

THE FOUNDATIONS OF A NATION'S EXISTENCE IN MAGHAKIA ORMANYAN'S ARGUMENTS

Lilit Sarvazyan

PhD, Associate Professor at the Yerevan State

Pedagogical University

Senior Researcher at the Institute of Philosophy,

Sociology and Law of NAS RA

lilit.sarvazyan@gmail.com

Abstract

It is an obvious philosophical truth that people turn to eternal, unchanging values when they find themselves in uncertain, crisis or declining situations during historical and political scandals, as well as in the periods preceding violent cultural-civilizational movements, when in the search for new value orientations, the foundations of national existence, the universal essence of existence, universal principles of existence, reflections on human existence, self-interpretation and worldview become primary. Discussions of the problem of practical philosophy are also activated on the basis of theoretical concepts.

These universal patterns are also characteristic of the Armenian reality. In particular, in the process of searching for possible ways of solving the Armenian Question in Western Armenia at the end of the 19th century, the scientific and philosophical analyzes of the genealogy of the Armenian nation, the factors of preserving the national identity, and the legality and justice of the reform of the political existence were important.

Keywords: national existence, motherland, national factor, self-determination, national state, national unity, national goal.

In the political and philosophical concept of the Western Armenian social and political figure, theologian, philosopher, Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople Maghaqia Archbishop Ormanyan (1841-1918), the argumentation of the foundations of the existence of Armenians is of key importance. Realizing the goal of the Ottoman government to exterminate the Armenian people, to destroy Armenia and the Armenian civilization, the patriarch considers the primary problem to be the opposition of the Turkish plan to the national plan, the main idea of which is to live, act and create such “to create conditions for self-expression for Armenians, and newcomers and natives can tangibly see and feel that there is an Armenian element and an Armenian life.”¹ In other words, the basis and key to the solution of national practical-legal-political issues are the semantic arguments of Armenians as a functioning nation. With this starting point,

¹ Ormanyan 1910: 99.

Ormanyan examines the fundamentals of the Armenian nation, the reasons and factors of its existence, the phenomenon of Armenianness and its self-consciousness, especially the essence of the Armenian soul, because it is the spiritual existence that "...moves the main wheel of that machine called nationality".²

The beginning, core and goal of national existence is the nation itself. The existence of a nation is the way of its existence as a historical, cultural and political entity. National sense of meaning is the result of self-consciousness and reflection of national existence. According to Ormanyan, national knowledge is the proof of national existence. Thanks to self-consciousness, a person understands the infinity, inexhaustibility and incompleteness of national existence, which constantly pushes the nation to think about the mystery of survival and the cultural and civilizational perspective.

The core of Ormanyan's philosophical concept is the correlation between Armenianness and the Motherland, with their unbreakable unity, from which the idea of self-determination of the Armenian nation in Armenia derives. Without a self-defining subject, the motherland becomes a historical memory or an illusion. The thinker begins his theory by affirming the existence of the nation, because "existence is the first beginning and the first condition of all, the cause of all perfections and the flagman of all events."³ Of course, existence does not equate to national existence. The existence of the nation is the pre-initial certainty of its existence. The being implies not only the fact of existence, but also the reasons, manner, patterns, meaning, stability and integrity.

Ormanyan redefines the Armenian nationality in the context of the political developments of the time. According to his observation, "... today it seems that we have given a new meaning to that word, and we are placing new hopes on it. We have new theories about its explanation, and we define new points of view about its purpose"⁴. The new point of view about the nation does not at all mean putting forward the idea of a "newly created nationality", that is, such an ethnic community that has no history, tradition, and identity established by historical and political existence. Such an innovation would be useless because it contradicts natural and moral laws. The new point of view refers to the national-political movement and not to the origin and existence of the nation.

The ontological analysis of the nation was conditioned by some opinions circulating in the given period, according to which: 1) the current existence of the nation is not consistent with the essence and existence of the nation. 2) There is simply a monolingual and mono-religious community, which is called Armenian, while "...nationality is a political position that requires a political center around which all elements of Armenianness are surrounded, and which, as a center, can summarize all,

² Ormanyan 1888: 13.

³ Ormanyan 1880: 9.

⁴ Ormanyan 1880: 3-4.

and make regular all processes and joint work.”⁵ Meanwhile, Armenians do not have a political power, a governing center, and there is no hope that it will be created in the case of the existing divisions of the nation. 3) Armenians are scattered all over the world, and just as the Jews cannot expect the restoration of the Jewish kingdom, so the Armenians cannot expect the restoration of their political being. As noted by S. Sargsyan, “Ormanyany directly contrasts the Armenian model of nation-building with the European political model of national formation, based on a realistic understanding of national life, its uniqueness, and the great problem of preservation of Armenianness.”⁶

According to Ormanyany, political self-organization is the natural ability of nations, which is manifested in the historical regular movement. Therefore, the unnecessary similarity of Jews and Armenians is wrong. He does not deny the influence of Jews in foreign countries in the financial, economic, cultural, scientific and educational and other spheres, which, however, is not enough to restore Jewish statehood. The thinker mentions the reasons for its impossibility in the current historical period, the non-existence of the Jews as a native ethnic group in the motherland itself, their dispersion in different states, which excludes their political position in the state legal systems, “...so that in Judea it is not necessary to strengthen the Jewishness, but especially to reestablish it”⁷, because the main natural condition of nation’s existence is the presence of the native people in the native cradle.

In this context, the observation of the German philosopher Kurt Hubner is noteworthy. Commenting on the conditions for the formation of Aristotelian polity, he affirms. “The nation in the state is not derived from its structure, but the structure of the state itself is derived from its nation, which must follow its specific cultural goal under changing historical conditions. The structures change, but the nations remain.”⁸ It is obvious that both Ormanyany and Hubner value the nation as the natural-substantial-residence basis of the existence of the state. YG Fichte and A. Muller emphasize the supra-temporal nature of nations. This idea is fundamental in the romantic philosophy of the XVIII-XIX centuries. According to Fichte, “The state is not an end in itself, but a means... The state structure is a creation of ideology, but it is endowed with vitality thanks to the nation.”⁹ The concept of “nation-state” is opposed to these ideas, the authors of which understand the nation, if not as a synonym of the state, then as a reality connected to the latter. Moreover, according to L. Acton, “A state can create a nation over time, but the notion that a nation should form and establish a state contradicts the nature of modern civilization.”¹⁰

According to Ormanyany’s remark, some accept the existence of nationality only where “... there is a separate state position and according to this, all the peoples that

⁵ Ormanyany 1880: 10.

⁶ Sargsyan 2001: 207-208.

⁷ Ormanyany 1880: 11.

⁸ Hubner 2001: 27-28.

⁹ Hyubner 2001: 144.

¹⁰ Acton 2002: 44.

make up the essential or integral parts of each state are called the common nation, without distinguishing that they are different peoples, have different languages and different characteristics". Actually, this is not the general point of view that the whole civilized world defends, because "European powers, neither in the past nor today, have identified the borders of their nationalities with the borders of their states."¹¹

For example, the Italian nation is not limited to the Kingdom of Italy. The Germans by the German Empire and the citizens of Austria are representatives of many nations and ethnic groups.

It should be noted that until the 18th-19th centuries, the national factor did not play a significant role in European political processes, state, political, religious and other factors were mainly important. The state was perceived and observed as a form of political organization of society, and society as a union of individuals united by state-citizen ties. For example, according to the definition of Immanuel Kant, "The state (civitas) unites many people subject to legal laws, with the recognition of common law."¹² The definition of a philosopher is consistent only with the rule of law. However, as Jean Beaudin points out, this definition does not fit the Ottoman state at all, whose subjects and government were not united by common laws and interests.¹³

In historiography, philosophy of law and political philosophy, the national factor gradually began to be valued as the basis of historical progress and political changes. The main topic of scientific debates became the issues of the nation's nature, identity, fundamental elements and conditions of national existence. The peoples were declared free communities endowed with their own history and state rights and national self-consciousness¹⁴. Thus, science of statehood could no longer be satisfied with the traditional method of research, according to which the state is an abstract idea, a political structure without correlation with nationality.

The political realities of the modern era led to the formation of the theory of the national state, the foundations of which are: a) the natural basis of the state is nationality, and the state is the legal and political form of the nation, b) the main object of state policy is the public life of the nation or the people, c) there is solidarity between the people and the government of the fundamental elements of political nationality, because the nation and the state are not mutually exclusive or opposing entities. However, it should be noted that the concepts of state and nationality are not identical, the state as a legal and political structure does not coincide with the national units of the governed society.

With the increase in the level of awareness of the national and civil rights of the people, a different position was required. According to Yu. Habermas, "the national self-consciousness of the people is the cultural context that contributed to the growth of

¹¹ Ormanyanyan 1880: 12-13.

¹² Kant 1965: 233.

¹³ Mirumyan 2006: 288.

¹⁴ Bodarchuk 2005 (ed.): 7-9.

political activity of citizens.”¹⁵ From the point of view of the latest political philosophy, the identity of the state is embodied both by the right to independence of the highest authority and by the right to independent political development of the nationality as a competent entity. The nation is the source and bearer of state sovereignty. This new principle no longer corresponded to the system of artificial states based on the Treaties of the 1815 Vienna Summit.

In Europe, the right of independent historical development of each nationality as a subject of history was recognized as the basis of state identity in international relations. New theories were formed. I.K. Blunchley proposed a concept in which the natural nation and the state nation (Volk) are distinguished. For example, Germans, Italians are natural nationalities, and Prussians, Austrians, and Swiss are state nations. According to J.S. Mill's point of view, the main condition of the existence of the nation is the political contact. The coexistence of people united by the commonality of language, religion, territory and other conditions is still not a nationality in the state sense. A natural nation may also not form a state by being incorporated into another state or divided between several powers. Meanwhile, the state nation, even made up of different ethnic units, is a unique nation with the generality of state-political life.

It is obvious that such an approach ignores the rights of the natural nations themselves. According to A. Gradovski, “The principle of nationality contradicts the mechanical, forced unification of already formed nationalities into one state, from which a new nationality cannot be formed in any way.”¹⁶ We think that from the historical fact that some states were formed from different ethnic groups, many people concluded that the main condition of the existence of the nation is political contact and the commonality of state life. But it is necessary to take into consideration the non-identity of the process of formation of nations historically. We can confirm that if the basis of national consciousness with the European mentality is state-political integrity, then the self-consciousness of the Armenian nation is the starting point that led to the ideas of Armenian political self-organization and state unity.

The principle of the nation-state theory is that every nationality has the right to political independence. But this principle cannot justify the attempt to merge those nations and nationalities that are the conquered subjects of the superpowers. It is not possible to equalize the natural nationalities by depriving them of the national right of self-determination and self-governance only with forced political unity within the state borders. A typical example of this is the people of the Ottoman Empire, Russia, Austria, Switzerland and other countries. And, which is very important, if the constitutional order of the legal state of Switzerland obliges the state to protect the equality of nationalities with the active exercise of political and civil liberties, then the subjects of the mentioned other dictatorial powers have always fought not only for the right to national self-determination, but also for the respect of human dignity and basic civil rights. All the

¹⁵ Habermas 2002: 368.

¹⁶ Gradovski 1873: 22.

resources and management energy of these states created by the laws of tyranny were directed only to the preservation of the rights of the ruling nation, as well as the unnatural state structure and the formation of apparent public solidarity. These states did not even recognize the principle of administrative self-government, realizing that its application would naturally lead to the demand for recognition of the right to political identity and independent national statehood.

According to Ormanyan, the creation of a national state is the main aspiration of every nation. This is a historical truth, because both the ancient nations (including the Armenians) and the nationalities formed in modern times, as a political ethnos, took place in state-legal structures. According to H. Gevorgyan, "It is the presence of general forms of the upper civilizational layer of culture that makes a people a nation, characterizes a nation as a united community and its culture as a national culture."

Ignoring the role of the state, Ormanyan affirms that the political (even insignificant) position of a nationality is a guarantee of its security, but it is not the basis of the existence of a nation. According to him, Armenians "... have all the skills of national existence, even if they do not have statehood", that is, statehood is not an attribute for the nation in the system of nation-building foundations. As for the political powers of the nation with foreign subjection, he affirms: "and not for the existence of a nationality is a particular political position so strictly essential that without it the nationality is considered nothing... Sometimes it is possible for a nationality to maintain its existence even without this condition."¹⁷ In other words, with the loss of the state, the national existence does not end, the foundations of the nation's existence, including state-legal and political existence, do not disappear, nor does the nation's capacity for self-organization and self-governance, which Armenia has demonstrated in almost all historical periods.

On the eve of the expected national-political renaissance at the end of the 19th century, the main task was to assure the world with solid arguments that the Armenian nation, as a subject of history, has all the conditions of the existence of a nation and development and is legally and capable of participating in the international diplomatic processes of the political solution of its national issues. With this in mind, Ormanyan sees the discovery and understanding of the nation's foundation of existence as a primary issue in the subject status of the Armenians. According to him, "...in order for a nation to exist, it must also have a tradition, a multitude, a language, a center, an organization, some ties and a goal."¹⁸ Without excluding other realities, he considers the listed basics to be the main and essential ones, to which all the other characteristics of the nation ultimately lead.

Interpreting tradition (history) as evidence of the existence of a nation, Ormanyan excludes the hypothesis of the creation of a "new nationality". It is possible to develop, strengthen, and conversely disintegrate, assimilate or destroy nationalities, but inventing

¹⁷ Ormanyan 1880: 13-14.

¹⁸ Ormanyan 1880: 12:

a nation is not natural. In his opinion, even if the traditions seem mythical, and the history does not inspire national pride, nevertheless, the tradition is one of the basic conditions of national identity. With the same logic, Ghevond Alishan confirms that “The most important memory of every nation is its History, which should be traditional, especially the written one, because there are also verbal memories...”¹⁹ According to Hobsbawm, “The past is what creates a nation.”²⁰

According to Ormanyan, both the Sacred History, the polar writings-records, and the bibliography report the honorable, reliable tradition and authentic history of the Armenian nation, according to which “...in the time immemorial, there was a nation where its motherland is, and as a result of the development, it got a prominent position in the timeline.”²¹ For a special purpose, he mentions the history of the inheritance of the Armenian royal four dynasties as national statehood, which inspired Armenians with political zeal and determination to restore national statehood. Therefore, the national tradition is not only a tragedy of decline and destruction, but also a story of a glorious political history, which has rightfully become a historical-political pillar of national preservation, because “A nation that has a history for forty centuries and... is not destroyed, may it not be destroyed after all.”²²

Examining ethnic population (“multitude”) as a fundamental element of ethnography, Ormanyan informs that in the historical period of ethnography, a certain number of people were not defined as a rule. There are various large and small peoples in terms of the quantity in the world, which are recognized as separate nations with their own statehood, or nationalities scattered in different states. According to him, such a number of the national population may be required, “...which can be sufficient in itself, and achieve all the actions necessary for the preservation, governance and development of a nation”.²³ Therefore, if a people with a number of one or two million are able to be a self-sufficient, legally self-governing nation and state, then the four million Armenians “...always have a large enough number to form a nation, and dare to say that the Armenian nationality is one”.²⁴ Therefore, it is unacceptable to simply call Armenians a “minority” or a community, even in their own (albeit occupied) motherland.

Language is one of the essential foundations of the existence of nations, which Ormanyan values as a means of communication of ideas, a method of social and political contacts, as well as a unifying factor that unites the divided parts of the nation. Armenian is a comprehensive and flexible language for national literary, public speaking, scientific, rhetorical, political, legal, diplomatic, educational, ritual and other operations.

¹⁹ Alishan 1901: 10.

²⁰ Hobsbaum 2002: 332.

²¹ Ormanyan 1880: 15.

²² Ormanyan 1879, N 2240.

²³ Ormanyan 1880: 18.

²⁴ Ormanyan 1880: 19.

Referring to the issue of modernization of Armenian and formation of literary language, the specialist in Armenian Studies emphasizes the necessity of both Grabar (ancient Armenian) and modern Armenian language in the national life, because “Two languages... are linked and united by the equality of two relatives”.²⁵ In his opinion, in order not to deviate from the natural patterns of the preservation and development of the national language itself, it is necessary:

- To study all the provincial dialects”... to filter what is natural or according to the rule, and what is distorted or foreign”.²⁶
- To avoid unnecessary “neologism” presented as orthography, as well as the mechanical introduction of the grammar of foreign languages, because “...a language cannot be moved by the rules of mathematical equations and comparisons, nor subject to servile imitation”.²⁷
- Under no circumstances should Armenian be deprived of its national nuances, which determine the unity of national language thinking.

In fact, Ormanyan does not propose the task of language reconstruction, but the development of literary Armenian.

The native environment, according to the thinker, is the following one: “For the existence of our nationality, we need to have our country, our world, our motherland, our center.”²⁸ The motherland-center is the natural basis of national existence, the cradle where the Armenian people became a nation. Therefore, Armenians are the natural heirs and rightful owners of their motherland, and Armenia is inalienable. According to Ormanyan, the Armenian nation is patriotic by nature, so it should always be the bearer and defender of the idea of one-centeredness regardless of legal and political status.

Thus, the existence of a nation is determined by history (tradition), population, language and motherland. However, these objective bases are necessary, but not sufficient for national identity. They constitute the physical existence of the nation, in which its spiritual components are also interwoven. According to Ormanyan, the spiritual existence of the Armenian nation is determined by national organization, national purpose and national unity.

The national organization is a special structure, with the power of which the nation can “...grant itself a private residence and facilitate the development of its internal activity with the internal movement.” According to him, “for our nationality, it is not possible to show a more real condition”.²⁹ In Western Armenia, such a structure is the Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople, whose powers extend only to the Armenian subjects of the Ottoman Empire, as a result of which relatives living in other countries, as well as relatives, who practice other religions, are excluded from the legal framework

²⁵ Ormanyan 1880: 21.

²⁶ Ormanyan 1879, N 2232.

²⁷ Ormanyan 1879, N 2316.

²⁸ Ormanyan 1880: 23.

²⁹ Ormanyan 1880: 24.

of that center. For this reason, Ormanyan combines the condition of national unity with the National Center as a factor of national protection.

The concept of unity has different cultural, social, political, religious and other sub-layers of meaning. With a historical analysis, Ormanyan first addresses the perceptions and forms of manifestation of the idea of unity formed in separate Armenian historical periods. According to him, Armenians were united in the once independent Armenia because "...at that time it had a political independence that was the foundation and center of the union". In other words, the basis of national unity with the existence of statehood was the sovereign kingdom of Armenians, and "Haykaznian and Arshakid dynasties united all Armenians under the power of their king."³⁰ In this case, there was no special propaganda about unity.

Later, during the reign of the Bagratid dynasty, the Armenian princes did not rule over all of Armenia, because they "...they reign in Ani and Kars and Vaspurakan, and they think they are protecting the same Armenia independently."³¹ From that time, the real union of Armenians was broken. It was not restored even during the reign of the Rubenid dynasty, because the Cilician kingdom was not the state-political center of all Armenia. In addition, the separation of the Patriarchal See and power with the intervention of Latin figures became the reason for a new national division³².

According to Ormanyan, the concept of "union" is opposed by two concepts: division and disunity. The first is in a physical sense, and the second in a spiritual-moral sense. In this historical period, the reason for the division of the nation was apostasy, political division and subjection to foreign states, different ways of language communication, various cultural influences, etc.

As a result of the religious division, some parts of the Armenians differ in religion and subjection to the jurisdiction of different churches. Ormanyan does not ignore the freedom of conscience and religion, but from the starting point of the idea of national unity, it is impossible not to conclude that "... such a division could also divide us as a nation... They could create new centers in Armenia, which had conflicts with the old center, and ... with a combative position they tried to damage an old center and they provoked us, caused problems."³³ If the united forces were supposed to strengthen the Armenians, then such divisions divided the nation. In addition, the Christian teaching contributes to the stability of both the whole humanity and the unique national societies. It is a faith of Love and Unity, not divisiveness. Preaching this truth, Ormanyan urges "Armenians, do not divide the nation for the sake of Christ, but honor Christ with your union."³⁴

The problem of political division is discussed on two levels: a) emigration and resettlement, b) physical political division of the motherland and Armenians. In both

³⁰ Ormanyan 1879: 7.

³¹ Ormanyan 1879: 8:

³² Sarvazyan 2011: 60-61.

³³ Ormanyan 1879: 13.

³⁴ Ormanyan 1879: 15.

cases, there are political implications. Ormanyan considers emigration to be a national evil, because those who lived in foreign countries "... got used to the local customs and language, lifestyle and family relations, and as much as the level of the national identity decreased, the level of foreignness increased as well... and he who was Armenian ... today he is Polish, Hungarian, Italian."³⁵ The most dangerous thing is to get used to inbreeding. He also does not encourage the creation of private Armenian centers in foreign countries, where, although cultural and economic progress is evident, this all is not in the Motherland.

Examining the problem in the context of the Armenian Question, Ormanyan informs that the required information about the integrity of Armenia was not enough. According to the thinker, in diplomatic negotiations, it was important that the Armenian states themselves were presented with common cultural-civilizational attributes, which were undeniable as the foundations of statehood or autonomy. And the men who are not interested in the Armenian Question "...couldn't claim that today a country in Asia that has a large population of Armenians and has formed an Armenia is being sought in vain."³⁶

The impact of the consequences of Armenia's political divisions will remain until their causes are neutralized, especially in the case of the country's triple division. In the case of one country's rule, it is easier to regulate national life with certain policies and principles and hope for political reforms. However, the biblical saying "No one can serve two masters", according to Ormanyan, "became a reality on the example of Armenia."³⁷

The reasons for violating national unity are objective, for which Armenians are not responsible. The nation is responsible for spiritual disunity. According to Ormanyan, "It is wrong to confuse division and disunity, as it is wrong to confuse the body with the soul and the natural with the moral."³⁸ Disastrous consequences flow from this confusion. It is worth arguing that the existence of Armenians is the result of patriotism and spiritual unity.

According to Ormanyan, existing divisions are difficult to eliminate, because the law of freedom of conscience opposes the ecclesiastical (denominational) union, the administrative laws of empires oppose the idea of national unity, the law of protection of economic interests opposes the union based on locality, and the international law established by military laws and diplomatic law opposes the state-political union. Therefore, certain laws contradict the real union of Armenians, which cannot be ignored. It is obvious that until statehood is restored, Armenians "...will remain separated by church, nation, place and state".³⁹

Ormanyan interprets the European understanding of the idea of national unity. According to him, "The union of nationality in a civilized nation is established on the

³⁵ Ormanyan 1879: 16.

³⁶ Ormanyan 1879: 17.

³⁷ Ormanyan 1879: 19-20.

³⁸ Ormanyan 1879: 22.

³⁹ Ormanyan 1879: 25.

basis of political union so that even if other divisions prevail in a nation they do not call its unity destroyed.”⁴⁰ In this case, national unity and civic unity are identified and represent such a powerful force that remains unshaken by religion, place of residence or other divisions. However, in the current political existence of Armenians in the XIX-XX centuries, it was extremely dangerous to defend the idea of the identity of state unity and national unity, which implied the fusion of a subject nation with a dominating people. With this in mind, the Armenian thinker emphasizes the necessity of using the vey historical method. “Today, our union will be known in a sense suitable to us and our situation, and it will be prepared in a style corresponding to it.”⁴¹

Analyzing the realities of the past and present, which became objective reasons for dividing the nation, Ormanyan proposes ways to eliminate them. According to his point of view, it is possible to “form a complete unity among all the elements, who recognize their Armenianness and want to remain in union with Armenia”.⁴² For example, he affirms that the discussion of the problem of religious divisions of the nation does not imply the denial of freedom of conscience, church rights, or a call for the unification of churches, because “in the 19th century, national unity does not depend on the number of words, or on the classification of ecclesiastical authority. The point on which we base our nationhood, Armenianness, is beyond that.”⁴³ If the religious choice of some persons is made in consideration of the supernatural order, their freedom of will should be respected. It is simply preferable to have a religious union, which has been valued for centuries as one of the foundations of national unity.

In the absence of a national political center, it is the only way out, “National unity under the administration of the Armenian Patriarchate.”⁴⁴ Ormanyan interprets the integrity of the nation by imagining it as a pyramidal formation in relation to its fundamental parts. The peak of the pyramid is St. Etchmiadzin, “who will draw the content of Armenianness, and whose influence will form Armenia.”⁴⁵ According to him, the protection of national interests in the current situation is conditioned by cooperation with the spiritual power of the nation. Therefore, the unity of Armenians with the Mother See “...will have such powerful influences that Armenians will turn the Armenian Church into a nation.”⁴⁶

The national-church union is the first permanent step for the unity of Armenians. The second is the problem of local population and unity with the state, which became a supreme issue at the end of the 19th century. According to the historical-geographic theory, Ormanyan notes that it is not correct to surround the “place of Armenian” with narrow borders and to define the Armenian-inhabited countries with 15 provinces of

⁴⁰ Ormanyan 1879: 25-26.

⁴¹ Ormanyan 1879: 26.

⁴² Ormanyan 1880: 27.

⁴³ Ormanyan 1879, N 2233:

⁴⁴ Ormanyan 1879: 36.

⁴⁵ Ormanyan 1888, N A, p. 8.

⁴⁶ Ormanyan 1880: 27.

Greater Armenia. Minor Armenia (Pontos, Cilicia, Mesopotamia, Atropatene, Aghvank, Virk) has been a part of the whole of Armenia for about 37 centuries. The countries mentioned by centuries of rule “are accustomed to Armenia and populated by Armenians, and as a native element, they would not present a fairer element with a more prominent and permanent residence than Armenia.”⁴⁷ In addition, many Muslims living there are of Armenian origin, although they have become alienated from Armenians by their religious worship and nomadic lifestyle. With national education and upbringing, they can rediscover their nationality. However, as a political center, he emphasizes the actual Armenian territories of Upper Armenia and Vaspurakan, “...which are the center of Armenians.”⁴⁸

The most complicated problem is the political division of Armenians in the Ottoman, Russian and Persian autonomies and other countries. Even if all Armenians were to concentrate in Armenia, they would be united by locality, but not by the state, because they would again differ in political subjection. And as long as political unity and national-state unity are not possible, it is the primary problem of Armenians “...that they should put aside all, for the unity of their nationality not be disrupted.”⁴⁹ The patriarchal power in the Ottoman Empire, the Armenian Patriarchal power in Russia and the granting of some national freedoms to the Persian Armenians are the grounds that, according to Ormanyan, are sufficient to “... preserve the unity of the Armenians in Armenia, divided by the state, without giving diplomatic and military requests and let us protect all, enjoying the freedom of relations that are the result of the above-mentioned privileges”.⁵⁰

Thus, the four main divisions of Armenians (denominational, administrative, political, local and state) were coercive, independent of the nation’s will. Since true spiritual-ecclesiastical and national-political unity is still not possible, it is necessary to mitigate the consequences of divisions, to reduce the factors that divide the nation. According to Ormanyan, national unity is possible even in case of divisions. For this, one must first reject fatalism as a political ideology, and nationally oppose violence presented as national destiny.

He proposes the idea of a comparative center: “let us form a complex center for Armenians, partly local, partly educational, partly administrative, and mostly ecclesiastical.”⁵¹ It differs from the intra-organizational style of the Union of European Nations, but can be effective in the presence of inevitable divisions. In such a center, various persons are united in various relationships, being obliged to perform various functions. Thus, the majority of Armenians is under the jurisdiction of the Mother See and forms a church union with the Armenian religion, although they are divided by locality and subjection. Although the Armenians subject to the authority of the Sis See

⁴⁷ Ormanyan 1879: 39.

⁴⁸ Ormanyan 1879, N 2233.

⁴⁹ Ormanyan 1879: 46.

⁵⁰ Ormanyan 1879: 47.

⁵¹ Ormanyan 1879: 27.

are divided by ecclesiastical authority, they are united by religion, and administratively they are connected with the Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople. And if the latter united Armenians of different religions with administrative authority, then a dual union would be created between them. As for the Armenians living outside Armenia, who are separated from the Armenians themselves by religion and administrative authority, a spiritual and moral union should be established with them as a people of the nation.

The educational union implies the unification of national educational centers and agencies under one center so that national education and training are carried out with the same policies and programs.

Ormanyan evaluates the mentioned measures that make national unity possible as legal and pro-national in accordance with the political, legal and cultural realities of the time. And since the National Center has no coercive law and punitive functions for the union, the unity of Armenians must be based on national agreement and will. In addition, there will always be obstacles from incumbent governments that need to be neutralized by unified national power as well as realistic plans. In the past, the main weapon for inciting national differences and internal riots was the efforts to present the pitiful state of Armenians and the principle of the formation of a nation as doomed. At the end of the 19th century, this weapon was not effective, because it was not possible to convince the civilized world of the non-existence of Armenia and Armenians.

Referring to the issue of the possibility of national unity, Ormanyan states that Armenians are oriented towards the principle of decentralization of private activities, which is natural and applicable in terms of national existence. He excludes the absolute centralization of the activities of the National Administrative Center: "in order to make the Union of Armenia active, we are always obliged to adopt a composite, constitutional form."⁵² When the divided parts of the nation are united by national will as relative members of one mighty union, the possibility of national union will be irresistible.

The national goal is valued as the main spiritual factor of national identity, without which national aspirations, activities and the influence of all the above-mentioned basic conditions are groundless. According to Ormanyan, the goal is a direct consequence of the current state of the nation. But this existence is perceived and evaluated ambiguously, which determines the difference between the choice of national goals and their priority. "...while some are satisfied with modest goals, others dare to be the mirror of a more encouraging and higher goal."⁵³ If the former oppose the idea of Armenians as a nation in dramatic moods and are guided only by the idea of a decayed, destroyed motherland and a discouraged, incapacitated people, then realistic national figures emphasize not only the justification of the idea of Armenians as a functioning nation, rejecting "sick and miserable" image of the people, but also manifest intense national energy and political will to "restore" and legitimately reform the national existence.

⁵² Ormanyan 1879: 52.

⁵³ Ormanyan 1880: 28.

Thus, according to Ormanyan's argument, Armenian nationality exists because all the conditions of nationality exist: tradition (history), national population with the necessary number, language, Motherland-center, spiritual-political organization, national unity and nationwide goal.

The goal of the constitutional movement of the 19th century was the national self-determination of the Armenians. According to Ormanyan, the natural basis of the legitimacy of the nation's political self-government is the existence of the Armenian nation and nationalism: there is no nation, so there is not and cannot be a state, but not vice versa. Therefore, the universal goal is the political revival of Armenia and the recognition of Armenian statehood under international law.

In this context, Ormanyan affirms that the concept of "nation" should not be understood only as "people", because it contains a political meaning. It should be noted that the nation differs from other ethnic communities in the characteristic of political self-organization and self-governance. The thinker states that the autonomy program presented by Armenians in international assemblies could not include the issue of national rights, if the existence of Armenia as a nation was not perceived in political circles, that it "...can be invited to the arena as a prominent and powerful element of the Eastern world, especially since as the main and most visible among the ancient Asian nationalities, as Western authors and political scientists did not hesitate to name the Armenian nationality"⁵⁴. Thus, the initial goal of Armenians is the survival of the nation, and the ultimate goal is the restoration of the statehood, that is, the establishment of a nationwide government in Armenia.

It is noteworthy that Ormanyan does not mention religion among the basic conditions of nation formation. He does not accept the idea of an "irreligious society" at all. As for the national religion, he unequivocally affirms the unity of the nation and religion, both in the past and in the present: "what in our opinion was religious by itself was and is truly national."⁵⁵

Ormanyan searches for the secret of Armenian existence in the unique spiritual abilities of the nation. The main task of consciousness is the discovery and meaning of the essence of the soul of the Armenians and the existence of the nation itself. According to the specialist in Armenian Studies, the national soul contains the whole of spiritual original qualities and relationships of Armenian individuals. The beginning of the recognition of the national soul is the self-consciousness of the Armenian individual, because "a part of the soul of Armenia is inside each of us, and the soul of many of us is the soul of the majority of Armenians, and the soul of Armenia is also the soul of the majority of Armenians."⁵⁶ Ormanyan argues the stability of the value system, all elements of which prove the Armenian itself and the vitality of the nation: "if we are what

⁵⁴ Ormanyan 1880: 28.

⁵⁵ Ormanyan 1880: 55.

⁵⁶ Ormanyan 1879: 5.

we are only for that reason that each Armenian individual fully had the desires and feelings and skills and abilities that will ensure the natural life of each nation”⁵⁷.

Ormanyan sees the study of the soul of Armenianness as a methodological starting point, standard, and guide for making sense of the national history and the ways of the nation’s political revival. He interprets the soul of the Armenian nation in terms of such essential features, which are endowed with the “chosen soul” nations. According to that, Armenians are characterized by natural sobriety, ingenuity, the ability to find a way out of dangerous situations, the ability to find a quick way out of dangerous situations and the ability to use the necessary measures, courage, conservatism to preserve nationality, religion, language, traditions, moderation of morals, national unity, by which the individuals of the nation strive for national welfare with a united consensus.

A nation’s positive attributes are often contrasted by many disadvantages. Ormanyan explains that the soul of Armenians is not identical only to the totality of virtues. Many Armenians are also characterized by ambition, selfishness, betrayal, etc., which are mainly caused by long-term subjugation. Foreign conquerors have always sought to complement political subjugation with spiritual subjugation: “...the lovers of critical meaning of history will feel the succession of Parthian and Persian, Greek and Arab, Christian and Mohammedan authorities” which tried to “implant their own feelings of shortcomings on the soul of Armenia”⁵⁸.

It is obvious that the mentioned defects are not natural and definitely did not affect Armenian individuals, which became the cause of internal contradictions. Therefore, the healing of the Armenian soul can be realized only by restoring the national characteristics itself, and the initial stage of solving this problem is to educate all members of the nation equally and uniformly. According to Ormanyan, the shortcomings of the nation do not diminish the greatness of the national soul. Of course, their elimination is desirable, but human shortcomings should not be mixed up with crimes committed independently of the will of the nation by declaring Armenia solely responsible for all historical trials. Therefore, in order to avoid such mistakes, he recommends making the knowledge of the national soul the basis of Armenological research.

Ormanyan also refuses to see xenophobia as a defect characteristic of the entire Armenian nation. It may be specific to some individuals, but the majority of the nation accepts national values. In addition, “whatever Armenians had and whatever they accepted from outside, they gave it a separate national form.”⁵⁹ According to him, in order to avoid xenophobia, it is necessary that a) every Armenian “...should individually feel his national value”⁶⁰, b) recognize the primary goals and urgent problems of the

⁵⁷ Ormanyan 1879: 9-10.

⁵⁸ Ormanyan 1879: 25.

⁵⁹ Ormanyan 1879, N 2230.

⁶⁰ Ormanyan 1880: 44.

nation, c) use his own means in the course of national activities, not relying on foreigners.

Thus, the basis of national identity is the soul of the nation, by which the Armenian differs from other nations and peoples, confirming its uniqueness, the National Self. With this reality, Ormanyan also emphasizes the impossibility of mixing Armenians with other nations, because "... Armenians always had an advantage over other global nations to maintain their authenticity"⁶¹. The nation has solved the main problem of survival, so it is able to strengthen national security and develop taking into consideration various civilizational factors.

Summary

The article analyzes the semantic arguments of Maghaqia Ormanyan regarding the foundations of the survival of the Armenian nation, the factors guaranteeing them, the phenomenon of Armenianness and its self-consciousness. Rejecting the "nation-state" point of view of European political philosophy, according to which the basis of the existence of the nation is political communication and the state-legal system, he argues that the concepts of "state" and "nation" are not identical, because the identity of the state is embodied in the nation as the source and bearer of state sovereignty with the right to independent political development. The natural support of the legitimacy of the nation's political self-government is the existence of the Armenian nation and nationalism. There is no nation, so there is not and cannot be a national state. The nation is valued as the natural-substantive basis of the formation of the state. Ormanyan conditions the existence of a nation with the nation-building foundations of history, population, language and motherland (objective foundations), in which the components of its spiritual existence are embedded: the national self-organization, national goal and national unity. The self-consciousness of the Armenian nation is the very starting point that led to the ideas of Armenian political self-organization and state unity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acton L. 2002. *The Principle of National Self-Determination, Nations and Nationalism* (Translation from English). Moscow: Praxis (In Russian).
- Alishan Gh. 1901. *Armenian History, Part I*. Venice: St Lazzaro (In Arm.).
- Bodarchuk V.S. 2005 (ed.). *National idea in Western Europe in modern times. Essays on history* Moscow: Zercalo-M (In Russian).
- Gevorgyan H.A. 2005. *Philosophy: History: Culture*. Yerevan: Gitutyun (In Arm.).
- Gradovsky A. 1873. *The national question in history and literature*. Saint Petersburg: Typography of A.Transhel (In Russian).

⁶¹ Ormanyan 1879, N 2231.

Habermas J. 2002. The European nation-state: its achievements and limits. About the past and future of sovereignty and citizenship, in Nations and Nationalism. Moscow: Praxis, 346-351 (In Russian).

Hobsbaum E. J. 2002. The principle of ethnicity and nationalism in modern Europe, in Nations and Nationalism. Moscow: Praxis, 332-346 (In Russian).

Hyubner K. 2001. Nation: from oblivion to rebirth. Moscow: Kanon+; IO Reabilitacia (In Russian).

Kant I. 1965. Metaphysics of Morals. 2 parts, in six volumes, Vol. 4. Moscow: Misl (In Russian).

Mirumyan K. 2006. History of political teachings. Yerevan: Zangak-97 (In Arm.).

Sargsyan S. 2001. The human problem in 19th century Armenian philosophical and social Thought. Yerevan: Vanevan (In Arm.).

Sarvazyan L. 2011. The idea of national unity in the political teaching of Maghakia Ormanyan, in Armenia, Finance and Economics. Yerevan, 60-64 (In Arm.).

Ormnyan M. 1879a Union of Armenians (Lecture). Constantinople: (In Arm.).

Ormnyan M. 1879b. The soul of Armenians (Lecture), Constantinople: (In Arm.).

Ormnyan M. 1879c. Armenian past, present and future (Lecture), Masis, Constantinople, N 2230-2240 (In Arm.).

Ormnyan M. (Tirayr) 1879. Bibliographical. Minas Cheraz. Armenia and Italy, Masis, N 2316 (In Arm.).

Ormnyan M. 1880a. Armenian Nationality (Lecture), Constantinople: (In Arm.).

Ormnyan M. 1880b Armenian Youth (Lecture), Constantinople: (In Arm.).

Ormnyan M. 1888a. Etchmiadzin, Part A, Ararat, St. Etchmiadzin, Number A, 5-13 (In Arm.).

Ormnyan M. 1888b. We miss you (Lecture), Constantinople: (In Arm.).

Ormnyan M. 1910. Archbishop, Memorial book of the two decades Patriarchate, Book 1, Constantinople: (In Arm.).

Translated from Armenian by G. Harutyunyan

The article was delivered on 18.03.2024, reviewed on 25.04.2024, accepted for publication on 22.06.2024.