

THE TURNING POINT OF JOHANNES LEPSIUS IN SUMMER 1915¹

Key Words – *Johannees Lepsius, William Gladstone, Armenians, Germany, Armenian Genocide, Prime Minister, government, people, movement, massacres*

Johannes Lepsius is a well-known person for all Armenians and for many others, especially those who are familiar with Franz Werfel's famous novel *The Forty Days of Musa Dagh* from 1933, where the Jewish-German writer labelled him the "guarding angel of the Armenians". For us in Germany he is mainly an outstanding example of civil courage, especially in times when human rights are at risk. And as such we regard him as an emblematic persona, still for our present disturbing times of violent geopolitical ruptures and ongoing crimes against humanity. This essay will be on the characteristics of his personality, and a time of crisis he experienced in early summer 1915, when he became fully aware of the large-scale Armenian Genocide, that was going on in the Ottoman Empire. As a confessing Christian and a political actor he became a "German Exception" in World War I².

European awareness of the Armenian problem arose in the late XIX century. It was no coincidence that this occurred specifically in the age of spreading European imperialism all across the globe and the Great Game in the "Orient". It was also the time when utopian ideas of resurrecting the "lands of the bible" and ancient oriental Christianity were almost a mania among western missionaries³. In the globalizing world of XIX century European imperialism, protection and resurrection of Christianity in this region were seen as an outstanding civilizing mission.

In Germany, the pro-Armenian movement of the 1890's – which had been triggered by the hamidian massacres of 1894-1896 – was mainly supported by evangelical circles within German Protestantism. It was also championed by some liberal Protestant intellectuals in the vicinity of Martin Rade's journal *Christliche Welt* ("Christian World"), which – albeit representing only a minority – exerted a valuable influence over the country's opinion-leaders⁴.

The most prominent figure of the German pro-Armenia movement – close to Rade who began to encourage his engagement for the Armenians in early 1896⁵ – was

¹ Talk at Yerevan State University, May 6, 2019.

² **Hosfeld R.**, Johannes Lepsius. Eine deutsche Ausnahme // **Hosfeld R.** (ed.), Johannes Lepsius – Eine deutsche Ausnahme. Der Völkermord an den Armeniern, Humanitarismus und Menschenrechte, Göttingen, 2013, S. 9-26.

³ **Kieser H.-L.**, Nahostmillenarismus, protestantische Internationale und Johannes Lepsius // **Hosfeld R.**, op. cit, S. 61.

⁴ **Nipperdey T.**, Deutsche Geschichte 1866-1918, Vol. 1: Arbeitswelt und Bürgergeist, München, 1994, S. 477.

⁵ **Meißner A.**, Martin Rades „Christliche Welt“ und Armenien. Bausteine für eine internationale Ethik des Protestantismus, Berlin, 2010, S. 104.

theologian Johannes Lepsius, who had come into contact with the minority problems in the Ottoman Empire during a two years stay as a young vicar in Jerusalem 1884-1886. His father had been an Egyptologist of international reputation, well interconnected with personalities of means in this region, among them the Armenian Prime Minister of Egypt, Boghos Nubar Pasha the Elder. His mother – a person of deep pietistic religiosity – came from the family of XVIII century enlightenment writer and publisher Friedrich Nicolai, a close friend of the Jewish-German philosopher Moses Mendelssohn. Lepsius’s moral views were strongly (or even exclusively) determined by the *Sermon on the Mount*¹, which often brought him into conflict with the official church and the German government².

In this same vein, he also shared the spirit of Rade’s Neo-Kantianism and the German enlightenment philosopher Immanuel Kant’s appeal to a universal “Moral Law in us”³, outlined mainly in his central opus *Critique of Practical Reason*, which Lepsius had been dedicated to since his student years⁴. It taught the impetus of a categorical moral imperative, also in the field of politics. Since the 1890’s, Rade – a man of Sorbian descent, a Slavic ethnic minority within Germany – had been championing the causes of the Polish and Danish minorities within the German Empire as well as that of the Jews in Russia who were periodically subjected to pogroms.

Approaching the humanitarian question concerning the Armenians in this manner of moral politics was in sharp contrast to the “booming silence”⁵ of most secular German intellectuals, whose cultural and ethical relativism was strongly influenced by the philosophical tradition of German historicism, which denied any universal (“categorical”) moral values by teaching that every culture had values of its own⁶ – and in this special case that the Turks were acting on ground of so-called “oriental values”. Yet a questioning of universalism was unthinkable for Lepsius. In 1897 he wrote in Maximilian Harden’s journal *Zukunft* (“Future”), counteracting an anti-Armenian pamphlet: “A priori, my antipathy goes out to the butcher, whereas the victim, whatever else I may think of his worth, gets my sympathy”⁷. This was for him the case not primarily because the victims were Christians, but rather because of *the moral law in us*, because “we” are Christians.

This assessment – and the moral universalism at its core – remained a constant of his life, regardless of any changes in his viewpoints and perceptions in detail. It was also the foundation of – something along these lines being far from obvious for a liberal-conservative *Bildungsbürger* [educated *bourgeois*] of the Wilhelmine era⁸ – his

¹ **Aschke M.**, Christliche Ethik und Politik. Johannes Lepsius über die Gebote der Bergpredigt und die legitimen sozialen Ordnungen // **Hosfeld R.**, op. cit., S. 69-109.

² **Prinz Max von Baden**, Erinnerungen und Dokument, Stuttgart/Berlin/Leipzig, 1927, S. 77.

³ **Meißner A.**, op. cit., S. 172.

⁴ **Rainer Lepsius M.**, Johannes Lepsius: Die Formierung seiner Persönlichkeit in der Jugend- und Studienzeit // **Goltz H.** (ed.): Akten des Internationalen Dr. Johannes-Lepsius-Symposiums 1986 an der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, Halle (Saale), 1987, S. 79.

⁵ **Sieg U.**, Deutsche Intellektuelle und ihre Haltung zu Armenien im Ersten Weltkrieg // **Hosfeld**, op. cit., S. 112.

⁶ **Hosfeld R.**, Tod in der Wüste. Der Völkermord an den Armeniern, München, 2015, S. 17.

⁷ **Lepsius J.**, Antwort auf Hans Barth // *Zukunft* 18 (1897), S. 478.

⁸ His parents’ house combined constitutionalist influences from 1848, a cautious appropriation of Bismarck’s unification politics, and a clear rejection of Antisemitism. **Rainer Lepsius M.**,

lifelong close relations with Armenian revolutionary circles, who in his cultural and political environment would always be seen as part of a dangerous international “overthrow party”. This started in 1896 with major public appearances alongside Garabed Thoumajan, who had been sentenced to death in the Ottoman Empire on grounds of revolutionary activities.

Most of these contacts of his were members of the *Armenian Revolutionary Federation Dashnaktutyun*, an organization that had its roots in a hybrid reception of European socialism and some traditions of the Russian *Narodnaja Wolja*¹ and that would join the Socialist (“Second”) International in 1907², thus being well connected with German Social Democracy, which frequently published articles of Mikael Varandian in its magazine *Die Neue Zeit*³. Also in 1896, Lepsius founded the *Deutsche Orient-Mission* (“German Mission to the Orient”) which soon turned into what was primarily an Armenian Relief Society with stations in Urfa and other places in Turkey, Iran and Bulgaria⁴. The same year saw the publication of his book *Armenien und Europa* (“Armenia and Europe”) on the Hamidian massacres, which was subsequently translated into several languages.

What Lepsius demanded here in the consequence, was what we today would call tangible European pressure. He complained about the inactivity of the Great (“Christian”) powers, namely Germany and its pro-Turkish opportunism, which made them co-responsible bystanders, silently accepting the downfall of Oriental Christianity for egocentric reasons⁵.

The book exerted a tremendous international influence⁶, making Lepsius a man of note in Europe. Religiously minded men in Germany and all over Europe who were thinking rightly on the Eastern question, British Liberal and former Prime Minister William Gladstone wrote in an 1897 letter to Lepsius after having read this “valuable book on the Armenian massacres”, had for all this time been misrepresented by their Governments. He called this “one of the saddest, if not the very saddest”, truths of the time⁷.

The former Prime Minister invoked Lepsius’s authority for his own pro-Armenian campaigns of the late 1890’s. To serve Armenia was, in his view, “to serve

Bildungsbürgertum und Wissenschaft. Richard Lepsius und seine Familie // Demokratie in Deutschland, Göttingen, 1993, S. 324.

¹ **Hosfeld R.**, Tod in der Wüste, S. 45.

² On the greater context of Lepsius’s Armenian connections, see: **Hayruni A.**, Johannes Lepsius‘ armenische Verbindungen // **Hosfeld R.**, Ausnahme, S. 207-226 (regarding Thoumajan, see p. 208).

³ For example Mikael Warandian, Die russische Politik in Armenien. Die Neue Zeit (1904), vol. 13, or Warandian, Die „Daschnakzutiun“ und die Emanzipationskämpfe im Orient, Die Neue Zeit (1913), vol. 8., p. 281-290.

⁴ **Meißner A.**, Das Armenische Hilfswerk von Johannes Lepsius. Umfang und Bedeutung // **Hosfeld R.**, Ausnahme, S. 172-196.

⁵ **Lepsius J.**, Armenien und Europa. Eine Anklageschrift wider die christlichen Großmächte und ein Aufruf an das christliche Deutschland, Berlin, 1896, S. 85, 63.

⁶ **Rodogno D.**, Against Massacre. Humanitarian Interventions in the Ottoman Empire 1815-1914, Princeton, 2012, p. 206.

⁷ William Ewart Gladstone to Johannes Lepsius, 25 July 1897, Lepsius-Archiv Potsdam (LAP), 157-1710.

civilization”¹. He may be described as the era’s most efficacious proponent of an ethically motivated foreign policy and as an early visionary of a liberal, pan-European legislative system². As historian Hans-Lukas Kieser has pointed out, Lepsius – a Protestant internationalist, much influenced by Anglo-American missionary sources – was driven by similar concepts³. His book he labelled an “Indictment” (“Anklageschrift”), an accusation. Phrased timely in the manner of Émile Zola’s famous *J’accuse* against French Anti-Semitism in the Dreyfus-Affair⁴ – which, by the way, and you as Armenians will know this, was also supported by Krikor Zohrab during the years of his exile in Paris⁵–, Lepsius’s indictment was one of the milestones of political morals as it was growing ever more popular in late XIX century Europe. By publishing *Armenia and Europe*, as sociologist M. Rainer Lepsius wrote, “Johannes Lepsius entered the political space”⁶.

Like Gladstone Lepsius was a liberal imperialist with ethical principles. As we today would put it: His impact in a wider sense was to “westernize” the world, aiming at the implementation of human rights and “good government” everywhere on the globe by missionary activities, thus strictly following the principles of the *Sermon on the Mount* in politics.

Armenia and Europe was published during an era when the calculated, more or less non-aggressive *Realpolitik* of Otto von Bismarck, the first Chancellor of the Second German Reich, was increasingly being supplanted by visions of a geographically expansive Germany in times of growing geopolitical rivalries among the Great Powers. The turnaround of public opinion toward an impatient brand of imperialism had become an intellectual fashion in Germany following Max Weber’s widely received Freiburg inaugural address in 1895⁷. This also affected a sought after new spheres of influence in the Ottoman Empire. In the new climate, British calls for an intervention prompted by the Armenian massacres were eventually – after moments of irritated indignation and hesitation⁸ – abruptly dismissed by Emperor Wilhelm II. as a sinister ploy designed to increase London’s Eastern influence⁹.

¹ Quoted in: **Anderson M. L.**, “Down in Turkey, far away”: Human Rights, the Armenian Massacres, and Orientalism in Wilhelmine Germany // “The Journal of Modern History”, 79, March, 2007, p. 84.

² **Ceadel M.**, Gladstone and a Liberal Theory of International Relations // Gosh P./Goldman L. (eds.), *Politics and Culture in Victorian Britain. Essays in Memory of Colin Matthew*, Oxford, 2006, p. 79 ff.

³ **Kieser H.-L.**, op. cit., p. 62 ff.

⁴ **Kieser H.-L.**, *Zion-Armenien-Deutschland. Johannes Lepsius und die „protestantische Internationale“ in der spätosmanischen Welt* // www.lepsiushaus-potsdam.de; Publikationen.

⁵ **Kaligian D. M.**, *Armenian Organization and Ideology under Ottoman Rule 1908-1914*, New Brunswick and London, 2011, p. 16.

⁶ **Rainer Lepsius M.**, *Johannes Lepsius’ politische Ansichten* // **Hosfeld R.**, op. cit., S. 28.

⁷ **Radkau J.**, *Max Weber. Die Leidenschaft des Denkens*, München/Vienna, 2009, S. 218.

⁸ **Anderson M. S.**, *The Eastern Question, 1774-1923. A Study in International Relations*, London/Melbourne/Toronto 1966, p. 257. Important: Saurma to Hohenlohe, 29 July 1896, with Wilhelm II. Writing in the margin: “We now need to clearly convey to Effendimis that he is going to disappear just like (his predecessor) Abdul Aziz”. // **Lepsius J. / Mendelssohn-Bartholdy A. / Thimme F.**, *Die Große Politik der Europäischen Kabinette 1871-1914. Sammlung diplomatischer Akten des Auswärtigen Amts*, Vol. 12/1, Berlin, 1923, S. 18.

⁹ **Mommsen W. J.**, *Großmachtstellung und Weltpolitik 1870-1914. Die Außenpolitik des Deutschen Reichs*, Frankfurt (Main)/Berlin, 1993, S. 129.

For these very reasons, and trusting the growing power of public opinion, Lepsius and the moral politics of the German pro-Armenian movement were strongly opposed to the Reich's official policies. He rallied throughout Germany, speaking to public assemblies even in smaller towns and villages, by this raising reasonable amounts of money among Christian circles for his Armenian relief work.

In 1897, he wrote that national interest should never become the guiding principle of moral thought, judgment and action¹. Nationalist Protestants accused him of being overly dependent on English influence, politically as well as theologically². The Prussian Ministry of the Interior intervened. Friedrich Naumann, subsequent *doyen* of German-minded political liberalism, went as far as spin doctoring the victims of the Hamidian massacres to serve some higher purpose. This was supposed to lie in the German destiny for *Weltpolitik* (World Policy) in the Orient. Anyone who – like Lepsius – thought international, i. e. “English”, as Naumann contended, might well take the Armenian side³.

However, Lepsius was not fundamentally opposed to German *Weltpolitik*, although his take on the subject was only distantly related to the Wilhelmine boom of power politics. In the context of his missionary visions he even at the turn of the century began to see a chance in it. To Lepsius the theologian and missionary, *Weltpolitik* presented itself predominantly as a necessary condition for the advent of a constitutionally ordered world on earth, based on the humanitarian principles of the gospel (as which he saw the Kingdom of Christ). Yet Lepsius, like virtually every educated German protestant of his day, viewed Luther's Germany as God's predestined country. Even more than many others he believed in Germany's duty, “by virtue of its moral superiority”⁴, to lead the other powers. This might be called a German version of national exceptionalism.

He began to doubt this exceptionalism only in 1915, when he experienced the beginning of the Armenian Genocide. “His feelings were aroused chiefly against his own government”, Henry Morgenthau records in his memoirs writing about a meeting with Johannes Lepsius at the American Embassy in Constantinople on July 31, 1915⁵. Lepsius even went as far as doubting whether, within all the national hatred of this war, one could continue in earnest to speak of a “Christendom”⁶.

Yet during the first months of the war, Lepsius subscribed to the illusion that the German-Turkish alliance would by necessity bring about a certain hegemonial Europeanization of Turkey at the hands of Germany – a “disciplined European government”, as he put it⁷. But such pipe dreams of a “German Egypt” were soon shattered. Most importantly, it became more and more apparent that Turkey was very decidedly going to follow its own agenda in this war, and strictly rejected any

¹ Lepsius J., Antwort auf Hans Barth // *Zukunft* 18, 1897, S. 478.

² Feigel U., *Das evangelische Deutschland und Armenien. Die Armenierhilfe deutscher evangelischer Christen seit dem Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts im Kontext der deutsch-türkischen Beziehungen*, Göttingen, 1989, S. 52.

³ Naumann F., *Asia*. Berlin-Schöneberg, 1900, S. 145, p. 141.

⁴ Anderson M. L., *op. cit.*, p. 105.

⁵ Morgenthau H., *Ambassador Morgenthau's Story*, New York, 1918, p. 344.

⁶ Lepsius J., *Unsere Waffenbrüderschaft mit der Türkei* // *Der Christliche Orient*, Vol. 16, 1915, S. 9; S. 32.

⁷ Lepsius J., *Die Zukunft der Türkei* // *Der Christliche Orient*, Vol. 14, 1914, S. 60; S. 84.

interference in so-called “domestic affairs”, as Lepsius learned in a meeting with Enver Pasha in Constantinople on August 10, 1915 (which is also reported in Franz Werfel’s novel). “We can handle our internal enemies”, Enver had said to him: “You in Germany cannot. In this we are stronger than you”¹. After this meeting Lepsius wrote to his wife Alice in Potsdam: “Unspeakable things have happened and are happening still. The goal is perfect extermination – executed under the veil of martial law. There is nothing else to be said”².

Lepsius decided not to remain silent after his return to Germany in September. This was in clear contrast to the considerable number of people in the Reich, in similarly or more prominent positions, who knew exactly what was going on in Turkey, yet for the *raison d’état* during wartime did not speak up. “Lepsius seems to be really in earnest to do something”, as Henry Morgenthau noted in his diary dated 31st of July³. On his way back to Berlin, Lepsius went by the central bureau of the *Armenian Revolutionary Federation Dashnaktutyun*, which had been transferred to Sofia since the outbreak of the war, where he took stock of the correspondence since the beginning of the era of persecution⁴. The overwhelming bulk of information he had collected while on this journey culminated in an experience of personal catharsis.

As he said in Sofia by the end of August to a leading Dashnak, Liparit Nasariantz, a man who, in June 1914, had been a founding member of Lepsius’s *Deutsch-Armenische Gesellschaft* (“German-Armenian Society”) in Berlin: The way things looked at that point, any question pertaining to the situation of the Ottoman Armenians could be solved “by revolutionary means only”⁵.

By revolutionary means only. One should not take this literally. He never turned into a radical. For him “revolutionary means” in this context meant that all his efforts – beginning with the Armenian Reforms 1913/14 – to help the Armenians with the assistance of German diplomacy had come to a dramatic close. As I have already quoted Henry Morgenthau from July 31, 1915: Lepsius’ feelings began to arouse chiefly against his own government in these days. His visit in Constantinople was a turning point.

He seriously again started thinking about civil disobedience, as he had practiced it in the 1890s. Yet under the war conditions of military censorship and the so-called national *Burgfrieden* (the “voluntary” truce in domestic politics for the war’s duration) this option for disobedience could easily turn into a dangerous affair.

One of the first things he did upon return was to publish anonymously an article entitled *Die Ausrottung eines Volkes* (“The Extermination of a People”) in the 16 September 1915 issue of Swiss newspaper *Basler Nachrichten* which, nationally as well as internationally, caused quite a stir.

¹ Lepsius J., *Der Todesgang des Armenischen Volkes*, Potsdam, 1919, S. XVI.

² Lepsius to Alice Lepsius, beginning of August 1915, LAP 118-1320.

³ Morgenthau H., *United States Diplomacy on the Bosphorus: The Diaries of Ambassador Morgenthau, 1913-1916*. Compiled with an introduction by Ara Sarafian, Princeton/London, 2004, p. 291.

⁴ Lepsius J., *Der Todesgang des Armenischen Volkes*, p. XXI.

⁵ ԼԵՍԻՍԻԱՆ Ռ., Մեծ սպիտի օրերուն // «Հայրենիք», 1928, թիվ 8, էջ 108: (Lernjan (Nasariantz), *During “Aghet”* // “Hajrenik”, 1928, n° 8, Boston, p. 108. Thanks to Ashot Hayruni for this source.

One could read there that the mass robbery and murder that had been committed against the Armenian people was the result of a system of Turkification and Islamization implemented by the Ottoman government. A consequence of the same program in his view were February 1915's anti-Jewish pogroms in Palestine as well as the expulsion of the Greeks from the Smyrna (Izmir) area the previous year. "In front of the entire civilized world", Lepsius concluded, "we hereby demand that the governments, ambassadors, and consuls of all those powers yet present in Turkey bring all the authority of civilized and Christian commonwealths, which they command to the extent to which they want to command it, to bear on the Turkish government to put a halt to the organized destruction of the Armenian people as well as to secure the preservation of the surviving remnant of the deported population"¹. In Basel, he also became an "agitator," holding public meetings, as an angry Carl Wunderlich, Imperial German Consul, reported to his superiors in Berlin – and as the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* reported to the entire world².

In Germany, his journal *Der Christliche Orient* ("The Christian Orient") published a "Cry for Help", describing the tasks, "we are facing in response to even just the pinnacle of the screaming needs are nonetheless ten times greater than what was needed after the great massacres of Abdul Hamid"³. The reference to the massacres of the late 19th century could hardly be misconstrued. Relief for the still surviving Armenians was necessary, much more than twenty years ago.

In June 1916, Lepsius published his *Bericht über die Lage des armenischen Volkes in der Türkei* ("Report on the Situation of the Armenian People in Turkey"), a book nearly three hundred pages long. The *Bericht* contained precise chronological representations of deportations, as well as a thorough analysis of causes. In Lepsius' view, the destruction of the Armenians was an exclusively Turkish project of an ethno-political nature, including deadly mass-robbery on a great scale. After hesitating for a long time and following the powerful intervention by Prussian court preacher Ernst von Dryander, even Lepsius's closest collaborators in the *Deutsche Orient-Mission* ("German Mission to the Orient") had opted against publishing his *Bericht*, because it too clearly and unmistakably raised the question of political guilt and was thus a public embarrassment to a military ally⁴. Yet Lepsius personally managed to have 20.500 copies printed secretly and distributed all over the Reich. The book was banned on 7 August 1916.

A decision in domestic affairs coincided with these steps. The handling – or better, non-handling – of the Armenian Genocide in his own country led him on the path to democracy. On 14 June 1916, at the time the *Bericht* was being published, he joined the *Vereinigung Gleichgesinnter* ("Association of Like Minded") in Berlin, an organization that was the successor to the recently banned pacifist *Bund Neues Vaterland* ("League New Fatherland") that, highlighting different issues, was attacking annexationist programs that were increasingly making their way to the press,

¹ Die Ausrottung eines Volkes. Basler Nachrichten, 16 September 1915, Beilage zu Nr. 469.

² Wunderlich to Bethmann-Hollweg, 22 September 1915. PA-AA R 14087.

³ Hilferuf! // *Der Christliche Orient*, Vol. 16, 1915, S. 73.

⁴ **Lepsius J.**, In eigener Sache. Mitteilungen aus der Arbeit von Dr. Johannes Lepsius, September/Dezember 1918, S. 129.

and that was advertising for an inner democratization of the German Empire, based on full parliamentary rule¹.

The fact that the *Orient-Mission* wanted to dodge all responsibilities for Lepsius's publication "on the basis of misunderstood patriotism" and in preemptive obedience to the Foreign Office was, as Lepsius characterized it, nothing other than a "lack of principle"² among opportunist "State Christians"³. He, on the other hand, rejected for reasons of principle the "duty of silence that was imposed on me"⁴. He thus – in regard to this one question that was essential to him – reneged on the national *Burgfrieden* (the "voluntary" truce in domestic politics).

"There is no value in speaking half-truths", as he wrote in the *Bericht*, and he closed the book with this clairvoyant sentence: "The moral consequences of the Armenian massacres and deportations will only become tangible after the war"⁵.

Was this merely an outpouring of moral sentimentality (*Gesinnungsethik* in Max Weber's terms), as some have argued⁶? Lepsius considered himself as bearing responsibility for a liberal protestant culture that seemed to be unraveling from the inside during the war, especially now that even his own *Orient-Mission* – which had taken the persecuted Armenians' side for twenty years – wanted to just "silently pass by" their destruction⁷.

The *Bericht* is an astonishing opus. First and foremost, it is a testimony of extraordinary personal courage. This book was, as the *New York Tribune* noted in July 1919, the most powerful indictment of Turkey's crimes in Armenia that appeared during the war in any country⁸, and, as Ulrich Trumppener wrote in 1968 "the best work of synthesis on this subject"⁹ for decades.

Silence on this major crime against humanity, as Lepsius saw it, would cause a moral disaster of *longue durée*, also for the Germans. Silence, and even more denialism would continue the genocide in the memory of the victims and the whole world.

¹ **Holl K.**, Die „Vereinigung Gleichgesinnter“. Ein Berliner Kreis pazifistischer Intellektueller im Ersten Weltkrieg // Archiv für Kulturgeschichte, Jg. 54, 1972, S. 367. See also: **Hosfeld R.**, Der Warner. Johannes Lepsius // **Krimm K.** (ed.), Der Wunschlose. Prinz Max von Baden und seine Welt, Stuttgart, 2016, S. 134 ff., and **Rainer Lepsius M.**, Johannes Lepsius' politische Ansichten, S. 27-58.

² **Lepsius J.**, Persönliches // Der Orient, Jg. 1925, S. 104.

³ Lepsius to August Winkler, 26 March 1916. LAP 7183.

⁴ **Lepsius J.**, Was hat man den Armeniern angetan? Die Zeit zu reden ist gekommen // Mitteilungen aus der Arbeit von Dr. Johannes Lepsius, Nr.11/12, September/Dezember 1918, S. 115 f.

⁵ **Lepsius J.**, Bericht über die Lage des Armenischen Volkes in der Türkei, Potsdam, 1916, S. 297.

⁶ **Schulz A.**, Orientmission und Weltpolitik. Johannes Lepsius und der europäische Imperialismus // Dieter Hein/Klaus Hildebrand/Andreas Schulz (eds.), Historie und Leben. Der Historiker als Wissenschaftler und Zeitgenosse, [Festschrift für Lothar Gall zum 70. Geburtstag], Munich, 2006, S. 453.

⁷ **Lepsius J.**, Meine Mission // Mitteilungen aus der Arbeit von Dr. Johannes Lepsius, March/May 1918, S. 53.

⁸ Another Chapter in Germany's Confession of Turkish Guilt // New York Tribune, 27 July 1919. PA-AA R 14106.

⁹ **Trumppener U.**, Germany and the Ottoman Empire 1914-1918, Princeton, 1968, p. 204.

Ռուֆ Հոսֆելդ – Յոհաննես Լեփսիուսի շրջադարձային կետը 1915 թ. ամռանը

Հեղինակը անդրադառնում է Յոհաննես Լեփսիուսի համոզմունքների ակունքներին: 1894-1896 թթ. համիդյան կոտորածների ժամանակ նա դարձավ իր կառավարության և գերմանական կայսեր թրքամետ քաղաքականության վճռական ընդդիմախոսը և փորձում էր գերմանական արտաքին քաղաքականության միջոցով իր ազդեցությունը ի նպաստ հայերի գործադրել հայկական բարենորոգումներ շուրջ 1913-1914 թթ. ընթացող բանակցություններում: Հայոց ցեղասպանության ծավալումը դարձավ նրա անձնական ողբերգությունը, որը ի հայտ եկավ 1915 թ. ամռանը, երբ նա այցելեց Կոստանդնուպոլիս: Ինչպես 1890-ական թվականներին, նա կրկին դարձավ իր կառավարության վճռական ընդդիմախոսը և հնարավորության սահմաններում արեց ամեն ինչ՝ այդ ոճրագործության մասին միջազգային հանրությանը տեղեկացնելու համար: Հայոց ցեղասպանությունը նրան դրդեց ընդունելու պացիֆիզմը և ժողովրդավարությունը:

Рольф Хосфельд – Переломный момент для Иоганнеса Лепсиуса летом 1915 г.

Автор затрагивает вопрос об убеждениях Иоганнеса Лепсиуса. Во время гамидских погромов 1894-1896 гг. Лепсиус стал ярким противником протурецкой политики Германской империи и правительства, пытался посредством внешней политики Германии использовать свое влияние во благо армян на переговорах 1913-1914 гг. Геноцид армян стал для него личной трагедией летом 1915 г., когда он посетил Константинополь. Как и в 1890-е годы, он снова стал ярким противником правительства и по возможности делал все, чтобы мировая общественность узнала об этой трагедии. Геноцид армян привел его к пацифизму и демократии.

Ներկայացվել է 04.06.2019

Գրախոսվել է 12.06.2019

Ընդունվել է տպագրության 25.06.2019