

## THE NATIONAL IDEOLOGY OF MAGHAKIA ORMANYAN

Lilit Sarvazyan

*Institute of Philosophy, Sociology and Law of NAS RA*

*"Today, the Armenians do not lack any element  
necessary to form a civilized nation".*

*Maghakia Ormanyan*

At the core of the national ideology of prominent Armenian theologian, philosopher, jurist, diplomat, educator Maghakia Ormanyan (1841-1918) are his historical-philosophical, political, ecclesiastical, constitutional-legal concepts, which are reflected in the works of great thinker. The scientific outlook, national thinking, as well as political, civic, and religious orientations of Ormanyan gain meaning by his liberal-minded conservatism. For this reason, he has been praised as a liberal and progressive revolutionary or criticized as a traditionalist conservative and anti-revolutionary. The ambiguity of this assessment is compounded by Ormanyan's national ideology, the key of which is the Armenian-Homeland relationship, with their unbreakable unity and the idea of the nation's political self-determination.

Rejecting the views of European political philosophy according to which the bases of nationalism are state-law organizations or that the nation is "an artificial category" and has "no roots either in nature or in history,"<sup>1</sup> Ormanyan argues that the existence of nations as mankind is defined by divine law, which derives from their inalienable right to exist. According to the thinker, a full society is formed in the very sense of coexistence that has already been formed as a nation by its social and political nature. "The first step, the result, and the meaning of friendship, is nationality, whereby people will realize their social nature in legitimate, moderate, feasible and beneficial terms."<sup>2</sup>

Ormanyan also evaluates the nation as a natural, substantive-ontological basis of the state; the nation is the source, the holder and the political entity of state sovereignty. And if the basis of national consciousness is state-political integrity in the European mind, then the self-consciousness of the Armenian nation is the starting point that led to the ideas of political self-organization and state unity of Armenians. This idea of the Armenian thinker is in line with the observation of the German philosopher J.Habermas, "The national self-consciousness of the people is the cultural context that has contributed to the growth of citizens' political activism."<sup>3</sup>

Maghakia Ormanyan interprets the existence of a nation by its constitutive life-forms - history, population, language, and homeland, which interweave the components

---

<sup>1</sup> See Khrokh 2002: 122; Smith 2002: 338.

<sup>2</sup> Ormanyan 1880a: 20.

<sup>3</sup> Habermas 2002: 368.

of the spiritual essence of the nation; "... the nation ought to have a tradition, a multitude, a language, a center, an organization and a purpose for existence."<sup>4</sup>

**Tradition (history)** is evidence of the existence of a nation. According to Ormanyan, the national history of Armenian people should be understood and interpreted not only as a tragedy of decline and destruction, but also as a history of a glorious political past, which has rightly become the historical-political basis of national preservation, for "...the nation who has a history of forty centuries and has not perished, will not be perished from now on."<sup>5</sup>

In examining **ethnicity** as a key element of a nation's existence, Ormanyan refuses to call Armenians a "minority" or a "community", especially in their own homeland. According to him, there has been no definite number of people in the historical period of the genesis of nations, and in the modern world there are large and small numbers of peoples recognized as separate nations by their own statehoods. Therefore, four million Armenians "... always had and now also have a large population, enough to form a nationality, and one can say boldly that the Armenians are one ethnicity."<sup>6</sup>

The **homeland-center** is the natural basis of national existence, the cradle where the Armenian people became nationalized. Consequently, the Armenians are the natural heir of their homeland and the legal entity; and Armenia is indivisible from the nation, even under foreign rule. According to Ormanyan, the Armenian nation is a patriotic and one-centered idea by nature.

Ormanyan values **language** as a means of communication, a way of social and political communication, as well as a unifying factor for various segments of the nation. In order not to deviate from the natural patterns of preservation and development of the national language itself, he demands to study all the provincial dialects to filter out the traditional distortions, to avoid the mechanical introduction of grammar of foreign languages, to preserve the national nuances of the Armenian language, which are conditioned by national linguistics.

Thus, history, population, homeland, and language are the **objective** foundations of nationalism that constitute the physical existence of the nation. According to Ormanyan's observation, the **spiritual** components of the nation - national organization, national purpose and national unity - are also embedded in this being. The Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople was a national structure in Western Armenia, with its jurisdiction over the subjects of Armenian faith of the Ottoman Empire. Therefore, Ormanyan combines the factor of national unity with the National Center as a factor of national preservation.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>Ormanyan 1880a: 2.

<sup>5</sup> Ormanyan 1879a: 2240.

<sup>6</sup> Ormanyan 1880a: 19.

<sup>7</sup> For a detailed analysis of this problem see Sarvazyan 2011: 60-64.

Commenting on the European understanding of the idea of national unity, the Armenian thinker draws attention to the fact that in Europe "... the union of nationality is established at the beginning of a political union, in which, if other divisions exist in a nation, its union is not divided into such unequal divisions; they are locked in some content, and the union of nations is not false at all."<sup>8</sup> That is, the national unity and the civic unity are alike, and in this case the religious, national and other features are ignored.

It should be noted that in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the political status of Armenians was extremely dangerous to defend the idea of both state and national unities, which presupposed the unity of the subject nation. The idea of **Ottomanism** as a citizenship, circulated within the Ottoman government, pursued that very purpose. Considering this circumstance, Maghakia Ormanyan emphasizes that the problem of the national unity must be resolved in accordance with the political realities of the time. As he pointed out, it was possible to form a complete unity in all social elements, who recognized their Armenianness and wished to remain in unity with the Armeniency.<sup>9</sup> For example, according to him, discussing the issue of the **religious divisions** of the nation does not imply freedom of conscience, denial of church rights, or a call for unification of churches. If the religious choice of some people is not conditioned by political considerations, their freedom of will must be respected. But it is also preferable the nation's confessional union, which has always been valued as one of the foundations of national unity, for the defense of national interests was also carried out in partnership with the nation's spiritual authority when being subjugated by foreign powers. Consequently, the unity of the Armenians with the Mother See "... has such profound effects *that it is not the Armenians who form a church, but the Armenian Church converts to nationality* (emphasis added - L.S.)."<sup>10</sup>

The religious and administrative divisions of the Armenians were carried out forcibly, regardless of the will of the nation. According to Ormanyan, the national unity is also possible in the case of these divisions. To do this, one must first reject fatalism as a political ideology and oppose nationwide violence as a national fate. The unity of the Armenians must be achieved by national consent and will.

The **nation-wide goal** is valued as the main spiritual factor of nationalism, without which the national aspirations and activities are groundless. According to Ormanyan, the goal is the direct consequence of the nation's existence. But this being is perceived and evaluated unequivocally, which is the reason for the difference between the choice of national goals and their priority. "... While some move in moderation in praise of modest purpose, others are bolder in the pursuit of a higher purpose."<sup>11</sup> The realistic and far-sighted national figures attach importance to the idea of the Armenian nation as

---

<sup>8</sup> Ormanyan 1879b: 25-26.

<sup>9</sup> Ormanyan 1880a: 27.

<sup>10</sup> Idem.

<sup>11</sup> Idem: 28.

an acting nation, rejecting the image of a "sick and miserable" people, and displaying the political will to legally reform the national life.

It is noteworthy that Ormanyan does not mention religion among the foundations of nationalism, for it is "... according to its meaning and political science, a condition of substance, and of human society, whose nationality is a relic, or is born of a very new nature."<sup>12</sup> He does not accept the idea of a "lawless" society. As for national religion, the thinker affirms the unity of nation and religion: "What was religious to us was and really is a national."<sup>13</sup>

The goal of the constitutional movement of the XIX century in Western Armenia was the **national self-determination of Armenians**, according to Maghakia Ormanyan; the natural basis of the legitimacy of the political self-governance of the nation is the existence of the Armenian nation, since if **there is no nation, there cannot be a state**, but not vice versa. In this context, his explanation of the political meaning of the term "**nation**" is noteworthy, according to which the "nation" is not identical to the concept of "people". The point is that the nation is different from other ethnic communities in terms of being **politically self-organized and self-governed**, which has manifested itself in all periods of the Armenian history.

Ormanyan conceives of the existence of the Armenianness by the spiritual abilities of the nation ("talents"). According to him, the national spirit encompasses the totality of spiritual attributes and relationships of Armenian individuals. The beginning of the knowledge of the national spirit is the self-consciousness of the Armenian individual, because "One part of the spirit of the Armenians is within each of us, and the soul of most of us is, in some way, the soul of the Armenian majority, and the spirit of the Armenians is the soul of the Armenian majority."<sup>14</sup> **The national soul is the basis of the nation's identity**, in which the Armenian self differs from other nations and peoples in affirming its inimitability, the **National Self**. In this reality, Ormanyan stresses the impossibility of merging Armenians with other nations, because "... the Armenian was always excellent in preserving his authenticity over another universal nation. And he/she has shown so much power and ability that it is indispensable that he/she should be saved from the waves of worldly people, if not without injury, at least without a restrained sinking, to free his/her national ship."<sup>15</sup> Thus, the nation has solved the problem of her existence and, consequently, she is capable to be developed through civilizational factors.

The basis for the determination of the identity of national civilization is the philosophical understanding of history. Criticizing the theories that "the Armenian nation is merely a historical and non-political community" and that Armenia is "in a phase of decline or collapse",<sup>16</sup> Ormanyan asserts that the Armenian civilization is in continuous

---

<sup>12</sup> Idem: 54.

<sup>13</sup> Idem: 55.

<sup>14</sup> Ormanyan 1879c: 5.

<sup>15</sup> Ormanyan 1879a: 2231.

<sup>16</sup> Nalbandyan 1980: 317; Gevorgyan 2005: 66.

existence, which is conditioned by the continuous transformation of the Armenian nation and cultural-political aptitude. According to him, the Armenian nation has been able to establish national-administrative structures of self-governance under the statehood, in the national-liberation struggle and under foreign rule. Despite the fact that the Armenian nation has lost its statehood, it has also preserved its national identity through non-political means, giving them a hidden political shade. The proof of this is that the Armenian nation not only survived, but also permanently participated in national and regional cultural and civilization movements. Consequently, "the Armenians do not lack an element today that is required to form a civilized nation."<sup>17</sup>

The right to national self-determination is interpreted in Ormanyan's ideology as the right to determine one's own political life or to define one's political personality. According to him, **the right of nations to self-determination should be exercised exclusively in the homeland of the self**, which rejects the principle of administrative autonomy, on the basis of which the mechanical segregation of the national-historical territories is carried out, as a result of which the nations are deprived of their national sovereignty. Ormanyan puts forward important assumptions that should become an irreplaceable basis for diplomatic negotiations over the issue of national sovereignty. They are as follows:

- the genesis and existence of the nation are conditioned by tribal origin and historical homeland;
- the natural individuals of self-identified nationality are: "... those related to it by descent and relationship; the use of language is not essential; the difference of religion is not a negative condition;"
- a nation cannot be deported from its homeland by any international law, and the international law must not contradict the natural and historical rights of nations;<sup>18</sup>
- the objective conditions for the actual and legal recognition of national political rights are "...historical existence, political life and civilized power"<sup>19</sup> as well as the spiritual-cultural value system;
- the relatives who have emigrated from their home country should not be considered as nationalist elements alienated from the national life;
- the territories, occupied by foreign states, must be returned to their rightful owner by the international law;
- the Armenian state does not exclude the residence and peaceful coexistence of foreign nations. But there is no doubt that "Armenia is the land of Armenians, and the Armenian land owner is Armenian";<sup>20</sup>
- the Alliance of Nations is acceptable for establishing diplomatic relations, unifying common interests and co-operating the means, necessary for political reforms;

---

<sup>17</sup> Ormanyan 1879a: 2231.

<sup>18</sup> Ormanyan 1931: 370.

<sup>19</sup> Idem.

<sup>20</sup> Ormanyan 1880a: 47.

○the subjects violating the right of political immunity of the nations on the way to self-determination or independence should be tried in the International Supreme Court, composed of representatives of military-political powers and representatives of the neighboring states of the region, where any action, prohibited by law, shall be condemned;

○inter-ethnic and inter-state disputes must be resolved through political and legal processes, ending them with mutually beneficial agreements and excluding military conflicts.

In fact, Ormanyan sets out the principles of international law protecting the right of nations to self-determination in the historical homeland, regulating international relations, and asserting the political responsibility of dominant states that were essential in the 19th century and have a contemporary sound in the context of present political realities.

The important components of the national ideology, Ormanyan confessed, are interpretations of the **historical role of Armenian Church** as a national foundation as well as the foundations of sovereignty, the political significance of the doctrinal struggle, the legislative, advisory, political, judicial, and diplomatic activities of the Armenian spiritual authority. According to him, preserving the administrative sovereignty of the Armenian Church could solve many national problems, especially in the case of Armenian subjects. In this context, he argues for the origin, mission and self-governance of Patriarchal Seat, as well as the legal inheritance, the inalienability of the Church's administrative independence and national rights.

It is no coincidence that Ormanyan conducts the examination of national history on the basis of the unity of history of both the Armenian Church and Armenian political life with the aim of revealing the spiritual and secular realities of national being. According to him, with the officialization of Christianity in Armenia, "... church history was closely linked to political events."<sup>21</sup> Rejecting the notion that spiritual power and its rights derive from political authority, Ormanyan affirms that the church is Christ-centered and that "... the existence and origin and life of Patriarchal Seats are governed by ecclesiastical laws and can only be changed by ecclesiastical laws. Spiritual jurisdiction does not derive from political authority, nor can it be a source of political authority ... Consequently, the encroachment on political authority is contrary to legal principles."<sup>22</sup> He criticizes pro-Greek and pro-Latin views on the origins of the Armenian Church, as well as the denial of Armenian Church's sovereignty.<sup>23</sup>

Ormanyan's concept of the **relation between secular and spiritual authorities is essential**. As an important historical testimony, he recalls that Armenians have always moved the Catholicosate to the center of political power. The Armenian kings sought to have the Patriarchate seat. And in the state-free periods, the nation's spiritual

---

<sup>21</sup> Ormanyan 1912: 71.

<sup>22</sup> Ormanyan 1931: 340; See also Ormanyan 1886: 14-15.

<sup>23</sup> See the analysis of this problem in Sarvazyan 2008a: 70-85; Sarvazyan 2008b: 24-34 .

independence has been the basis of its political self-organization and self-governance. "The patriarchal office, in addition to religious affiliation, enjoyed political and national rights, and occupied an important place within the royal authority."<sup>24</sup> Without claiming to theocracy, the sovereign administration of the Armenian Church was able to be a legislative body in the national life, defining the rights and duties of the nation with the power to enforce the laws.

Ormanyan rejects the views of both spiritual and secular authorities on merging or absolute separation. According to him, the key to resolving the problem is to accurately differentiate the essence, powers, and functions of the authorities, excluding the domination or subordination of any of them. He defines **secular** (state, political, or patriarchal) authority as "... the power or ability to impose laws on the relations of members and to make orders for the protection of society."<sup>25</sup> That is, the essence of secular power is manifested in law-making, administrative and judicial functions. **Spiritual** (ecclesiastical) authority "... is a gradual order of the various classes, and is a devoted state or authority governed by divine and spiritual rule."<sup>26</sup> It is designed to prescribe church rules, monitor their application, protect and unite the people, preserve spiritual values, implement national rituals, etc. Investigating the historical-political and spiritual activity of the national authorities and its results, the thinker asserts that national figures should be called those who never made the basis of the nation's existence subject to enforced concessions, being "*a worker in preserving the Armenian Kingdom and the Armenian Church* (emphasis added – L. S.)."<sup>27</sup>

The policy of resolving inter-ethnic conflicts in the religious struggle of the V-XIX centuries has been based on true faith-based arguments and attempts to reach agreement on them. When commenting on the **policy of the Armenian Church**, Maghakia Ormanyan substantiates the relationship of Christological issues to legal and political issues, the Armenian Church's national position in the doctrinal struggle, the equality of churches in inter-church relations, the irrevocability of the ideology of Armenian religion as preserving national identity. According to him, the rapprochement of churches is possible only with the necessary and acceptable principles. Does he criticize the Catholic Church's intolerant policy of "... eternal salvation in the Roman Church," or the Greek Church's policy of refusing to recognize the national forms of church counseling? In contrast to these churches, the policy of the Armenian Church is based on the principles of **forgiveness, freedom, and tolerance**. "According to Ormanyan," Our Church sums up the amount of core beliefs necessary for unity, upholding the freedom of each Church in secondary affairs, dyophysitism, habits, and conveniences. ... ».<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Ormanyan 1912: 308.

<sup>25</sup> Ormanyan 1985: 20.

<sup>26</sup> Ormanyan 1886: 2.

<sup>27</sup> Ormanyan 1913: 1924.

<sup>28</sup> Ormanyan 1956: 6.

Not avoiding negotiations with other churches, the Armenian Church has pursued a compromise on the issues that were not essential to the nation and the church. For the sake of political ends, the idea of uniting the churches as **equal and independent entities** is considered acceptable only, when considering Christian solidarity as the basis, for peaceful resolution of legal, political and spiritual issues, for the security and welfare of the nation.<sup>29</sup>

Apart from political and religious reasons, the complexity of inter-church relations is conditioned by the fact that despite the Christian moral laws, which are universal and acceptable to all mankind, church rules operate within the framework of national co-existence, defining the rights and responsibilities of particular church members. Emphasizing this fact, Ormanyán affirms: "Christ never put his faith in an anti-national situation; and that the ancient and primitive church respected each nation's principle of governing by national church administration."<sup>30</sup> Consequently, church regulations vary in different societies, and the laws of any church are not necessarily applicable to others.

Thus, the Armenian Church differs from other Christian churches in its freedom of ideas, nationalism, democratic principles of administration, and national activity. Maghakia Ormanyán's national ideology is essential to the foundations of the political organization of the society, the state structure, the essence and forms of governance, the subject of power, and the tendencies of national politics.<sup>31</sup> According to the thinker, the granting of power is a natural rule established by divine laws, which derives from the rights of nations to equality and self-government. Whereas in European philosophies the idea of state sovereignty is emphasized, Ormanyán sees the sovereignty not only as an attribute of the state, but also as a **natural right of the nation and the foundation of national-political independence**. In this connection he assures: "Every authority must be the property of the company that seeks protection, because if any company does not have its own power and is governed by the power of another company, it means that it is under the control of that company."<sup>32</sup>

Confirming the history of the forms of government, Ormanian argues that these forms are either right or wrong, based on the consideration of legitimacy of state formation, security of both the people and the state, moral description of the rulers, and other factors. He considers **democratic-constitutional governance** the best, and excluding the success of revolutionary movements in the history under discussion, he points out the constitutional way of resolving national issues to be more realistic, based on the system of values of national constitutional and political culture.

The principles of separation of powers, balances and restraint are essential in the constitutional governance system. According to Ormanyán, they operate not only in the

---

<sup>29</sup> See the detailed analysis of the problem in Sarvazyan 2008c: 34-50.

<sup>30</sup> Ormanyán 1879b: 29.

<sup>31</sup> Lloyd 2002: 193; Mirumyan 2004: 163; Mirumyan 2006: 194, 319.

<sup>32</sup> Ormanyán 1985: 20.



administration of state but also in spiritual authority, since "Church authority contains the **legal, tyrannical (executive-L.S.), and judicial law.**"<sup>33</sup> The constitutional power also presupposes the interdependence, balance, disparity and harmony of the functions and policies of the individual branches of power.

Ormanyan conditioned the efficiency of the operation of the state by a **democratic constitutional system**, whose standard and guarantee of legitimacy and fairness is the maximum participation of the people in public administration. "It should be subordinate to the government ... it will be made up of members of the public. It is only a question of which member is going to do the job or exercise that right."<sup>34</sup> He attaches importance to the **principle of national agreement** in the process of formation of authorities. The application of the **principle of justice** begins with the nomination of candidates, taking into account not only their personal merits, but also their national interest, political wisdom, experience in defending national and state rights and interests, popular authority, and so on.

In the legal and philosophical conception of Maghakia Ormanyan, **national conservatism** has emerged as a political creed. It is most evident in the arguments for the relationship between laws and rights, freedom and responsibility. He urges not to confuse the meaningful appreciation of the idea of freedom with political and legal definitions. In a meaningful way, freedom is a supreme value given by God. **Freedom is the natural basis of human dignity, the primary attribute of human identity and sovereignty**, but freedom in social and political life is manifested by other standards in relation to laws, rights, and obligations. From this perspective the thinker explains: "When I summarize the issue in such a narrow and definite context, I see the use of Freedom under the present conditions, rules, and laws as a basic principle, because the activity of pleasure, of living in pleasure, will become a violation of Freedom."<sup>35</sup> The boundary of one's freedom in national (social) relations is the freedom of other individuals, and the arbitrariness of one is countered by the arbitrariness of others. Therefore, the legalization of freedom is possible only by established laws, since "...the idea of freedom does not mean being free of chains and rules. The rule and order, the size and weight, the manner and conditions are the educators and guardians of Liberty."<sup>36</sup>

Ormanyan makes an important observation on the problem of law enforcement, noting that copying is easier when it is voluntary and not coercive. However, it should not be ignored that the **free man is subject to just laws**, and "... It is enough that there is no doubt about the existence of Order and Law, because even a scientifically incorrect law is not a law and does not give rise to any obligation."<sup>37</sup> On this plane, the

---

<sup>33</sup> Idem: 24.

<sup>34</sup> Idem: 25.

<sup>35</sup> Ormanyan 1931: 39.

<sup>36</sup> Idem: 40.

<sup>37</sup> Idem.

balance of the right and responsibility of freedom of public officials is also valued. According to the political scientist, the administrative freedom of the manager should be limited by **civil laws**, because the just, the legitimate and the useful are restricted to individual and national-state interests and rights.

Ormanyan's concept of legislative activity and the variability of laws are of particular importance. According to him, the basics of law making are: 1) Recognize the historical and political realities of the time, the current state and affairs of the nation, state interests, public needs, national rights and the peculiarities of the country; 2) study the spirit of laws, the ability of people to understand their purpose and put them into practice; 3) study foreign law codes and constitutions, but always remembering that "Very good things (theories - L.S.), very good laws ... are being established ... in various worlds and nations. It is inappropriate to argue that they should be applied in our own nation and world in the same way, and expect immediate benefits from it..."<sup>38</sup> Therefore, some laws can be borrowed if they are absent from the national law, and the necessity of their implementation in national life is substantiated. In addition, it is very important for the law making process to be on a legal way but not vice versa.

By proclaiming the Christian slogan "**Laws are for man**", Maghakia Ormanyan reveals the essence of the laws, the spirit and the principles of application. If divine and natural laws are eternal, then positive laws can be changed for the sake of human welfare. The lawmaker explains the relationship between the **external** (formal) and **internal** (essential) aspects of the law as a relation of **law** and **morality**. The moral principles embodied in the hearts of nature are that "... the spirit of the law will be embodied as a spirit that in itself is nothing but an inanimate, inactive and uninfluential body."<sup>39</sup> Acknowledging the **unity of the Old and New Testaments**, the theologian affirms that the literal definitions of the Old Law are complemented by the spiritual-moral principles of Christianity, which give new meaning and spirit to the laws.

Ormanyan's assessment of civil and national virtues places special emphasis on the **LOVE LAW**, which is the essence and summary of all Divine commandments, "And he said unto them, 'Whatsoever ye would, that men should do unto you, even so do ye them', for this is the law and the prophets."<sup>40</sup> The Golden Rule is the spiritual basis of constitutional laws, regulating public and national relations, from which administrative, civil, marital, inheritance, procedural, and other rights derive. He rejects "unwise judgments" based on the Christian commandment: "Do not judge that you will not be judged. For by what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged by him; and by what measure ye mete, it shall be measured unto you."<sup>41</sup> With this command he criticizes both the wrongdoings of individuals and the invasive policy of the Homeland and the nation.

---

<sup>38</sup> Ormanyan 1879c: 31.

<sup>39</sup> Ormanyan 1880b: 61.

<sup>40</sup> Matthew. Ch. 7. 12.

<sup>41</sup> Matthew. Ch. 7. 1-2.

According to Ormanyan, secular laws are the opposite of Divine definitions, unless they come from the latter. In this context, he explains: "There are so many external and carnal interests, they can never be a ransom for the release of inner and spiritual harm."<sup>42</sup> The divine law can be blessed in two ways: by **observing the commandments and by charity**: the first is a prerequisite and the second is a perfect degree, but human capacity is limited and insufficient for self-control and salvation. "Above all, there is a divine power, before which nothing is impossible, and which is a helper to mankind in all its gifts and graces."<sup>43</sup> At the same time, the importance of the truth, the supreme help, the application of the Divine laws are harmonized with the free activity of man in accordance with those laws. It is obvious that the thinker combines the ideas of Divine providence, human will and freedom of choice, which are valued not only in interpersonal relations but also in the national and inter-ethnic plane.

Summarizing the main points of Maghakia Ormanyan's national ideology, we can conclude:

The national issues are argued in his conception of the libertarian-conservative position, viewing nation and national existence as methodological starting points.

The existence of a nation is conditioned by the constituent foundations of history, population, language, and homeland, embodying the components of the spiritual essence of a nation (national organization, national purpose, and national unity).

Contrary to European views on civilizations, it is proved that Armenian civilization is not in a state of decline or collapse, but in continuous existence, which is manifested by the constant transformation of the nation and its cultural potential. Armenian civilization is a culture of realization of the nation's sovereignty, self-organization and self-governing abilities.

The right of national self-determination is interpreted as the right to determine one's own political life or to define one's political personality. Moreover, the right of nations to self-determination must be exercised in the homeland of an entity on the way to self-determination.

The unity of the history of the Armenian Church and the unity of the Armenian political history reveals the spiritual and secular realities. It is argued that the nation's spiritual independence in the periods of statehood was the basis of its political self-organization and self-governance.

The policy of the Armenian Church is interpreted in the context of Christological problems and legal-political issues. The Armenian Church's national position in the doctrinal struggle, the administrative equality of the churches in inter-church relations, and the immutability of the ideologies of the Armenian religion as a spiritual basis for the preservation of national identity are emphasized.

When arguing the foundations of the political organization of society, the power is regarded as the natural law prescribed by the Divine laws, from which the rights of

---

<sup>42</sup> Ormanyan 1911: 332.

<sup>43</sup> Idem: 540.

nations to self-governance derive. Whereas in European philosophical theories the idea of state sovereignty is emphasized, Ormanyan's concept of sovereignty is argued not only as an attribute of the state, but also as a natural right of the nation and a condition of national political independence.

Excluding the success of the revolutionary movements in the history under discussion, Ormanyan considers the constitutional way of solving national problems more realistic, based on the constitutional system of national and political culture.

The efficiency of the operation of the state is conditioned by a democratic constitutional system, operating on the basis of the constitution, whose standard and guarantee of legitimacy and fairness is the maximum participation of the people in public administration through the principle of national consent.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Gevorgyan H.A. 2005. Philosophy. History. Culture, Yerevan (in Arm.).
2. Habermas J. 2002. European national state. Its achievements and territory. About the past and future of the sovereignty of the citizen, in *Nation and Nationalism*, Moscow, 364-380 (in Russian).
3. Khrokh M. 2002. From national movements to the completely formed nation. The process of the nation-building in Europe, in *Nation and Nationalism*, 121-145 (in Russian).
4. Lloyd D. 2002. *The Idea of Laws* (transl. from English), Moscow (in Russian).
5. Nalbandyan M. 1980. Notices, in *Complete works*, vol. 2, Yerevan (in Arm.).
6. Mirumyan K. 2004. *The History of Political Science*, part 1. Classical period, Yerevan (in Russian).
7. Mirumyan K. 2006. *History of Political doctrines*, Yerevan (in Arm.).
8. Ormanyan M. 1879a. Past, present and future of the Armenian, Massis, Constantinople, 2230- 2240 (in Arm.).
9. Ormanyan M. 1879b. *The Union of the Armenians* (Speech), Constantinople (in Arm.).
10. Ormanyan M. 1879c. *The Soul of Armenians* (Speech), Constantinople (in Arm.).
11. Ormanyan M. 1880a. *Armenian Nationality* (Speech), Constantinople (in Arm.).
12. Ormanyan M. 1880b. *Armenian youth* (Speech), Constantinople (in Arm.).
13. Ormanyan M. 1886. *Mother See of Armenia*, Vagharshapat (in Arm.).
14. Ormanyan M. 1911. *Hamapatum. The Contents of four Books of gospels binded, harmonized and explained*, Constantinople (in Arm.).
15. Ormanyan M. 1912. *National History. Events of the Armenian Orthodox church from the beginning to the present told through national circumstances*, part 1, Constantinople (in Arm.).
16. Ormanyan M. 1913. *National History*, part 2, Constantinople (in Arm.).

17. Ormanyan M. 1931. Thoughts and speeches on his last period of life, Jerusalem (in Arm.).
18. Ormanyan M. 1956. The luminous belief of Armenian church (two kondaks), Anthilias-Lebanon (in Arm.).
19. Ormanyan M. 1985. Rudiments of Theology. Theoretical theology, Jerusalem (in Arm.).
20. Sarvazyan L. 2008a. The problem of foundations of the Armenian church's autonomy in the doctrine of Maghakia Ormanyan, Bulletin of the Russian-Armenian University, Yerevan, 2008/1, 70-85 (in Arm.).
21. Sarvazyan L. 2008b. Historical-political and juridical argumentations regarding the authenticity of the «Charter of Friendship and Concord», Armenia. Finances and Economics, 2008/10, 24-34 (in Arm.).
22. Sarvazyan L. 2008c. National policy of the Armenian Church in the context of the attempts to unification of churches and theological struggle, Armenia. Finances and Economics, 2008/11-12, 34-50 (in Arm.).
23. Sarvazyan L. 2011. The Idea of national unity in the doctrine of Maghakia Ormanyan, Armenia. Finances and Economics, 2011/8, 60-64 (in Arm.).
24. Smith E. 2002. Nationalism and Historians, in Nation and Nationalism (transl. from English), Moscow, 236-263 (in Russian).

***Translated from the Armenian by Vahram Gharakhanyan***