taken to Istanbul and from there everyone except Edith Cold returned home later in the year. At the end of the memoir, Eby states that the Armenian forces held out until October when the entire city was decimated and many were massacred.[80] Eby said that she did not know what became of the orphans but a report in *The New York Times* stated that "The fate of the Armenian orphans is not known, although there were reports among the Turks that the boys were killed and the girls were taken to Caesarea (Kaisarieh)."[81]

The experience of the American missionary women in Hadjin is an example of how the two groups had become dependent on each other to serve their own needs, however opposite they were. The female missionaries had little choice but to remain on friendly terms with

---

[76] "Grateful Turk Saved American Women by Delaying Shelling of Their Compound," *The New York Times (1857-Current File),* July 2, 1920.
[77] Eby, 242.
[78] Eby, 258.
[79] Eby, 261.
[80] Eby, 284.

Turkish authorities and military if they wanted to continue to provide aid and saves lives where they could. The Armenian cause was fading out of the American public consciousness and past experience had shown the missionary women that help from the United States or any of its allies could not be counted on. The presence of American women missionaries also influenced on the actions of the Turkish government since the women were so instrumental in informing public opinion and the consequences of harming the women would have drawn consequences from the international community. Turkish authorities were careful to remain on friendly terms with the women in hopes that they would portray a positive image in the international press as well as to use them as a neutral peacekeeping force where necessary. Even though relations between the two constantly shifted from cordiality to hostility, a relationship with any other party would not have yielded the same benefits.

---

[81] "Americans Give Up Orphans to Turks," *The New York Times,* June 14, 1920.