

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.46991/AFA/2025.21.1.207>

THE REFLECTION OF THE IDEA OF REPATRIATION OF THE ARMENIAN DEPORTEES IN *DJAGADAMART (BATTLE), HAIRENIK (HOMELAND) AND ASBAREZ (ARENA)* PERIODICALS IN 1920

Lilit Hovhannisyan*

<https://orcid.org/0009-0007-7896-3922>

Institute of History of NAS RA, Armenia

In 1920, the periodicals *Djagadamart* (Constantinople) and *Hairenik* (Boston), *Asbarez* (Fresno) published an interesting analysis on the issue of returning deported Armenians to their homeland. The political sections of newspapers emphasized the significance of addressing the issues related to the deprivation of the Armenians from their homeland, their exile, and their right to return within the context of the current Middle East situation. They have also covered the Paris International Peace Conference, the Eastern policies of the Allied Powers, and the foreign policy pursued by the First Republic of Armenia. In this context, the publications regarding the Sevres Treaty signed on August 10, 1920 and the Arbitral Award of the U.S. President Woodrow Wilson regarding the Armenian-Turkish border on November 22nd are of particular interest. These periodicals have made valuable contributions to clarifying safeguards for the safety and security of Western Armenians, and promoting ideas for an Independent and United Armenia. Challenges to the concept of repatriating deported Armenians back to their homeland have also been raised in the pages of the above-mentioned publications. The topic is relevant as the periodicals *Djagadamart*, *Hairenik*, *Asbarez* are being presented for the first time within the context of discussing the issue of repatriation of deported Armenians.

Keywords: *Western Armenia, Republic of Armenia, Cilicia, Armenian Genocide, homeland, idea of an Independent and United Armenia.*

Introduction

The restoration of Armenia's independence in 1991 and the 100th commemoration of the Armenian Genocide in 2015 were pivotal events that formed the basis for significant conceptual changes in Armenian historiography. The beginning of comprehensive study of the consequences of the Armenian Genocide and the historical

* lilit.hovhannisyan@isec.am

Received: 28.09.2024

Revised: 31.01.2025

Accepted: 07.02.2025



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

© The Author(s) 2025

and legal basis for their redress, as well as the Armenian Question and the Armenian Cause has been laid. For over a century, significant scientific and theoretical research has been conducted in this area both in Armenia and within the Armenian Diaspora. The ultimate practical aim of this work is to facilitate the repatriation of the Armenian deportees and their descendants to their ancestral homeland (Hovhannisyan, 2020; Hovhannisyan, 2022, pp. 469-478; Hovhannisyan, 2023, pp. 306-326; Hovhannisyan, 2024, pp. 100-130; "The documents of the diplomatic representative of Armenia Ferdinand Takhtachyan in Vatican archive", 2023; Sahakyan, L., Voskanyan, A., & Sargsyan, A., 2024).

The purpose of this study is to elucidate the issues of depriving the Armenian people of their historical homeland and the right to return to their ancestral lands through political publications of three reputable Armenian periodicals - *Djagadamart* (Constantinople), *Hairenik* (Boston), *Asbarez* (Fresno), in 1920. It should be noted that the selection of the date is not arbitrary. The year 1920 is of significant importance to the Armenian people and their independent statehood.

Picture 1: Hairenik (Boston)



Picture 2: Asbarez (Fresno)



Picture 3: Djagadamart (Constantinople)



The selection of newspapers is determined by their credibility among readers, their ability to maintain national issues at the forefront and consistently report on them, and the frequency of their publication.

The national, literary, political, and socio-scientific daily newspaper *Hairenik* is the central organ of ARF Dashnaksutyun in America. It was founded in New York in 1890 and has been published continuously since 1900,

based in Boston.

Published since 1908 in Fresno, the national, political and literary three-day newspaper *Asbarez* is the organ of the Central Committee of the ARF Dashnaksutyun of Western America.

The political, literary, and national daily newspaper *Djagadamart* (1914-1915 and 1918-1924) and, since 1924, *Marmara*, stood out among Armenian periodicals published in Constantinople as an exponent of the sentiments and aspirations of Western Armenian refugees from the Armenian Genocide in Turkey.

Research problems:

- to analyse the situation in the Middle East,
- to explain the anti-Armenian policy of the Allied Powers at the Paris International Peace Conference,
- to appreciate the foreign policy of the First Republic of Armenia. In this sense, the publications in the mentioned newspapers on the Sevres Peace Treaty of August 10, 1920, and the Arbitral award of the U.S. President Woodrow Wilson of November 22 on the boundary between Turkey and Armenia, which constitute the international legal framework for resolving the Armenian Question,
- to present the work of the *Hairenik*, *Asbarez*, *Djagadamart* on assessing the losses and damages suffered by the Armenian population as a result of the Armenian Genocide, to express the expectations of Armenians from the Diaspora regarding the Paris Conference's efforts to ensure the safety of the lives and property of Western Armenians, also to present the work of periodicals in order to promote the realization of the vision of an Independent and United Armenia,
- to present the arguments against the idea of repatriation of the Armenian deportees, according to the mentioned newspapers.

The topic is relevant as periodicals *Hairenik*, *Asbarez*, *Djagadamart* are being presented for the first time within the context of the discussion regarding the repatriation of the Armenian deportees to their homeland and the establishment of an Independent and United Armenian state. The issues raised in the article and the materials presented complement the valuable work done in the direction of studying the history of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation (ARF Dashnaksutyun) periodical press in Constantinople (Hovsepyan, 2009; 2016; 2020). Given the limited scope of the scientific article, the problem of repatriation of the Armenian deportees is presented in the work in terms of the implementation of the idea for an Independent and United Armenia, and through the publications of the above mentioned three periodicals, which were most influential among Western Armenians and representing the nationwide political force - ARF Dashnaksutyun.

The study was carried out using both general and special professional research methods.

An independent and united Armenia as a nationwide goal

As a result of the Armenian Genocide in Western Armenia and other areas with significant Armenian populations within the Ottoman Empire, approximately 1.5 million Armenians were killed, forcibly deported, and died along the routes of deportation or in the deserts of Mesopotamia¹. This accounted for approximately two thirds of Western Armenians and approximately one third of the overall Armenian population at the time. In fact, the defenseless and unarmed Armenian people suffered as many casualties in their homeland, far from any front lines, as the United Kingdom, Italy, and the United States combined did on the European and Asian battlefields (Tarle, 1928, p. 182). However, the atrocities did not end there. Approximately 200.000 Armenians were forcefully converted to Islam (Simonyan, 1986, pp. 360-361). As a result of the massacre and deportation, a significant wave of exile arose. In 1915-1916, approximately one million Armenians were compelled to leave their homeland and seek refuge elsewhere (Brook, 1986, p. 776). Cultural genocide was also a characteristic of the destruction of Armenians. The Armenian spiritual and material heritage was destroyed and plundered (NAA, f. 450, list 2, dossier 88, p. 49; "The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, 1915-1916", 1916, pp. 291-292).

In Van, Mush, Sasun, Shapin-Garahisar, and Urfa, as well as on Musa Dagh Mountain, Armenians have mounted heroic resistance against regular Turkish armed forces and bands, saving numerous lives. However, it should be noted that, in the context of the genocide and deportations, which became state policy, they only temporarily postponed the eviction of Armenians from their native territories. The Armenians were not entirely expelled from Constantinople, except for those who were deported and killed in April 1915. They were also not expelled from Adrianople and Izmir due to the presence of diplomatic missions from various countries in these cities, since the policies of the Ottoman government towards the Armenians would have attracted the attention of the international community. The fact that the Armenians in Constantinople largely maintained their financial, economic and socio-political standing is supported by the extensive content and prominent publications of the *Djagadamart* in 1920.

It should be noted that during the Ittihadist and Kemalist governments, Muslims were resettled with incredible speed and fervor to the Western Armenian territories desolated in 1915-1918 and the Eastern Armenian territories occupied in 1918 and 1920. This was done because the return of Armenian refugees would have changed the demographic composition of the depopulated Armenian territories (*Djagadamart*, 2.I.1920, 7.III.1920; Hakobyan, 2002, p. 220). And in this regard, they were not in any way constrained by the Mudros Armistice of October 30, 1918. The question is that, according to Article 11 of the Armistice, the Ottoman Empire was "withdrawing" its troops from the occupied territories in Transcaucasia. Therefore, Armenia, as the legal successor to the Russian Empire in the region, was restoring its pre-war borders,

including the Kars region. However, the six provinces of Western Armenia that make up the majority of Armenia were not occupied by Allied forces, despite the fact that there were more moral and legal justifications for this than for the occupation of other Asian territories of the Ottoman Empire. Furthermore, in accordance with Article 24 of the Mudros Armistice, the Turkish troops were assigned responsibility for maintaining order in the Armenian provinces until the final determination of their status by the International Peace Conference. The occupation of the Armenian provinces by the Allied forces was only contemplated in the event of “disturbances” there. Turkish forces remained in Western Armenia as a police force, which was intended to prevent resolution of the Armenian Question on the basis of the Soviet decree “On Turkish Armenia”. In fact, in Western Armenia, the main population of which was subjected to genocide, all foreigners were armed, with the exception of the victims, who were brave soldiers of the armies of the United States, France and Russia during the First World War (“The Genocide of Armenians”, 2002, № 348, p. 330). This was the essence of the new course of British foreign policy. The fact is that the Allied Powers, especially Great Britain, feared the penetration of the threat of Bolshevism into Western Armenia, from where the way opened to the oil-rich countries of the Middle East. In order to prevent the threat of the spread of Bolshevism, they intended to use the factor of Turkish nationalism. This involved refraining from making final decisions on matters related to Western Armenia, which has an important strategic location and significance. They were prepared, if necessary, to re-establish Turkish control over the Armenian territories (Djagadamart, 28.I.1920; Hovhannisyan, 2020, pp. 286-287).

At the same time, the signing of the Mudros Armistice radically changed the course of the Armenian Question. The newly established Republic of Armenia, emerging from the constraints of the 1918 Brest-Litovsk and Batum Peace Treaties, gained the opportunity, with support from the Allied Powers, to permanently and irrevocably sever its ties with Turkish control (Avetisyan, 1997, p. 328).

Attitude towards the policy of the Allied Powers

In 1920, Armenian periodicals were devoting significant attention to the policies of the Allied Powers regarding the Armenian Question, analyzing issues related to Armenian independence, borders, and international protection towards Republic of Armenia. According to the observations of the newspaper *Djagadamart*, the Paris Peace Conference postponed the conclusion of a peace treaty with Turkey. And this is in the case when the fate of Turkey, as a direct consequence of the war, should have been determined long ago. This means that not only Turkey, but the entire Islamic world, immediately after the war, had to be brought to political and criminal responsibility for both war crimes and crimes committed against humanity and civilization. Meanwhile, due to the inconsistency and connivance of the Allied Powers, a year after the signing of the Mudros Armistice, the voice of the criminals sounded more powerful than the

cry of the victims. Moreover, the Turkish “Milli”, that is Kemalist movement, as well as Azerbaijan were not only making territorial claims against Armenia, but also demonstrating their desire to connect with each other through the territory of Armenia (*Djagadamart*, 3.I.1920, 15.II.1920).

From the perspective of the *Djagadamart*, Constantinople could only remain under Turkish control if strict international oversight of the Black Sea straits were in place. Furthermore, given the bloody history of the Ottoman Empire, the newspaper was emphasizing the need to remove all territories with a predominately Christian population from Turkish control, grant them independent status, and place them under international protection. From this point of view, first of all, Armenia was meant (*Djagadamart*, 13.I.1920). At the same time, newspaper was highly appreciating the decision of the leaders of the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan on de facto recognition of the Republic of Armenia during the meeting of the Paris Peace Conference on January 19, 1920. It also was noting that the restoration of independent Armenian state in the eastern part of historical Armenia was the first victory of Armenian people on the way to the complete liberation of Armenia and the realization of its long-standing dream of independence on its historical homeland, based on the nationwide physical, material, and moral potential (*Djagadamart*, 27.I.1920, 28.I.1920, 1.II.1920, 3.II.1920).

According to *Djagadamart*, the establishment of an Independent and United Armenia was in line with the military, political, and economic interests of the Allied Powers in the East, as it could serve as a buffer against Soviet Russia (*Djagadamart*, 3.II.1920). However, the newspaper failed to recognize that the Eastern policy of the Allies was anti-Armenian in its essence as much as it had anti-Soviet nature. The question is that under the guise of the anti-Soviet struggle, the Ittihadists, and then the Kemalists, with the support of the Allied Powers, consistently were restoring Turkey, continuing the policy of pan-Turkism and the Armenian Genocide. Although the Turks outwardly were not opposing the independence of Armenia, they were promoting the argument that the idea of Greater Armenia was impractical. They were arguing that Armenians had not formed a majority in the region prior to the World War and, therefore, it would be impossible to gather them in Armenia (*Djagadamart*, 28.I.1920). The *Djagadamart* had another problem from this point of view: “Armenia must remain within its borders in order to ensure its ability to defend itself, take advantage of economic development opportunities and have access to the sea” (*Djagadamart*, 25.III.1920, 4.VIII.1920).

In several issues of the newspaper *Asbarez* a central place is given to the analysis and assessment of the Middle Eastern policy of the Allied Powers. The periodical criticizes the policy of the Great Powers towards the Republic of Armenia and Cilicia and exposes their self-interested nature (*Asbarez*, 9.IV.1920).

The road to independence

Fully supporting the foreign policy of the Republic of Armenia on the Armenian Question, the *Djagadamart* was emphasizing the importance of the national factor in international relations on its pages.

In particular, the newspaper was pointing out that every Cause of liberation, including the Armenian Cause, has impulses acting in two directions: external and internal. The second is the most important, as the interests of the Great Powers in the destiny of other nations are conditioned by their self-serving objectives. From this perspective, the newspaper retrospectively was criticizing the idea of an All-Armenian Congress proposed by the head of the National delegation Boghos Nubar, regarding it as being short-sighted. It should be noted that the proposal to convene the congress was made following the adoption of a policy decision on the establishment of an Independent and United Armenia and the principle of “one nation, one homeland” at the Second Congress of Western Armenians, which was held in Yerevan from February 6 to 13, 1919. The All-Armenian Congress took place from February 24th to April 22nd, 1919, in Paris, with the goal of unifying the interests of Armenian colonies, the Armenians of Western Armenia and the Caucasus on the Armenian Question (*Djagadamart*, 1.I.1920; Poghosian, 2004, pp. 162-170).

Appreciating the resolute actions of the Government and the army to directly regulate relations with the states bordering Armenia, the newspaper stressed the importance of consolidating the national potential around Armenia in terms of failure of the Wilson foreign policy, the lengthy discussions of Armenia’s mandate at the Paris Peace Conference, also the position of Armenian national and political circles to link the solution of the Armenian Question exclusively with the Allied Powers (*Djagadamart*, 1.I.1920). The newspaper also was emphasizing that the external threat to Armenian statehood will exist until the national goals of the Armenian people are partially achieved. The risk may increase significantly if the Armenian people is unsuccessful in its sacred struggle for self-defense, security, and victory in the Armenian Cause (*Djagadamart*, 28.I.1920, 19.II.1920). The *Djagadamart* calls for the principle of “first we, own abilities and sacrifices, and then the assistance of friendly large and small nations.” (*Djagadamart*, 1.I.1920). Furthermore, the newspapers *Djagadamart* and *Hairenik* were emphasizing the importance of being realistic and showing solidarity (*Djagadamart*, 2.I.1920, 10.I.1920, 11.I.1920; *Hairenik*, 15.V.1920).

The significance of organizing mass repatriation of the Armenian deportees was also highlighting the pages of *Djagadamart* and *Hairenik* (*Djagadamart*, 26.II.1920; *Hairenik*, 4.VI.1920). The *Hairenik* was expressing regret that, under the circumstances of de facto recognition of Armenia, rather than rebuilding the homeland, the Western Armenians were embarking on a path of voluntary migration to Constantinople or Izmir and from there to European countries (*Hairenik*, 12.X.1920). The periodical was suggesting that the underlying reason for this trend was the ongoing

confrontation between Western and Eastern Armenians (*Djagadamart*, 28.II.1920; *Hairenik*, 24.VI.1920, 26.VI.1920, 6.X.1920, 12.X.1920, 15.X.1920, 17.X.1920, 20.X.1920, 21.X.1920, 31.X.1920, 2.XI.1920, 10.XI.1920, 12.XI.1920, 14.XI.1920, 17.XI.1920, 18.XI.1920, 10.XII.1920).

Picture 4: Djagadamart



The position of the *Hairenik* on the issue of Armenian Cause content is clear. According to it, during the period from the end of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878 to the outbreak of World War I, the content of the issue of Western Armenian provinces was limiting to the implementation of reforms and the establishment of national autonomy under the Ottoman rule. And this was not a formulation of a national demand, but a resolution forcefully adopted in a format that is understandable to the diplomatic community. Prior to the war, there had been no question of the independence of Western Armenia, despite it being a national aspiration of the Armenian people. Therefore, according to the newspaper's report, the assertion that the process of Western Armenia's independence begins with the 1878 Treaty of San Stefano is completely unhistorical. The issue of the independence of both Western and Eastern Armenia arose following the World War. At the same time, had the Quadruple Alliance won the war, even the autonomy of Western Armenia would not have become a reality, let alone independence. At the same time, had the tsarist regime not been overthrown, the issue of Eastern Armenia would not exist. It was due to the collapse of the tyrannical regimes in Turkey and Russia that the issue of the independence of historic Armenia arose. Consequently, according to the newspaper, our position is unified. The periodical's stance was a definitive response to those who have attempted to separate the issues of Eastern and Western Armenia (*Hairenik*, 10.I.1920).

The issue of the Armenian-Kurdish agreement

While some Armenians had chosen to emigrate to other countries rather than exercise their rights and strengthen their ancestral homeland, the issue of the Armenian-Kurdish agreement was brought to the agenda of the Paris Peace Conference at the request of Kurdish representatives. Considering the vast majority of Kurdish people in Western Armenia compared to Armenians, considering the Armenian demand for Western Armenia and Cilicia to be extreme on this basis, as well as calculating its harmful and disastrous consequences for Turkey, Chairman of the Kurdish delegation Sherif Pasha

suggested that Boghos Nubar enter into an agreement which would ensure peaceful coexistence between Armenians and Kurds in Western Armenia (Djagadamart, 28.II.1920).

On November 20, 1919, an Armenian-Kurdish joint memorandum was submitted to the Paris Peace Conference (Sasuni, 1969, p. 235). It was signed by Boghos Nubar, the Deputy Chairman of the Delegation of the Republic of Armenia H. Ohanjanyan² and Sherif Pasha (Poghosian, 2004, p. 148). The memorandum called for the independence of the two nations and the authority of any state to assist in rebuilding these newly independent countries. The issue of borders, however, was left to the discretion of the Peace Conference. According to the *Djagadamart*, the memorandum was the outcome of a “shrewd game” by Sherif Pasha. In recognition of the unquestionable right of the Armenian people to self-determination, the Kurdish leader in turn granted Nubar Pasha acknowledgment of the existence of Kurdistan within Western Armenia, thus negating the rights of Armenian deportees to repatriate to their ancestral homeland. The newspaper strongly criticized Boghos Nubar, calling on the government and parliament of Armenia to hold him accountable, along with A. Aharonyan and H. Ohanjanyan (Djagadamart, 28.II.1920). It should be noted that the experience of the Armenian-Kurdish agreement was not further developed. First, Sherif Pasha did not represent the will of the entire Kurdish population. Then, he left the Kurdish national delegation shortly after and became a member of the pro-Turkish party, hoping to become Prime Minister of Turkey (Poghosian, 2004, p. 149). It is also possible that the government of Turkey was behind this agreement.

According to the *Hairenik* newspaper, the British plan to transfer Cilicia and a part of southern Armenia to France and establish an independent Kurdish state on most of the territory of Armenia was a dangerous prospect that could lead to the division of Armenia between France, the Kurds, and Armenians (*Hairenik*, 13.I.1920).

The issue of Cilicia

In the pages of the *Hairenik* a special focus is given to the issue of Cilicia. With reference to the declaration of independence of Cilicia on May 4, 1920, under the mandate of France, the newspaper stresses that Cilicia forms an integral part of independent and united Armenia (*Hairenik*, 24.VII.1920). The newspaper’s articles analyze in detail France’s policies in Cilicia and reveal the Franco-British contradictions in Turkey following the collapse of the Russian Empire and the termination of secret Anglo-Franco-Russian agreements. Consequently, and also with the aim of disrupting the establishment of absolute British influence in Turkey. France has begun to pursue an anti-Armenian policy in order to create a stronger Turkey (*Hairenik*, 1.VIII.1920). According to the *Hairenik*, France sought to acquire not only the territories that were transferred to it in accordance with the secret Anglo-Franco-Russian agreements of 1915-1916, but also those possessions that were previously

transferred to Russia. It is not a coincidence that Colonel Chardinier, who was in the Russian officer corps in Transcaucasia, advised Armenians to be content with Western Armenia. The newspaper refers to a statement made by the French Vice-Consul in Tiflis in July 1918, which stated that the Armenians had been fortunate that the United States had entered the war, as the situation for Armenians would likely have been much worse had the U.S. not become involved. They could not rely on the Allied Powers, in particular France, as the latter had strong ties with the East and would likely have forgotten about Armenia after the armistice (Hairenik, 14.X.1920).

There is one conclusion to be drawn: France did not wish for Armenians to exist as an independent nation. France relied upon the Turkish element, as it had strength. Naturally, in order to maintain its dominance in Cilicia, France had to take care not only of the Armenians but also of the Turks, upon whom its Middle Eastern plans were dependent. The French government initially monitored the concentration of Armenian refugees in Cilicia with a certain degree of calmness, based on the assumption that the descendants of those Armenians who were killed or exiled may not only have no political ambitions, but also would not be able to improve their economic situation in the next 50 years. Consequently, they were considered harmless and could potentially be used as a source of cheap labor. Only the Armenian Legionary Army was seen as a potentially dangerous element. It is not a coincidence that the French government disbanded the Armenian Legion, to the detriment of Cilician security. And, when, shortly thereafter, the Armenians began to reawaken to economic and cultural life, they became undesirable to the French government as well, which became more apparent after the British withdrawal, despite the British having set a condition for the French to ensure the safety of the Armenians. However, this did not deter the Turks from continuing their actions. The massacre at Marash occurred, and after the signing of a peace treaty with Turkey, France did not only fail to withdraw from Cilicia but also increased its military presence there in an effort to reinforce its position. But now the Turks had become the mainstay for this purpose. All attempts by Armenians to gain autonomy were thwarted by the French authorities themselves. Following August 4, when the French government refused to cooperate with Mihran Tamatyan, relations of the Armenians with France became strained (Hairenik, 14.X.1920).

The Hairenik had warned about the challenging situation in Cilicia, including the closure of prominent Armenian newspapers, France's plans to withdraw its forces from the region and leave the Armenians to fend for themselves. It was also noted that French forces, which were drawn from various parts of Cilicia, had concentrated in cities such as Adana, Mersin and Tarson. The Armenians attempted to persuade the authorities to provide them with the means for self-defence. Cilicia was the only region in Turkey where the Armenians constituted a relative majority, and they could continue the unfinished work of the French in ensuring the security of the region and its over 100,000 Armenian inhabitants. Despite the Armenians' efforts, the French government refrained from granting them explicit privileges for such action. France had the right to maintain its troops in Cilicia until the ratification of the peace treaty. Instead, France

gradually withdrew its forces and attempted to negotiate with the Kemalists. When the French devastated Sis, Marash and other cities, the Armenian population moved to Adana, then to Mersin, and from there to Marseille. Already on October 14, 1920, the *Hairenik* published an alert regarding the arrest and deportation of Adana Union members by the French government's decision, as well as the imprisonment and exile of 500 Armenian volunteers. It had also been reported that 50,000 Armenian refugees had been ordered to leave Cilicia. Some of these refugees had arrived Mersin in a very deplorable condition. The Armenian militia had been eliminated. It was believed that the commander of this force, Shishmanyan, had also been deported. It was also likely that the diplomatic representative of the Armenian National delegation, Mihran Tamatyan, had been forcibly removed from the region (*Hairenik*, 14.X.1920, 17.X.1920).

In the Treaty of Sevres, the clause regarding the transfer of Cilicia to Turkish control was one of the most contentious issues for the Armenian side, which required revision. This decision dealt a significant blow to the predominantly Christian population of the region (Khaldean, Nestorian, Greek, Assyrian, and Armenian), who constituted the vast majority in the region. While the Christians did not directly object to the Turkish authorities, they did demand measures to ensure their personal safety and protection of property.

According to the Armenian side, one of the reasons for the increased threats to their security was the delay in the W. Wilson arbitration decision regarding the Armenian-Turkish border. In the absence of such a decision, Armenia did not have the legal basis to deploy troops to the Western Armenian territories transferred to its control under the terms of the peace treaty. As a result, Western Armenia remained under Turkish occupation. The Turks continued to consolidate their position and even prepared for an attack towards Kars.

The Armenians' only request to influential states was for them to arm the Armenian population. The newspaper *Hairenik* reported that the American Committee for Relief in the Near East was also going to recall its representatives from Adana. They were gradually replaced by Turkish gendarmes. Greece transported weapons to more than 100,000 Armenians of the region through Alexandretta (*Hairenik*, 12.X.1920, 14.X.1920).

The ongoing devastation of Cilicia is described in the October-December issues of the *Hairenik* (*Hairenik*, 29.X.1920, 30.X.1920, 31.X.1920, 9.XI.1920, 11.XI.1920, 13.XI.1920, 16.XI.1920, 25.XI.1920, 2.XII.1920, 3.XII.1920, 5.XII.1920, 9.XII.1920, 11.XII.1920, 14.XII.1920, 15.XII.1920, 17.XII.1920, 19.XII.1920). According to the newspaper, France was highly responsible for the suffering of the Armenians in Cilicia following 1918, the rise and success of the Kemalist movement, and the alignment of M. Kemal with the Bolsheviks (*Hairenik*, 29.XII.1920).

Conclusion

Thus, the Armenian press of the period under review is an important source for understanding the events that were of crucial significance for the fate of the Armenian people of 1920. Despite the mass massacres of Armenians in Ottoman Empire and their deportation from Western Armenia and Cilicia, as well as the absence of rapid and regular communication between Armenian Diaspora and the Republic (first) of Armenia, the press continued to report on Armenian national, socio-political, economic, and cultural life. At the same time, the daily newspaper *Djagadamat* was not inferior in terms of comprehensive and detailed coverage to *Hairenik* and *Asbarez* newspapers. Despite some bias that may be observed in publications regarding the fate of Cilicia and the diplomatic discussions on the Armenian Cause, in general, opinions and viewpoints expressed in newspapers' editorials and author's articles on specific topics raise national issues and priorities, reflect the realities of the time, and consider them from the perspective of national interests. All three newspapers focus on the issues of ensuring national unity, preserving and developing independent Armenian statehood. These issues boil down to fully meeting the demands of Armenians, or, in other words, to the idea of repatriation of the Armenians to their homeland.

Notes

1. Report from the Chargé d'Affaires in Constantinople (Radowitz) to the Reichskanzler (Bethmann Hollweg). Political Archives of the German Foreign Office,
2. The Chairman of the RA delegation, A. Aharonyan, was not present in Paris at the time, but upon his return he supported this decision.

Conflict of interests

The author declares no ethical issues or conflict of interests in this research.

Ethical standards

The author affirms this research does not involve human subjects.

References

Asbarez. (1920). Fresno.

Avetisyan, H. (1997). *The Armenian Question in 1918*. Yerevan: Higher school.

Barseghov, Yu. (Ed.) (2002). *The Genocide of Armenians: the responsibility of Turkey and the obligations of the world community. Documents and commentary* (Vol. 1). Moscow: Gardariki.

Brook, S.I. (1986). *World population. Ethnodemographic reference book* (2nd ed.). Moscow: Nauka.

Djagadamat. (1920). Constantinople.

Hakobyan, H.V. (2002). *Historical and legal foundations of the demand for the repatriation of the Armenian deportees*, Yerevan: Asoghik.

Hairenik, Boston, 1920.

Hovhannisyan, L. (2020). *The elucidation of the problems of history of the Armenian Question , 1915-1923, in historical science of the Republic of Armenia (1991-2015)*. Yerevan: Institute of History, NAS RA.

Hovhannisyan, L. (2022). The results of research on the Armenian Question in historical science of Armenia (1991-2021), *Fundamental and applied research. Current issues and achievements. Collection of scientific articles. International conference*. Yerevan: ISEC, NAS RA, 469-478.

Hovhannisyan, L.H. (2023). Internationalization of the Western Armenia Question in the evaluation of modern Armenian historical science (1996-2022), *Problems of competitive education and science in a changing world. International conference. Collection of scientific articles*. Yerevan: ISEC, NAS RA, 306-326.

Hovhannisyan, L.H. (2024). Stages of diplomatic discussions of the Armenian Question in 1878-1923 according to the assessment of Armenian historical science (1991-2023), *Historical and Philological Journal*, 1, 100-130.

Hovsepyan, M. (2009). *Periodical press of ARF Dashnaksutyun in Constantinople*. Yerevan: Publishing house of the Institute of history of NAS RA.

Hovsepyan, M. (2016). *ARF Dashnaksutyun's partisan and sympathizing periodical press in Ottoman Turkey in 1909-1915 and 1918-1923*, Yerevan: Publishing house of the Institute of history of NAS RA.

Hovsepyan, M. (2020). *The problems of Armenian refugees and orphans in the daily newspaper of Constantinople "Djagadamat"*, Yerevan: Publishing house of the Institute of history of NAS RA.

National Archive of Armenia (NAA), f. 450, list 2, dossier 88, p. 49. (in Armenian)

Poghosian, S. (2004). *Boghos Nubar Pasha: the national figure*, Yerevan: Zangak-97.

Sahakyan, L., Voskanyan, A., & Sargsyan, A. (2024). *The Armenian Patriarchate of Jerusalem Archives on the Armenian Question and Armenian Genocide*, 1. Yerevan: Lusakn.

Sasuni, K. (1969). *Kurdish national movements and Armenian-Kurdish relations (from the 15th century to the present day)*. Beirut: Hamazgayin.

Simonyan, H. R. (1986). *Ideology and politics of the Turkish national bourgeoisie*, Yerevan: Hayastan.

Tarle, E.V. (1928). *Europe in the era of imperialism. 1871-1919*. (2nd ed.). Moscow-Leningrad: State publishing house.

The documents of the diplomatic representative of Armenia Ferdinand Takhtachyan in Vatican archive. Collection of documents (1919-1923), (2023). Yerevan: VELAS PRINT.

The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, 1915-1916: documents presented to Viscount Grey of Fallodon, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, by Viscount Bryce. (1916). London: H.M.S.O. Retrieved March 18, 2024.

**ԲՈՆԱԳԱՂԹՎԱԾ ՀԱՅԵՐԻ՝ ՀԱՅՐԵՆԻՔ ՎԵՐԱԴԱՌԱԼՈՒ
ԳԱՂԱՓԱՐԻ ԱՐՏԱՅՈՒՂԻՄԸ ՃԱԿԱՏԱՄԱՐՏ, ՀԱՅՐԵՆԻՔԵՎ
ԱՄՊԱՐԵԶՊԱՐՔԵՐԱԿԱՍՏԵՐՈՒՄ 1920 ԹՎԱԿԱՆԻՆ**

Լիլիթ Հովհաննիսյան

1920 թվականին Կոստանդնուպոլիսի Ճակատամարտ, Բոստոնի Հայրենիք և Ֆրեզնոյի Ասպարեզ պարբերականներն ուշագրավ վերլուծություններ են հրապարակել տարագրված հայերի՝ հայրենիք վերադառնալու հարցի վերաբերյալ: Պարբերականների քաղաքական բաժիններում կարևորվում էր հայ ժողովրդի հայրենազրկման, տարագրության և հայրենիք վերադառնալու իրավունքի հարցերի լուսաբանումը մերձավորաբեյան իրադրության, Փարիզի խաղաղության միջազգային վեհաժողովի, Դաշնակից տերությունների Արևելյան և Հայաստանի առաջին Հանրապետության արտաքին քաղաքականության համատերսում: Այս իմաստով հատկանշական են խնդրո առարկա պարբերականներում 1920 թ. հրապարակումները՝ կապված օգոստոսի 10-ին ստորագրված Սկրի հաշտության պայմանագրի, հայ-թուրքական սահմանագծման վերաբերյալ ԱՄՆ նախագահ Վուդրո Վիլսոնի նոյեմբերի 22-ի իրավարար վճռի հետ: Պարբերականները կարևոր աշխատանք են կատարել Փարիզի վեհաժողովից սփյուռքահայության ակնկալիքները բարձրածայնելու, արևմտահայության անվտանգության երաշխիքները հստակեցնելու, Անկախ և Միացյալ Հայաստանի գաղափարի իրազործմանը նպաստելու ուղղությամբ: Պարբերականների էջերում նաև վերհանվել են բռնազարթված հայերի՝ հայրենիք վերադառնալու գաղափարի դեմ ուղղված մարտահրավերները: Թեման արդիական է նրանով, որ Բոստոնի Հայրենիք, Ֆրեզնոյի Ասպարեզ և Կոստանդնուպոլիսի Ճակատամարտ պարբերականներն առաջին անգամ ներկայացվում են բռնազարթված հայերի՝ հայրենիք վերադառնալու հարցի համատերսում:

Բանալի բառեր՝ Արևմտյան Հայաստան, Հայաստանի Հանրապետություն, Կիլիկիա, Հայոց ցեղասպանություն, հայրենիք, Անկախ և Միացյալ Հայաստանի գաղափար: