

THE PROBLEM OF ARMENIAN STATEHOOD AND HUNCHAKYAN POLITICAL PARTY (1918-1921)

Gegham Hovhannisyan*

Abstract

At the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, during the rise of the national liberation movement of the Armenian people, the restoration of national statehood became one of the priority issues of the Armenian social and political thought. There were fundamental conditions for this. During the First World War, the overthrow of the Russian autocracy and the collapse of the empire, the defeat of Ottoman Turkey and the creation of the First Republic of Armenia made possible to restore the lost Armenian statehood in the territory of historical Armenia and the solution of the Armenian Question more realistic. In that period, each of the Armenian national-political circles had its own point of view regarding the political orientation of the Armenian people, the structure, character, and territory of the national state.

The article presents the Hunchakyan party's approach to the issue. The influence of the international-political events of the time on the fate of the Armenian people and the evolution of the Hunchakyan's views on the issues of Armenian statehood are presented. The above-mentioned was most completely and consistently expressed in the "Young Armenia" periodical, the press organ of the American branch of the Social Democratic Hunchakyan Party (hereafter SDHP).¹ In the context of the problem, the issues related to the mandate of Armenia, the policies adopted by Azerbaijan and Georgia towards the First Republic of Armenia, threats to Armenian statehood are discussed. Chronologically, the article covers the period between 1918 and 1921. In order to avoid the political mistakes made in the recent period of our history, to get rid of romantic delusions, and at the same time, in terms of developing the right strategy for the development of national statehood, the article can have a scientific-cognitive and guiding significance. The relevance of the topic lies in the fact that Armenian statehood faced challenges that have many similarities with the political problems of more than a century ago.

Keywords: Armenian statehood, "Young Armenia", Stepan Sapah-Gyulyan, Republic of Armenia, Paris Assembly, Russia, Hunchakyan Party, Soviet Armenia.

* Senior researcher at the Institute of History, NAS RA PhD in Historical Sciences, Associate Professor e-mail: gegham.hovhannisian@mail.ru

Received 17.09.2024, revised 20.10.2024, accepted 11.11.2024

© 2024 The Author(s). This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

¹ In Armenian historiography, the question was addressed by A. Kitur (Kitur 1962), R. Khurshudyan (Khurshudyan 1979), G. Hovhannisyan (Hovhannisyan 2014).

Establishment of the Republic of Armenia. The Armenian Question at the Paris Assembly and the Hunchakyan Party

In the last period of the First World War, 1917-1918, the imminent victory of the Entente over the German-Turkish alliance became evident. Under these conditions, the problem of restoring national statehood was gaining more and more resonance in the Armenian socio-political circles. The revolutions in Russia in 1917 gave it new momentum. However, after the Bolshevik coup, Western Armenia was occupied by Russia and the masses of Western Armenians in both Western and Eastern Armenia once again found themselves in a difficult situation. The invaluable achievement of the February Revolution was endangered, that is, the hopeful process of the establishment of national civil power in Western Armenia and the work of reconstruction.²

Transcaucasian political forces not recognizing the power of the Bolsheviks formed in Russia after the October Revolution, created a new body of local government in November 1917, the Transcaucasian Commissariat, which was replaced by the Transcaucasian Seim in February 1918. On April 9, 1918, the anti-Russian policy of the Georgian and Azerbaijani deputies of the Seim led to the secession of Transcaucasia from Russia. Infuriated by the decision of the Seim, the central administration of the Soviet Union in Tiflis published a leaflet in Armenian and Russian on April 11, 1918, in which it condemned the decision of the Seim to separate Transcaucasia from Russia, considering it a “great betrayal towards Russian revolution”. The leaflet accuses the counter-revolutionary nationalists and false socialists of the Transcaucasia, who united and severed ties with the Russian Democratic Republic, and by declaring the Transcaucasia an independent republic, adopted the “Turkish-German orientation” as the basis of its state-legal international status.³

This short-sighted policy of the Seim had disastrous consequences for the Armenian people. After secession from Russia, the Turks did not sign the promised peace agreement with the delegation of the Seim and, continuing the advance of their troops, recaptured Western Armenia and created a serious threat to the existence of the Transcaucasian Armenians.

After the fall of Kars and Alexandropol, on May 16, 1918, the Central Administration of the SDHP appeals to the Armenian people to put aside all contradictions, unite and fight “against the enemy invading the country”. It is said in the call that it is better to die with a weapon in hand for the achievements of the people and the revolution, “than to fall as a slave before the enemy’s sword and bullet”⁴. In the spring of 1918, the advance of the Turks in Transcaucasia further deepened the existing disagreements within the Seim, which ultimately led to its collapse and the creation of the republics of Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia.

² Melikyan 2019: 6.

³ NAA, fund 1456, inv. 1, list 216, sheet 2.

⁴ NAA, fund 1456, inv. 1, list 219, sheet 1.

On May 30, 1918, the Armenian National Council of Tiflis declared itself the supreme authority of the Armenian provinces of Transcaucasia. In this regard, the position of the Tiflis Hunchakyan Center is noteworthy, which in its call-leaflet of May 31 protests against that statement and demands the National Council to renounce all its powers. The Hunchakians propose to form “a new temporary National Council from an equal number of representatives of all political, revolutionary and socialist organizations”.⁵ The reason for the dissatisfaction of the Hunchakyan center was that the Armenian Revolutionary Federation members had a great influence in the Armenian National Council of Tiflis, for this reason it proposed forming a new National Council in which the Hunchakians would have an equal number of representatives with other Armenian political parties. Even on the eve of the First World War, Hunchakyan theorist S.Sapah-Gyulyan justified the idea of an autonomous Armenia. He believed that the great European powers “individually and collectively acquired the historical right to intervene and on that basis intervened in Turkey’s internal affairs.” According to him, in the process of its liberation, the Armenian nation has expectations from England, France, and Russia, which, at the behest of their political interests, have finally united to destroy the Ottoman state⁶. Historian Yeznik Cheredjian believes that it was during this period, especially in the 7th meeting of deputies of the SDHP held in Constanta in 1913, that the Hunchakyan party adopted the plan of creating an autonomous Armenia apart from Ottoman Turkey.⁷

According to the Hunchakians, the creation of the Republic of Armenia was only the first step for the Armenian statehood to become full-fledged. It is no coincidence that Hunchakians, like the Ramkavar Party and reorganized Hunchakians, put forward the term “The Ararat Republic”. The prominent Hunchakyan theorist S. Sapah-Gyulyan in his article “Recognition of the Ararat Republic” considered that the Entente states should recognize the “independence of the Ararat Armenian Republic while acknowledging that most of our historical motherland is still endangered”. The article cites the examples of Poland, Finland, Ukraine, whose independence was recognized by the Entente, not leaving the solution of the issue to the upcoming peace congress.⁸

In the autumn of 1918, on the eve of the victory of the Entente in the First World War, “Young Armenia”, the press organ of the American branch of the Hunchak Party, began to discuss extensively the issue of the restoration of Armenian statehood during the future peace assembly. It was emphasized the fact that the demands of the Armenian side should come down to the question of secession and independence of six vilayets and Cilicia from the Ottoman Empire⁹.

⁵ NAA, fund 1456, inv. 1, list 221, sheet 1.

⁶ Sapah-Gyulyan 1915: 64.

⁷ Djeredjian 2021: 384.

⁸ Yeritasard Hayastan, 1918, N 37, September 7.

⁹ Yeritasard Hayastan, 1918, N 48, October 16.

During the Paris Assembly, disagreements arose between Hunchakians and the National Delegation led by Poghos Nubar over the Cilicia issue. The Hunchakians, like the Ramkavars and the reorganized Hunchakians, supported the idea of including Cilicia in the United Armenian State.¹⁰ They severely criticized Poghos Nubar for leaving aside the original approach and, having reached an agreement with the delegation of the Republic of Armenia, refused to include Cilicia in the list of Armenian demands.¹¹ In the context of the discussed problem, Hunchakians also touched on the issue of Armenia's mandate. S. Sapah-Gyulyan believed that, regardless of the circumstances, of which state will take over the mandate (patronage) of Armenia, the colonial nature of the foreign policy of those states will not change, it will be the same as towards Armenia's "neighboring and distant states" and the politics of Armenia "will always be subject to the politics of the foreigner."¹²

The columnist of "Young Armenia" S. Shahen considers the policy receiving the patronage of any state for Armenia as an unforgivable mistake of the Armenian national delegation. According to him, the "sacred traditions" of the people of that country will be endangered under patronage, and the sponsoring state "will take all the riches of the motherland in its grip".¹³ Speaking about the issue of mandate, Sapah-Gyulyan's publications outline the mentality according to which the security and humanitarian justifications for taking small states under patronage by the powers are only the apparent side of the problem, and the deep goal was to create a coalition of small states against Russia. In this matter, the approach of the Georgian historian Menteshashvili who wrote that "according to the plans of the Entente, the Transcaucasian republics would act as a buffer between the RSFSR and the other countries of the East" is consistent with Sapah-Gyulyan's point of view.¹⁴

The question of the political orientation of the Armenian state, which was discussed by the Hunchakians, is an integral part of the discussed problem. For example, Sapah-Gyulyan believed that Armenia cannot become a tool in the hands of England and France and "enter into a coalition diametrically opposed to the permanent interests of the Armenian state, which would be against Bolshevik Russia".¹⁵ Hunchakian theoretician believed that if it is in the interests of Romania, Poland, Ukraine and other countries to join such a coalition, then the interests of Armenians are against it. According to him, the national interest requires that Armenians stay away from joining anti-Russian coalitions and, that Armenian soldiers should never take up arms against Russia at the instigation of a foreigner. Sapah-Gyulyan contrasted

¹⁰ NAA, fund 430, inv. 1, list 303, sheet 13.

¹¹ Yeritasard Hayastan, 1920, N 79, February 4.

¹² Yeritasard Hayastan, 1920, N 97, April 7.

¹³ Yeritasard Hayastan, 1919, N 11, June 7.

¹⁴ Menteshashvili 1996: 133.

¹⁵ Yeritasard Hayastan, 1920, N 97, April 7.

Bolshevik Russia with large capitalist states, which are in constant search for new markets loyal to their policies and new peoples and states that serve their interests.¹⁶

In the spring of 1920, Sapah-Gyulyan, who still had high expectations from the Paris Peace Assembly a year ago, wrote with deep disappointment: “The half-hearted decisions of the Congress of Versailles remained unfulfilled” and new conflicts arose.

Hence the conclusion that the principles of self-determination, justice, and freedom of the nations, so much repeated by the delegates of the European states at the Paris Assembly, were actually a cover for their hidden “imperialist interests, to mutilate and rob each other.” Speaking about the relationship between Armenia and the Entente, the famous leader of the White Movement, General Denikin, writes in his book “Essays on the Russian Time of Troubles” the following: “Armenian officials, who were not experienced in the political intrigues of international diplomacy, did not understand that none of the Entente countries was ready to shed blood for Armenians and that Colonel Haskell, who was appointed as the High Commissioner of the Entente in Armenia, had a pre-approved decision according to which no American soldiers would be sent to Armenia.”¹⁷ Denikin believed that the political course of the Armenians was “beneficial to the Pan-Turkish movement”.¹⁸

The fact that the Turks took advantage of this situation did not escape Sapah-Gyulyan’s attention. He believed that the Kemalist movement was directed equally against England, France, Italy and their allied countries, all of whom would suffer if they did not put aside their conflicts and defeat Turkish nationalism with joint forces. Realizing the threat posed to the Armenian people by the Kemal movement, the publicist wrote that “in this dangerous period, we will place our hopes exclusively on ourselves.”¹⁹ According to him, in order to fulfill this necessary condition, “the immediate duty of every Armenian will be to support the Republic of Armenia without paying attention to party affiliation”.²⁰ Sapah-Gyulyan was afraid that if the allies see a serious force on the side of the Turks, they will “remain silent” in case of their offensive actions²¹. Time has shown that approach was realistic.

At that time, “Young Armenia” discussed issues related to the state-political structure of United Armenia. The article “Armenian State Life” rejected the federal structure of the state and put forward the idea of “association of nations” (confederation - G.H.) as the correct form of interrelationship between nations.²²

The Hunchakyan periodical criticized those Armenian socialists who rejected the existence of the independent Republic of Armenia and sought to “reunite that part of our

¹⁶ Yeritasard Hayastan, 1920, N 97, April 7.

¹⁷ Nor Zhamanak, 2014, July 3.

¹⁸ Nor Zhamanak, 2014, July 3.

¹⁹ Yeritasard Hayastan, 1920, N 95, March 31.

²⁰ Yeritasard Hayastan, 1920, N 95, March 31.

²¹ Yeritasard Hayastan, 1920, N 95, March 31.

²² Yeritasard Hayastan, 1920, N 95, March 31.

liberated Motherland with Russia, which it called a retrogressive wish.” According to the periodical, “it was not necessary to boycott, but to give all support to its strengthening and prosperity”.²³

Hunchakians regarding threats to Armenian statehood

Hunchak periodicals also discussed the topic of threats to Armenian statehood. “Young Armenia” stated that the foreign policy of states is changeable and “does not have an eternal course. This is what the history of diplomacy has shown in general.”²⁴ The idea was emphasized that the small states should beware of the imperialist aspirations of the big states, which always use the small ones for their “internal, dark, long-term interests”²⁵.

Speaking about this issue, Sapah-Gyulyan considered that from the point of view of the interests of the Armenian state, “Bolshevik Russia is a thousand times better than Tsarist or Cadet Russia.” In the editorial article “Towards the Coming Storm”, Sapah-Gyulyan considered the White Movement a serious threat not only to “democratic Russia” but also to the “states emerging from the ruins” of the Russian Empire.²⁶ Sapah-Gyulyan wrote: “Bolsheviks, according to the right of peoples to self-determination, support the emergence of national states from the fragments of former Russia. The danger was coming to us and may come in the future from the Kolchaks, Denikins, Yudenichs and such people.”²⁷ Sapah-Gyulyan also did not trust the constitutional-democratic (Cadet) party, which, guided by the idea of “united and indivisible Russia”, after coming to power, would strive to “unite the former fragments” of Russia and re-establish the borders of Tsarist Russia.²⁸

The issue is also discussed in the “The Laborer” newspaper published in Tiflis by Hunchakians. In March 1919, when the White Movement was still on the rise, an article “Lenin and Denikin” put forward the idea that Denikin would not be able to unite “divided Russia” with his volunteer army, because the ideology he was guided by lacks vitality, therefore it cannot unite the peoples of Russia around it. Contrary to that, the “socialist world view” by Lenin has taken deep roots among the people of Russia. According to the article’s author (Abgar Payazat - G.H.), although the constituent peoples of Russia “deepened their aspirations towards self-determination” thanks to the revolution, they avoid Bolshevism, however, in case of a choice between Lenin and Denikin, they will

²³ Yeritasard Hayastan, 1920, N 90, March 13.

²⁴ Yeritasard Hayastan, 1920, N 90, March 13.

²⁵ Yeritasard Hayastan, 1920, N 90, March 13.

²⁶ Yeritasard Hayastan, 1919, N 18, July 2.

²⁷ Yeritasard Hayastan, 1920, N 90, March 13.

²⁸ Yeritasard Hayastan, 1920, N 90, March 13.

choose Lenin, because they see his ideas as the implementation tool for their national aspirations.²⁹

Referring to Georgia and Azerbaijan in the context of the discussed question, Hunchakyan theorist Sapah-Gyulyan considered that Armenia cannot ally with these states, because, according to him, “we cannot gain any advantage except for damage”³⁰. The article entitled “From the Slaughterhouse of Azerbaijan”, published in “The Laborer”, shows with a number of examples the cruelties and discriminatory treatment of the authorities of Musavat Azerbaijan towards Armenians³¹. Speaking about Azerbaijan, Sapah-Gyulyan writes that this republic is the “provincial base” of the Turkish-Tatar power, with which the Turkish world has high hopes “from the point of view of sinking the Armenian state.”³²

“Constituent Assembly of Georgia” editorial shows the violation of the rights of citizens of non-Georgian nationality by the Georgian authorities.³³

The article signed by Dr. Gnuni in “Young Armenia” shows that the Georgian authorities discriminate against Armenians and “subject the country to nationalization”.³⁴

The question of the relationship between Armenia and Soviet Russia and the Hunchakyan Party

In 1920, when the armies of Soviet Russia were getting closer and closer to the borders of the Transcaucasian republics, the relations between Russia and the Republic of Armenia, cooperation between Russia and Kemalist Turkey, and the political orientation of the Armenian state became urgent issue for Hunchakyan theorists. Sapah-Gyulyan saw no danger in the advance of Soviet Russia in the Caucasus. He wrote that the fact of Soviet Russia’s “being close to our borders, all will be more secure for us”³⁵. He naively believed that by accepting the right of nations to self-determination, the “friendly arm” of Soviet Russia would help to restore the borders of the “Armenian National State, which starts from the Caspian Sea and extends to the Mediterranean, from the Black Sea to Mesopotamia.”³⁶

Addressing the issue of rapprochement between Soviet Russia and Kemalist Turkey, Sapah-Gyulyan showed that there is no ideological agreement there. “The problem is essentially a political compromise,” he wrote, “and that rapprochement was made on the basis of the hostility that both sides have towards the Entente (G.H.)

²⁹ Ashkhatavor, 1919, N1, March 24.

³⁰ Yeritasard Hayastan, 1920, N 81, February 11.

³¹ Ashkhatavor, 1919, N1, March 24.

³² Yeritasard Hayastan, 1919, N 26, July 30.

³³ Ashkhatavor, 1919, N1, March 24.

³⁴ Yeritasard Hayastan, 1920, N 81, February 11.

³⁵ Yeritasard Hayastan, 1920, N 99, April 14.

³⁶ Yeritasard Hayastan, 1920, N 99, April 14.

states, each from its own point of view.”³⁷ The Hunchakyan theoretician was far from the idea that by approaching the Bolsheviks, the Kemalists aimed to establish the Soviet order in their country with their help, and rightly believed that the Turkish nationalists only wanted to use the forces of Soviet Russia to advance their nationalist goals. Having this circumstance in front of his eyes, the Hunchakyan figure emphasized that by reaching an agreement with the Kemalists, “Soviet Russia lost a lot of its credit and charm... it was a mistake and that mistake will be felt even more tomorrow.”³⁸

On this and a number of other issues, Alexander Myasnikyan waged an ideological struggle against the Armenian national parties, particularly Hunchakians. According to Myasnikyan, Hunchakians could not understand “why it is necessary to help the awakening Tajkistan now”³⁹.

Speaking about the Armenian-Russian relations, Sapah-Gyulyan was based on the belief that Armenia is one of the “external bases” of Soviet Russia, if not today, it will be such tomorrow⁴⁰. The bulletin of the Central Executive Committee of the CPSU of September 10, 1920 addressed to Lenin, the Central Executive Committee of the RSFSR, and the Comintern fits into this logic. Here, the difficult military-political situation of the Republic of Armenia, the threats it faces, and the friendly disposition of the Armenian people towards Soviet Russia are presented. In this situation, the Hunchakyan party considers it necessary in the bulletin “in order for Armenia not to appear in the camp of British imperialism, not to join the anti-Soviet coalitions in the East”:

- a) recognition of the independence of the Republic of Armenia by Soviet Russia,
- b) recognition of Karabakh and Zangezur as inseparable parts of the Republic of Armenia.

If, for various reasons, Soviet Russia does not consider its implementation possible, then to give these provinces autonomy under the direct control of Russia, until the final solution of the issue of reunification with Armenia. It is noted that in any case, Karabakh and Zangezur should never be included in the composition of Azerbaijan, because it contradicts the will of the local working population, which has repeatedly expressed its desire for reunification with Armenia.

For the fair solution of the Armenian Question, the Hunchakyan party believed that Soviet Russia would take steps to “connect Turkish Armenia to the Ararat Republic, providing access to the Black Sea. Independent Armenia can survive, develop economically and politically only in such territorial conditions, otherwise, the enclosure in the Yerevan-Alexandrapol-Kars triangle will condemn the country to destruction.”⁴¹

³⁷ Yeritasard Hayastan, 1920, N 55, October 22.

³⁸ Yeritasard Hayastan, 1920, N 55, October 22.

³⁹ Martuni 1924: 109.

⁴⁰ Yeritasard Hayastan, 1920, N 55, October 22.

⁴¹ NAA, fund 1456, inv. 1, list 241, sheet 18.

In the autumn of 1920, on the one hand, the defeat in the Armenian-Turkish war, on the other hand, the diplomatic pressure of Soviet Russia put Armenian republic in a desperate situation. Under these conditions, in November 1920, the conference of the Georgian branch of the Hunchakyan Party was held in Tiflis. Examining the current alarming and desperate situation of Armenia, the assembly adopted a resolution at the November 11 session, according to which the only way out to save the Armenian people from final destruction, to protect their physical existence and independence was considered to be the “overthrow of the regime in Armenia and the establishment of the worker-peasant Soviet government”.⁴²

After the establishment of the Soviet rule in Armenia, on December 9, 1920, the Armenian Legislative Committee appealed to the Yerevan branch of the SDHP to clarify the position of the Hunchakyan party regarding the change of power in Armenia and the international situation of Soviet Russia. On December 11, in a reply letter addressed to the Armenian Legislative Committee, the Hunchakians declare that they welcome the “coup carried out in Armenia and the established Soviet government”⁴³. In this article, the Yerevan branch of the SDHP also addresses the problems of the Soviet government in Armenia and gives priority to the issues of Armenia’s external situation, particularly Turkish-Armenian relations. The Hunchakians note that after the establishment of Soviet rule in Armenia, “there is no longer any reason for the troops of Mustafa Kemal, who declares himself a friend of Soviet Russia, to remain in the neighborhoods of Russia’s ally Soviet Armenia. There is no danger to him from the side of Soviet Armenia, because Soviet Armenia, having overthrown the previous government, has no imperialist aspirations, while the withdrawal of his (Kemal’s - G.H.) troops from the borders of Armenia will enable the national population who migrated from the occupied places to return to their place of residence”⁴⁴. At the end of the letter, the Hunchakians express their hope that “the proletariat of the Caucasus, with the support of Russia, will unite under the same flag, which will give everyone the opportunity to dedicate themselves to peaceful and constructive work.”⁴⁵

Speaking about the Soviet regime, Sapah-Gyulyan admitted that this regime is not free from flaws and should be criticized “with the view of creating the best”⁴⁶. He emphasized the idea that it is necessary to protect and support the socialist government of Armenia. Even on the eve of the February 1921 uprising, the unstable internal situation in Armenia leads the publicist to the correct conclusion that avoiding civil strife should be one of the priority tasks of the Armenian state. Sapah-Gyulyan tries to strengthen the idea of “historical necessity” of the Armenian people in the “Muslim-

⁴² NAA, fund 1456, inv. 1, list 244, sheet 1.

⁴³ NAA, fund 1456, inv.1, list 245, sheet 1.

⁴⁴ NAA, fund 1456, inv.1, list 245, sheet 1.

⁴⁵ NAA, fund 1456, inv.1, list 245, sheet 1.

⁴⁶ Yeritasard Hayastan, 1920, N 81, February 11.

Turan Ocean” to be with the Russian state⁴⁷. After 1921, the view of supporting Soviet Armenia is getting stronger among Hunchakians⁴⁸. Speaking about this issue, Ashot Melkonyan writes: “The attitude of Hunchakians towards Soviet Armenia was never hostile. Regardless of the political regime, they continued to perceive the Armenian SSR as a motherland, and in terms of status as an autonomous state entity within the Soviet Union.”⁴⁹

Conclusion

The victory of the Entente in the First World War, as well as the collapse of the Ottoman and Russian empires, made the possibility of the restoration of Armenian statehood more realistic, on which the Hunchakian party had its own point of view. They considered the First Republic of Armenia, established in 1918, to be the first step on the way to the creation of the United Armenian State. During the Paris Assembly, Hunchakians supported the idea of six Armenian vilayets and Cilicia separating from the Ottoman Empire and creating an independent state. They had a cautious approach to Armenia’s mandate. The Entente countries were considered to be self-serving and sought to form a coalition of small states against Bolshevik Russia. Hunchakian theorists believed that if it was in the interests of Ukraine, Poland, and Romania to join such a coalition, then it was harmful to the interests of Armenia and the Armenian people should stay away from joining anti-Russian coalitions.

On the way to the restoration of Armenian statehood, Hunchakians saw a great danger in the Kemalist movement and believed that the Entente countries would not take military action against Turkey.

The Hunchakians put forward the idea of confederation as the right form of people’s relationship. They criticized the Armenian socialists, who, rejecting the idea of Armenia’s independent existence, sought to unite the Republic of Armenia with Russia.

The Hunchakians also touched on the issue of threats our statehood faced. They considered Azerbaijan’s anti-Armenian policy a threat to Armenia. In addition, Hunchakian theorists saw a real danger in the White Movement of Russia and the political forces supporting it, which sought to restore a “united and indivisible” Russia.

The Hunchakians correctly understood the reasons for the Kemal-Bolshevik rapprochement and emphasized that the goals of Turkey were not to establish Soviet order in Turkey, but to achieve their political goals with the help of Soviet Russia.

Speaking about Karabakh, Hunchakians stressed that this territory should be an integral part of the Armenian state.

⁴⁷ Yeritasard Hayastan, 1920, N 81, February 11.

⁴⁸ NAA, fund 1456, inv. 1, list 254, sheet 1, list 272, sheet 1; Ardzaganq Parizi, 1924, N 3, April 27.

⁴⁹ Melkonyan 2022.

After the establishment of the Soviet rule in Armenia, the Hunchakians criticized the new government of Armenia in some issues, but generally supported it, because they saw the realization of their socialist ideals in the Soviet order.

Some views of Hunchakians regarding Armenian statehood in 1918-1920, the political orientations of the Armenian people and threats to Armenia have modern repercussions today.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARCHIVES AND NEWSPAPERS

NAA - National Archives of Armenia (Yerevan).

Ardzaganq Parizi (Paris, in Arm.).

Ashhatavor (Tiflis, in Arm.).

Nor Zhamanak (Yerevan, in Russian).

Yeritasard Hayastan (Chicago, in Arm.).

STUDIES

Djeredjyan Ye. 2021. The concept of independence and its activity, Proceedings of the “100th Anniversary of the First Republic of Armenia”. Materials of scientific conference. Antelias: Armenian Catholicosate of the Great House of Cilicia publishing house (In Arm.).

Hovhannisyan G. 2014. The History of Hunchak party (1887-1915). Yerevan: Institute of History (in Arm.).

Khurshudyan R. 1979. February Revolution and the Hunchak Party, Lraber hasarakakan gitutyunneri 1979/1, 18-28 (in Russian).

Kitur A. 1962 (ed.). The History of S.D. Hunchak party (1887-1962). Vol.1. Beirut: Shirak (in Arm.).

Martuni A. (A.Myasnikyan) 1924. Parties Among Armenians of Diaspora. Tiflis: Pethrat (In Arm.).

Melikyan V.H. 2019. The Defence of Erzerum and Causes of its Fall. 1918. Yerevan: Zangak (In Arm.).

Melkonyan A. 2022. The Idea of the Independence of Armenia in the Hunchakian Party Program Documents, VEM Armenological Journal 2022/ 3, 61-97 (In Arm.).

Menteshashvili A. 1996. Georgian Democratic Republic (1918-1921) and Western Powers, Problems of History 1996/9, 129-135 (In Russian).

Sapah-Gyulyan S. 1915. Autonomous Armenia. Cairo: Terteryan (In Arm.).

Translated from Armenian by Gevorg Harutyunyan