

ՀԵՏԱԶՈՏԱԿԱՆ ԱԿՆԱՐԿ

POLITICAL NOTES ON THE TREATY OF SÈVRES

Naira Ginosyan¹

DOI 10.46991/jos.2024.25.1.332

Articles 88–93 of the Treaty of Sevres, signed on August 10, 1920, restored the rights of the Armenian people to a part of their homeland, which was Western Armenia. The mentioned articles of the Treaty of Sèvres de jure recognized not only the Republic of Armenia, including the Armenian provinces of Transcaucasia, but also the United Armenia, including Eastern and Western Armenia. The signatory countries, including the Turkish state defeated in World War I, recognized the independence of United Armenia and agreed to expand Armenia's borders to include most of the territories of the provinces of Erzurum, Van and Bitlis, as well as part of the province of Trabzon, thereby securing Armenia's access to the Black Sea. The publication presents several key points about the Treaty of Sèvres, which marked the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and aimed to divide its territories between the allied states. Alas, it was not realized.

Keywords: *Treaty of Sèvres, Western Armenia, National House, Allied Powers, legal document, delimitation, arbitral award.*

The Treaty of Sevres signed as of August 10, 1920 was considered by Armenian socio-political thought exclusively in the context of Articles 88–93, which are directly related to Armenia. This was quite natural, as these articles restored the right of the Armenian people to their homeland, a part of Western Armenia. The mentioned articles of the Treaty of Sevres de jure recognized not only the Republic of Armenia including the Armenian provinces of Transcaucasia, but also United Armenia with Eastern and Western Armenias united. The signatory states, including the Turkish state

¹ Naira Ginosyan is an Associate Professor at the Department of Turkic Studies at the Faculty of Oriental Studies at Yerevan State University, E-mail naira.ginosyan@ysu.am, ORCID`0009-0008-2004-682X

that was defeated in the First World War, recognized the independence of United Armenia and agreed to expand the borders of Armenia by annexing most of the territories of the provinces of Erzurum, Van and Bitlis, as well as part of the province of Trabzon, thus ensuring the exit of Armenia to the Black Sea.

The Conference of the Prime Ministers and Foreign Ministers of England, France, Italy and Japan, convened in London from February 12 to April 10 in 1920, worked out all the main technical issues related to the Armenian-Turkish border.

On April 26, on the initiative of the Prime Minister of Great Britain D. George Lloyd the issue of the demarcation of Armenian territories was redirected to US President W. Wilson, who was invited to take on the role of border arbitrator².

The arbitration process started before the signing of the Treaty of Sevres, therefore it was a completely independent international legal document by Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, as members of the Supreme Council of the Allied Powers on the one hand, and Woodrow Wilson, as President of the United States on the other³.

W. Wilson had signed the arbitral resolution just 10 days before the Sovietization of Armenia on November 22, 1920. The official and full name of the resolution is “Decision of the President of the United States of America respecting the frontier between Turkey and Armenia, access for Armenia to the sea and the demilitarization of the Turkish territory Adjacent to the Armenian Frontier”⁴. The arbitral award made by US President Woodrow Wilson on the demarcation of the Armenian-Turkish border is an international legal document by which Ottoman-era Turkey, subject to legal rights, was held politically responsible for the Armenian

² Մախմուդյան Գ., Հայաստանի սահմանի հարցով Վ. Վիլսոնի կոմիտեի գործունեությունը, Սևրի պայմանագիրն ու ԱՄՆ նախագահ Վ. Վիլսոնի իրավարար վճիռը, Երևան, 2020, էջ 81:

³ Մարուքյան Ա., Հայոց Ցեղասպանության հետևանքների հաղթահարման հիմնախնդիրներն ու պատմաիրավական հիմնավորումները, Երևան, 2014, էջ 115:

⁴ Հովհաննիսյան Ռ., Հայաստանի Հանրապետություն, հ. IV, Երևան, 2016, էջ 48:

Genocide. This document deprived Turkey of its sovereignty over its former territories⁵. The area to be transferred to Armenia by an arbitral resolution was to be 103 599 sq. km, approximately 40% of Western Armenia⁶.

The 1921 London Conference should be considered as attempt to review the Treaty of Sevres. In January 1921, at a meeting of the Entente General Council in Paris, France proposed a revision of the Treaty of Sevres. In February-March of the same year, at a conference in London with the participation of Germany and the Ottoman Empire, which had lost the war to the Entente Powers, the issue of revising the reconciliation of the Treaty of Sevres was discussed at the suggestion of France and Italy. On the eve of the conference, the official delegation of the Republic of Armenia headed by Avetis Aharonyan and the National delegation headed by Boghos Nubar Pasha had arrived in London.

In that conference an attempt was made to replace the provisions of the Treaty of Sevres, which represented the legal rights of Armenia and the Armenian people, with the vague idea of a “Home National”, which, however, was rejected by the Turks themselves. By rejecting this idea at the London conference, the Turks themselves were, in fact, the first to reject the cancellation of the Treaty of Sevres⁷.

The Treaty of Sevres could only be replaced by a new document in London, the preamble of which should have specifically emphasized that the treaty was revising or amending the previously signed Treaty of Sevres. Albeit the signatories of the Treaty of Sevres in London announced their intention to revise it, no document was signed during the London Conference. This means that the conference did not achieve its goal, and the attempt to review the Treaty failed.

⁵ Մարուքյան Ա., Հայոց Ցեղասպանության հետևանքների հաղթահարման հիմնախնդիրներն ու պատմաիրավական հիմնավորումները, Երևան, 2014, էջ 120:

⁶ Պապյան, Հայոց պահանջատիրության իրավական հիմքերը (հոդվածների ժողովածու), Երևան, 2007, էջ 75:

⁷ Ահարոնյան Ա., Մարդարապատից մինչև Սևր և Լոզան (քաղաքական օրագիր 1919–1927), Երևան, 2001, էջ 142–158:

The Treaty of Sevres, together with the award of Mr. Wilson upon the boundaries of the proposed Armenian State, constitutes Armenia's political charter of independence. The Armenian clauses of that Treaty were drafted by the Allies without consultation with Armenian representatives. Consequently, it is upon the Allies that the responsibility for executing those clauses falls, and the official representatives of the Armenians have no moral or legal justification for renouncing their rights as recognized by the Allies in the Treaty of Sevres, at least until that document is technically abrogated by a fresh treaty.

Already, however, it has long been obvious that the Allies do not have the will to enforce the Treaty of Sèvres as it stands.

Although the Allies are solely responsible for this situation, the Armenians are the worst sufferers (compare, for example, Poland or Czecho-Slovakia):

(1) Turkish Armenia is in the hands of Mustafa Kemal, who has also seized certain territory in Russian Armenia, including Kars and Ardahan;

(2) the rest of Russian Armenia is in the hands of a Soviet Government forming part of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic, and the people have accepted this regime as the best hope of peace;

(3) Cilicia or Little Armenia is at the moment occupied by French troops, who however are to evacuate it almost immediately according to the recently signed agreement between France and the Angora Government. No provision is made for the effective protection of the non-Turkish populations when this territory is handed back to the Turks, and in the East it is widely believed that the evacuation of French troops will be followed by the systematic extermination of the non-Turkish elements.

In March 1921, the Allies made certain proposals for the modification of the Treaty of Sèvres, in as much as Armenia was concerned, the proposals required only the recognition by Turk of the right of Turkish Armenians to a national home on the eastern frontiers of Turkey in Asia, the boundaries of which were to be delimited by a Commission appointed by the Council of the League of Nations. These proposals were not

accepted by the Immediate protagonists, Greeks and Turks, who went on with their war today, nine months later, still no military decision has been reached. But it is highly probable that in the near future the Allies will make another attempt to work out a settlement in the Near East. It is in their own interest to put a stop to the political ferment and economic dislocation caused by the war, and it appears as if both Greece and Turkey would now be prepared to negotiate.

It is clear that any further negotiations must start from the Allied proposals of March 1921, this must be so as regards Armenia at least, for in September 1921 the Assembly of the League of Nations - which the Allies cannot very well ignore - adopted the following resolution:

*Seeing that the First Assembly on November 18th, 1920, entrusted the Council with the duty of safeguarding the future of Armenia;

that the Council on February 25th, 1921, while holding that the situation in Asia Minor made action for the time being impossible, entrusted the Secretary General with the duty of watching developments in Armenian affairs with a view to procuring subsequent decisions by the Council:

And that in the meantime the Supreme Council in the revision of the Treaty of Sèvres proposed to make provision for a National Home for the Armenians;

Seeing, further, the probable imminence of a Peace Treaty between Turkey and the Allied Powers at no distant date:

The Assembly urges the Council to press upon the Supreme Council of the Allies the necessity of making provisions in this Treaty for safeguarding the future of Armenia, and in particular of providing the Armenians with a National Home entirely Independent of Turkish rule.

It is incumbent upon the Allies, in creating a national home for the Armenians, to give it a form that will enable it to exist in spite of the open or veiled hostility of its neighbor,

Turkey. If the national home is created under conditions that themselves constitute *prima facie* evidence of its inability to maintain itself, even in the most favorable circumstances conceivable, the nations of the

world, whether members of the League or not, will hardly feel justified in making on its behalf efforts that would have no permanent value. In this connection, two points are of importance.

In the first place, guarantees must be obtained for the evacuation by Turkey of the territories to be assigned to the Armenian national home. For this purpose, the concessions to Turkey that are contemplated in other regions should be made conditional upon her previously evacuating the Armenian territory that it now holds. Turkish interests, however, might be directly represented in the Commission or other transitional regime which will presumably be needed to supervise the evacuation and carry on the administration until more permanent institutions are established.

In the second place, the territory to be transferred to form an Armenian national home must cover an area which potentially at least - comprises a geographical and economic unit, capable of military defense. An Armenia without territorial access to the sea does not fulfill this condition; nor does any Armenian State on the eastern frontiers of Turkey which leaves the latter in occupation of the Erzurum plateau.

The frontiers of Armenia as laid down by Mr. Wilson may be open to slight modification in detail, but in general, they give to Armenia most of the Turkish territory, which is justly hers, and little more than is necessary to make possible the existence of an independent Armenian State. For these reasons the Committee strongly urges that the terms of reference of the proposed League of Nations Commission to delimit the frontiers of the Armenian national home shall be based upon Mr. Wilson's award, and also take into consideration the distribution of races in the eastern vilayets of Turkey before August 1914, if not before the methodical massacres of Abdul Hamid. In order that the decisions of the Commission may enjoy the respect both of Turkey and of these countries which may be asked to provide material or other assistance for the Armenian national home, the Committee suggests that the majority of the Commission be nationals of neutral states, and that in any case its president be a subject of a neutral power who would command international confidence.

The Committee also wishes to urge upon the Supreme Council of the principal Allied Powers that the Council of the League of Nations be invited to appoint a Commission for the purpose of outlining a form of administration or constitution for the Armenian national home, upon which it would be willing to take action as suggested in its Memorandum of 11th April 1920.

NAA, f.412, l. 1, work 2316, p. 1–4.

ՔԱՂԱՔԱԿԱՆ ՄՏՈՐՈՒՄՆԵՐ ՄԵՎՐԻ ՊԱՅՄԱՆԱԳՐԻ ՄԱՍԻՆ

Նաիրա Գինոսյան⁸

1920 թվականի օգոստոսի 10-ին ստորագրված Սևրի պայմանագրի 88-93 հոդվածներով վերականգնվում էր հայ ժողովրդի իրավունքը իր հայրենիքի մի մասի՝ Արևմտյան Հայաստանի նկատմամբ:

Սևրի պայմանագրի նշված հոդվածները դե յուրե ճանաչում էին ոչ միայն Հայաստանի Հանրապետությունը՝ ներառելով Անդրկովկասի հայկական գավառները, այլև Միացյալ Հայաստանը՝ Արևելյան և Արևմտյան Հայաստաններով միավորված: Ստորագրող երկրները, այդ թվում՝ Առաջին համաշխարհային պատերազմում պարտված թուրքական պետությունը, ճանաչեցին Միացյալ Հայաստանի անկախությունը և համաձայնեցին ընդլայնել Հայաստանի սահմանները՝ միացնելով Էրզրումի, Վանի և Բիթլիսի նահանգների տարածքների մեծ մասը, ինչպես նաև Տրապիզոնի նահանգի մի մասը՝ դրանով իսկ ապահովելով Հայաստանի ելքը դեպի Սև ծով:

Հրապարակման մեջ ներկայացվում են Սևրի դաշնագրի մասին մի քանի հիմնական կետեր, որոնք նշանավորում էին Օսմանյան կայսրության փլուզումը և նպատակ ունեին նրա տարածքները բաժանել դաշնակից պետությունների միջև: Ավաղ, այն կյանքի չկոչվեց:

⁸ Նաիրա Գինոսյանը ԵՊՀ արևելագիտության ֆակուլտետի թյուրքագիտության ամբիոնի դոցենտ է, պատմական գիտությունների թեկնածու, Էլ. փոստ naira.ginosyan@ysu.am, ORCID՝ 0009-0008-2004-682X:

Բանալի բառեր. Սևրի պայմանագիր, Արևմտյան Հայաստան, Ազգային տուն (օջախ), դաշնակից տերություններ, իրավական փաստաթուղթ, սահմանազատում, իրավարար վճիռ:

ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИЕ ЗАМЕТКИ О СЕВРСКОМ ДОГОВОРЕ

Наира Гиносян⁹

Статьи 88–93 Севрского договора, подписанного 10 августа 1920 года, восстановили права армянского народа на часть его родины – Западной Армении.

Упомянутые статьи Севрского договора де-юре признавали не только Республику Армения, включая армянские провинции Закавказья, но и Единую Армению, объединенную Восточную и Западную Армению. Страны-подписанты, в том числе потерпевшее поражение в Первой мировой войне турецкое государство, признали независимость Единой Армении и согласились расширить границы Армении, включив в нее большую часть территорий провинций Эрзурум, Ван и Битлис, а также часть провинции Трабзон, тем самым обеспечив выход Армении к Черному морю.

В публикации представлены несколько ключевых моментов Севрского договора, ознаменовавшего распад Османской империи и направленного на раздел ее территорий между союзными государствами. Увы, он не воплотился в жизнь.

Ключевые слова: Севрский договор, Западная Армения, национальный дом, союзные державы, правовой документ, делимитация, арбитражное решение.

ՕԳՏԱԳՈՐԾՎԱԾ ԳՐԱԿԱՆՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՑԱՆԿ

1. Ահարոնյան Ա., Մարդարապատից մինչև Սևր և Լոզան (քաղաքական օրագիր 1919–1927 թթ.), ԵՊՀ հրատ., Երևան, 2001, 252 էջ:

⁹ Наира Гиносян – к.ист.н., доцент кафедры тюркологии факультета востоковедения ЕГУ, эл. почта naira.ginosyan@ysu.am, ORCID[®] 0009-0008-2004-682X.

2. Հովհաննիսյան Ռ., Հայաստանի Հանրապետություն, հ. IV, Երևան, Տիգրան Մեծ, 2016, 546 էջ:

3. Մախմուրյան Գ., Հայաստանի սահմանի հարցով Վ. Վիլսոնի կոմիտեի գործունեությունը, Սևրի պայմանագիրն ու ԱՄՆ նախագահ Վ. Վիլսոնի իրավարար վճիռը, Երևան, Լուսակն, 2020, 250 էջ:

4. Մարության Ա., Հայոց Ցեղասպանության հետևանքների հաղթահարման հիմնախնդիրներն ու պատմաիրավական հիմնավորումները, Երևան, Պատմության ինստ., 2014, 332 էջ:

5. Պապյան Ա., Հայոց պահանջատիրության իրավական հիմքերը (հոդվածների ժողովածու), Երևան, 2007, 119 էջ: