

CIVILIZATIONAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE ARMENIAN STATE SYSTEM AND MODERN CHALLENGES

Danielyan E. L.

Doctor of Sciences (History)

Armenia's strategic position in Western Asia, rich natural resources, military-economic might, high level of cultural achievements greatly contributed to the development of civilizational values, owing to more than five millennia-old ethno-spiritual, cultural and social-political roots of the Armenian statehood in the Armenian Highland, attested to by the archaeological and architectural monuments, and town building, cuneiform, ancient and medieval written and other historic sources.

An examination of the historical background of the ethno-cultural, social and political foundations on which the traditional infrastructure of independent Armenian statehood is based helps to delineate the path of its historical development. It also helps to classify theoretically the regenerative developments in the political system of the Republic of Armenia and the Arstakh Republic (the Nagorno-Karabakh Republic) and elaborate scientifically a conception of historical-comparative approaches in order to understand how the Armenian society can respond more efficiently and fundamentally to the rapid influx of modern reform ideas and projects. It is very important to comprehend the historically formed Armenian statehood's responses to the present-day international developments in the context of the world multi-cultural processes marked by the trends of modern democratization and globalization¹. As is stated in "National Security Strategy" of the Republic of Armenia: "The Republic of Armenia is engaged in a transitional process of an active reform. Any deterioration in the efficacy of public administration and any decrease in the speed or scope of its reform effort are seen as potential threats to national security"².

Hayastan-Armenia with more than five millennia-old ethno-spiritual, cultural and social-political roots of the Armenian statehood³ and civilizational achievements has the great national heritage a considerable part of which was lately destroyed as the result of the Armenian Genocide (1915-1923) and during the following decades by the genocidal Turkish regimes.

¹ Danielyan E. L., The fundamental questions of Armenian history in the light of tendencies of modern democracy.– Armenian Mind (Armenian Philosophical Academy), Vol. V, No. 1-2, 2000, pp. 7-17.

² The Republic of Armenia National Security Strategy (approved at the session of National Security Council at the RA President office on January 26, 2007) http://www.mfa.am/u_files/file/doctrine/Doctrineeng.pdf

³ The Haykian (Haykazun/Haikazun) kingdoms of Aratta, Armanum (the 3rd millennium BC), Hayasa, Nairi (the 2-nd millennium BC), Van-Ararat (Urartu), Great Armenia, Armenia Minor (the 1st millennium BC–the first decade of the 1st c. AD), Great Armenia (Armenian Arshakuni, 65–428), Artsakh-Utik (eastern provinces of Great Armenia) (Haykian-Sisakian, 484– the first half of the 6th century), Bagratuni Armenia (885–1045) and Cilician Armenia (principdom – 1080–1197, kingdom 1198–1375).

The Armenian people, particularly, in the 16th-17th centuries, as a result of the Turkish-Persian wars and divisions (1555, 1639) of Armenia, suffered tragic periods of devastations, territorial and human losses which continued during the following centuries. The Turkish state genocidal policy and actions intensified in the late 19th (1894-1896, the massacres of more than 300.000 Armenians in Western Armenia and other areas occupied by the Ottoman Empire⁴ and early 20th cc. (1909, Cilicia/Kilikia: 35.000 Armenians were massacred in and around Adana)⁵ culminating in the Armenian Genocide (more than 1,5 million Armenians were killed and eight hundred thousand deported) in Western Armenia, Cilician Armenia, the Armenian-populated areas of Asia Minor, Armenian (northern) Mesopotamia, some regions of Eastern Armenia⁶.

The Armenian state was restored in a part of Eastern Armenia due to the Armenian people's victories in the May Heroic Battles against the Turkish invaders. After the Battle of Sardarapat on May 28, 1918 the Republic of Armenia was established (1918-1920).

From the middle of 1918 artificially formed "Azerbaijan" [a pan-Turkic project with the illegally misappropriated name of Iranian Atropatene-Aderbaigan-Azerbaijan] following the Turkish genocidal policy periodically committed massacres against Armenians (Baku - September 15-17, 1918, Shushi - March 23, 1920). After the illegal and plunderous treaties signed between the Bolsheviks and Kemalists in Moscow (March 16) and Kars (October 13), and the Kavbiuro unlawful and forced decision (July 5, 1921), during the following decades AzSSR perpetrated inhuman acts of deportations, racial, political and religious persecutions of the native Armenian population and the destruction of Armenian cultural monuments in some regions of Eastern Armenia (Nakhijevan, Artsakh, Utik), as well as committed genocide against Armenians in Sumgait (February 27-29, 1988), Baku (January 13-19, 1990), Getashen and Martunashen (in Northern Artsakh) (April 30-May 7, 1991). In November 1988 Armenians were massacred and deported from Gandzak (Kirovabad), Chardakhlu [a home village of the heroes (from Artsakh) of the Sardarapat Battle and the Great Patriotic War, Marshals Hovhannes Baghramyan and Hovhannes Babajanyan, 12 generals and many others] and neighbouring villages.

⁴ Wintle W. J., Armenia and its sorrows, London, 1896; The Armenian massacres 1894-1896: U.S. media testimony, Detroit, 2004; The Armenian massacres, 1894-1896: British media testimony, 2008.

⁵ Գասպարյան Ռ. Հ., Հայկական կոտորածները Կիլիկիայում, Երևան, 2005; Simonyan H. R., The destruction of Armenians in Cilicia, April, 1909, London, 2012.

⁶ Թեոդիկ, Ամենուն տարեցոյցը, 1915, Թ. տարի, Բ. հրատ., Հալէպ, 2009; Horton G., The blight of Asia. An account of the systematic extermination of Christian populations by Mohammedans and of the culpability of certain Great Powers; with the true story of the burning of Smyrna. USA, 1926; Kirakosyan J. S., The Armenian Genocide: the Young Turks before the judgment of history, Madison, 1992; Dadrian V.N., The History of the Armenian Genocide, Oxford, 1995; Геноцид армян: ответственность Турции и обязательства мирового сообщества. Сост., отв. ред. Ю. Г. Барсегов, т. 1-2, М., 2002-2005; Kirakosyan A. J., The Armenian Question and the Armenian Genocide, Yerevan, 2006; A. de Zayas. The Genocide against the Armenians 1915-1923 and the relevance of the 1948 Genocide Convention, Beirut, 2010; Safrastyan R. A., Ottoman Empire: the Genesis of the Program of Genocide (1876-1920), Yerevan, 2011.

The demand of the Artsakh Armenians (powerfully supported by all Armenians in the Motherland and the Armenian Diaspora) to restore historical justice resulted in the Resolution of the joint session of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR and the National Council of NKAO on the re-unification of Artsakh with the Motherland (December 1, 1989)⁷.

After the declaration of independence (September 21, 1991) the Republic of Armenia set course for restructuring the political system, bringing changes in social, political, cultural and educational spheres. But the geopolitical situation had been aggravated by the aggression of Azerbaijan against the Artsakh Republic, which declared its independence on September 2, 1991. The ethnic purges, deportations and massacres of Armenians (Maragha - April, Shahumyan - June-July, 1992, etc.) intensified during the aggression of Azerbaijan against the Artsakh Republic.

The Artsakh Liberation War (1991-1994) was culminated in liberation of Shushi (May 8-9, 1992) and eastern Armenian territories [districts (gavars) of Artsakh - the tenth province of Great Armenia].

The falsification of Armenian history⁸ and destruction of historic monuments⁹ have been raised to the Azerbaijan's presidential level, becoming amalgamated with the revanchist propaganda, particularly after Azerbaijan's defeat in the war it unleashed¹⁰.

Thanks to the heroic struggle of the Armenian freedom fighters in the Artsakh Liberation War the native Armenian population and Armenian historic monuments are protected in the Artsakh Republic. The guarantors of the security of the Armenian civilizational heritage are the Republic of Armenia and the Artsakh Republic. The Artsakh Glorious Victory - a token of future victories - has proved the might of the Armenian spiritual potential, steadfast will and military firmness in protection of the foundations of the national security of the Motherland based on more than five millennia of Armenian holistic cultural creativeness and freedom-loving traditions in the spirit of the Victory of the Armenian Patriarch Hayk.

⁷ <http://www.mil.am/hy/68/71/287>

⁸ Danielyan E. L., Armenian civilizational heritage versus Turkish-Azerbaijani falsification of history and historical cartography. - "Լրաբեր" հաս. գիտ., 2014, N 1, էջ 59:

⁹ During the last decades among the numerous destroyed Armenian monuments were all the churches and khachkars (cross-stones) in Nakhijevan and the Jugha's Cemetery (Haghnazarian A.H., Julfa. The Annihilation of the Armenian Cemetery by Nakhijevan's Azerbaijani Authorities, Beirut, 2006; "Европейский суд по правам человека рассматривает вопрос уничтожения армянского кладбища в старой Джуге" <http://www.newsarmenia.ru/arm1/20081126/41988872.html> Danielyan E. L., Armenian civilizational heritage versus Turkish-Azerbaijani falsification of history and historical cartography. - "Լրաբեր" հաս. գիտ., 2014, N 1, էջ 59:

¹⁰ "The Republic of Azerbaijan continues to pursue an aggressive policy of militant posturing that explicitly threatens the Republic of Armenia and the Artsakh Republic (NKR). Despite numerous factors preventing such development, openly militant statements articulated at the highest level, cause to consider them as direct threats. In light of the heightened threat environment, there is an additional danger that the Republic of Turkey, a strategic partner of Azerbaijan, may also pose an additional threat. Taking into consideration the universally known provisions of international law, the Republic of Armenia considers the trade and transport blockade imposed by Turkey and Azerbaijan as a use of force against the Republic of Armenia" http://www.mfa.am/u_files/file/doctrine/Doctrineeng.pdf

For the theoretical grounding of the reforms touching upon the social strata, together with investigations in the fields of economics, education, political sciences (particularly comparative politics and law), public administration and governance, etc., historical research based on historical-comparative argumentation is also needed. The term *governance* has been defined as “regimes of laws, rules, judicial decisions, and administrative practices that constrain, prescribe, and enable the provision of publicly supported goods and services,” and its studies continue to hold strong interest for public administration scholars¹¹.

A comparative analysis of the historical developments of Armenian civic, political and administrative thought with the theory and practice of public administration in the Western world provides the opportunity of expanding the field of Armenian studies and advancing the research of public administration¹². The methodological basis of such complex comparative study deals with the analysis of the main aspects of the history of civilization as a foundation for construction of the theory of extrapolation of historically formed national values in response to present-day global challenges. Such a historical concept implies that a country undergoing the process of integration into the global or regional political and economic systems ought not to be a passive subject of application of the leveling schemes, but must be an active and responsive partner in the world community owing to its historically accumulated inner potential.

Nowadays a worldwide interest and necessity to understand the regularities of historic developments is observed through the prism of their contemporary reflections. F. E. Halliday noted: “One of the vexations of mortality is that we shall never know what happened next, but we can at least know what has happened, and have some idea, therefore, of what might happen. It is vitally important that we should know, for unless we do we are in an undiscovered country without a map”¹³. As Mike Greenwood wrote: “This renewed interest in history has an important part to play in addressing one of the key issues of the new century - how to meet the needs of society for lifelong learning by reaching out to people by way of their passions and interests, as well as their needs”¹⁴. According to B. L. Lawrence, “Studying the subject from its earliest phases in evolutionary continuity sharpens the vision of the present”¹⁵.

The historic evidence of the civilizational significance of Armenia is testified to in the spheres of archeology, rock art, metallurgy, agriculture and horse breeding, astronomy, architecture¹⁶ and other fields of cultural creation¹⁶.

¹¹ Laurence E. Lynn, Jr., Carolyn J. Henrich, Carolyn J. Hill., *Improving governance: a new logic for empirical research*, Washington, 2001, p. 7.

¹² Suvaryan Yu., Mirzoyan V., Hayrapetyan R., *Public Administration: Theory and History*, Yerevan, 2014, p. 10.

¹³ Halliday F. E., *England. A Concise History*, London, Thames and Hudson. 1995, p. 11.

¹⁴ Greenwood M., “Showing on a screen near you: BBC’s History 2000”. *History Today*. Vol. 50 (2), Feb., 2000. pp. 3-4.

¹⁵ Lawrence B.L., *Historical Perspective: Using the Past to Study the Present*. – *The Academy of Management Review*, vol. 9, No 2, 1984, p. 307.

¹⁶ Dixon J., Cann J. and Renfrew C., *Obsidian and the Origins of Trade*. *Scientific America*, No 218, 1968, pp. 44-48, N.I. Vavilov, *The phyto-geographical basis for plant breeding*. First published in *Theoretical basis for plant breeding*, vol. I, M.-L., 1935, – in: N.I.Vavilov, *Origin and Geography of Cultivated Plants*, p. 341, Areni-1

Historically Armenia, along with cultural values, has accumulated social, political and democratic ones of international significance.

(A) Historical background of international relations and politics. In ancient and medieval times the Armenian state carried great weight in international relations due to its might and geopolitical position. David Marshall Lang noted: “The ancient land of Armenia is situated in the high mountains... Although Mesopotamia with its ancient civilizations of Sumer¹⁷ and Babylon, is usually considered along with Egypt as the main source of civilized life in the modern sense, Armenia too has a claim to rank as one of the cradles of the human culture. To begin with, Noah's Ark is mentioned in the Book of Genesis to have landed on the summit of Mount Ararat, in the very centre of Armenia... Again, Armenia has a claim on our attention as one of the principal homes of ancient metallurgy, beginning at least five thousand years ago. Later on, Armenia became the first extensive kingdom to adopt Christianity as a state religion pioneering a style of Church architecture which anticipates our own Western Gothic”¹⁸.

The “Treaty of Hukkana”¹⁹ signed in the middle of the 14th century BC by the Hittite King Suppiluliuma I and the King of Hayasa Hukkana is considered to be the oldest treaty in the world²⁰, which was concluded a century earlier than the Treaty (c. 1259 BC) between Egyptian Pharaoh Ramesses II and Hittite King Hattusili III²¹.

Armenia's relations with powerful countries of the ancient world were guaranteed by the might and stability of the Armenian state and its political system. The period of the Van Kingdom may serve as an example of the continuity of the Armenian statehood and Armenia's indigenous Haykazun royal dynasty. After Arame Araratian (Haikazun)

Chalcolithic Cave Settlement, <http://arenicave.livejournal.com/> Site Preservation and Management Plan for Areni-1 Cave Enterprise Development and Market Competitiveness. – USAD, ARMENIA, 2013, pp. 10, 12-13; http://www.edmc.am/sites/default/files/resources/attachments/EDMC_FY13Q4_Site%20Preservation%20Plan%20for%20Areni-1%20Cave.pdf. E. L. Danielyan, Armanu – Prunus Armeniaca: originated in Armenia (historical background of the native land of apricot versus modern information challenges). – «21st CENTURY», № 2 (16), 2014, pp. 79-94; W.T.Olcott, Star Lore: Myths, Legends, and Facts (New York, London, 1911), New York, 2004, pp. 6, 8; Геворкян А. Ц., Из истории древнейшей металлургии Армянского нагорья, Ереван, 1980. Есаян С. А., Доспех древней Армении, М., 1986, с. 3; Հայաստանի հնագիտական ժառանգությունը, Երևան, 2013: Н. Е. Simonyan, The archaeological site of Shengavit: an ancient town in the Armenian Highland. – Fundamental Armenology, N1, 2015, p. 154; Թորամանյան Թ., Նյութեր հայկական ճարտարապետության պատմության, Երևան, 1942: Арутюнян В. М., Каменная летопись армянского народа, Ереван. 1985, Асратян М. М., Очерк армянской архитектуры, М., 1985. Շախկյան Գ. Ս., Հայ ճարտարապետության պատմության պարբերացման հարցեր. – “Լրաբեր” հասարակական գիտությունների, 1991, N 1, էջ 120-125:

¹⁷ W. Durant mentions Armenia as one of the countries from where the Sumerians (moving “through northern Mesopotamia down the Euphrates and the Tigris...”) could arrive to Sumer (W. Durant, Our oriental heritage, New York, 1954, pp. 118-119).

¹⁸ Lang D.M., Armenia cradle of civilization. London, 1970, p. 9.

¹⁹ Friedrich J., Der Vertrag des Šuppiluliumaš mit Hukkanaš und den Leuten von Hayaša. – Staatsverträge des Hatti Reiches in hethitischer Sprache, 2 Teil, Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft, 34 Band, 1 Heft, 1930, S. 103-163.

²⁰ Danielyan E. L., The historical background of the Armenian state political doctrine. – “Armenian Perspectives”, London: Curzon, 1997 pp. 279-280.

²¹ Bryce T., The Kingdom of the Hittites, Oxford University Press, 1999, p. 256.

(860-c. 845 BC) the Haykazun dynasty's branches for two centuries²² had been represented by its principalities in Aghdznik and its neighbourhood²³, Tsopk²⁴, Tayk²⁵, Ayrarat and the Lake Sevan basin²⁶, Javakhk²⁷ and Artsakh²⁸ et al. Its southern branch [in Biaina (Van-Վաւն), ^{KUR}Aidu(ni)²⁹, ^{âl/mât}Uajais³⁰ and ^{mât}Armarili³¹] - the ancestors of the Արծրունի (Artsrunis/Arşrunis³²) family concentrated the power in its hands and founded the Biainian (Van) dynasty. It centralized the Armenian statehood in the Armenian Highland. Among its cult symbols were the deities ^dArşibidini³³ and ^dZiukuni³⁴, which embodied the heavenly and aqueous elements. Since the mid 7th century BC the major Haykazun dynasty as represented by Skayordi and then his son

²² Until the middle of the 7th century BC, when Haikazun Skayordi and then his son Paruyr came to the power (Մովսես Խորենացի, էջ 64).

²³ ^{KUR}Arme and ^{KUR}Alzi(ni) (Н.В. Арутюнян, Корпус урартских клинообразных надписей, Ереван, 2001, с. 495, 497 (further КУКН).

²⁴ ^{KUR}Şupani (КУКН, с. 522)

²⁵ ^mDiau(e)hi (КУКН, с. 503, A. Dumikyan noted: "An interpretation of the Biainian cuneiforms' person determinative *m* in historiography as the determinative indicating *ethnos* has not been substantiated, because it is not a determinative indicating ethnic names." ^mDiau(e)he is deciphered as Diau(e)he-ian [suffix -he(-hi-) is not the ethnonym-forming, but a suffix indicating appurtenance, forming adjectives]. Similarly ^{Swj}tgghp (*Taikians*), mentioned in Armenian sources (cf. *Ταόχοι* of Greek sources) is a toponymical form of the name indicating the Armenian population of the province of Taik', as is seen from the mentioning of the Armenian population also under the names of other regions and districts (gavars) of Armenia: *Gugarkians*, *Mokkians*, *Sperians*, etc. (Ա. Դումիկյան, Հայոց հին և վաղմիջնադարյան պատմության հիմնահարցերը XIX դարի ֆրանսիական հայագիտության մեջ, Երևան, 2014, pp.74,75,177).

²⁶ ^{KUR}Etiuhi(ni) (КУКН, с. 505).

²⁷ ^{KUR}Zabaḥa (КУКН, с. 530).

²⁸ ^{KUR}Urtehi (КУКН, с. 529).

²⁹ Там же, с. 494, ^{mât}A-ia-di (Une relation de la huitième campagne de Sargon (714 av. J.-C.). Texte Assyrien inédit, publié et traduit par François Thureau-Dangin, Paris, 1912, p. 44, 280, p. 46, 297, p. 70, A119). As it is denoted by S.Yeremyan [see the map of "Ուրարտու" ("Urartu") Erevan, 1980], it corresponds to the territory of Հայոց ձոր (*Hayots Dzor*, on the south-western shore of Lake Van), where, according to Movses Khorenatsi, Haik defeated Bel in the battle (Մովսես Խորենացի, Պատմութիւն Հայոց, Երևան, 1991, էջ 37). The names of the Armenians' eponyms (Hayk and Aram Haikian, as ethnic indicators - հայ-արմեն, Hay-Armen) preserved in the roots of the toponyms ^{KUR}Aidu(ni)=^{mât}Aiadi, ^{âl}Uajais, ^{mât}Uajais and ^{mât}Armarili.

³⁰ F.Thureau-Dangin, op. cit.,.

³¹ Ibid., p. 42 (269), ^{mât}Armariali, p.44 (280, 290), p. 70 (A116).

³² According to Movses Khorenatsi and Tovma Artsruni, the Artsruni family name is derived from the Armenian word (bird name) *eagle* (Մովսես Խորենացի, էջ 111, Թովմա Արծրունի և Անանուն, Պատմութիւն տանն Արծրունեաց, Երևան, 1985, էջ 64) and it is now a dominant concept in the Armenological cuniform studies (Бархударян С.Г., Урартское происхождение армянского нахарарского рода Арцруни, - "Исследования по истории культуры народов Востока", М., 1960, с. 36. Джаукян Г.Б., Урартские заимствования в армянском языке. - "Культурное наследие Востока", Л., 1985, с. 369, Ջահուկյան Գ.Բ., Հայկական շերտը ուրարտական դիցարանում. - Պատմաբանասիրական հանդես (further ՊԲՀ), 1986, N 1, էջ 49: Հմայակյան Ս.Գ., Վանի թագավորության պետական կրոնը, Երևան, 1990, էջ 60, Սարգսյան Վ.Ս., Արծրունիների մասին վկայությունները սեպագիր արձանագրություններում և միջնադարյան աղբյուրներում, - Հայոց պատմության հարցեր, 15, Երևան, 2014, էջ 20-29 և այլ). Among the toponyms related to the Artsruni family may also be mentioned ^{URU}Arşuni(i)ni/u (КУКН, с. 498) .

³³ КУКН, с. 479.

³⁴ As noted G. Jahukyan, the Biainian theonyms ^dArşibidini, ^dZiukuni, the toponym ^{KUR}Ziuquni and the name of the horse (Arşibin) of Menua correspondingly preserved the ancient forms of the Armenian words արծիվ (eagle) and ձուկն (fish) (Ջահուկյան Գ.Բ., Հայոց լեզվի պատմություն. Նախագրային շրջան, Երևան, 1987, էջ 443-444):

Paruyr, had restored and consolidated its power in Armenia³⁵. After the battle of Nineveh (612 BC) Haykazun Paruyr Skayordi was recognized as the King of Armenia by the Median king³⁶.

The Armenian state and its political system were based on the hereditary [the Armenian patriarchal principalities' system (*nakharardom*) - the main factor in preserving the statehood even at times when the kingdom was abolished] and the might of Armenia's defensive forces, economic potential and rich natural resources, ethnic homogeneity (one of the causes of its deeply rooted cultural traditions) of the country and spiritual unity.

The strategic significance of Armenia was due to its territorial integrity (the Armenian Highland) and the control of important junctions of the great trade routes from Asia to Europe. Analyzing the foreign policy of the King of Kings Tigran II the Great (95-55 BC) from this viewpoint we see that the Kingdom of Great Armenia played a civilizing role in Western Asia and the creation of the Armenian Empire by him was dictated by the necessity to stop the Roman and Parthian aggression against Armenia, as well as to take under his control and protection the major routes of the Silk Road in Western Asia, a certain part of which passed through Armenia³⁷.

(B) Continuity of the Armenian state's political doctrine. The continuity in the development and implementation of the Armenian state political doctrine is reflected in the history of the Armenian statehood, particularly from the time of the Hayasa kingdom (the above mentioned Treaty of Alliance concluded with the Hittite Empire) up to the Cilician principedom (1080-1197 AD) and then the Kingdom (1198-1375 AD). The rise and prosperity of the Cilician Kingdom depended much on its flexible policy and skillful diplomacy with Eastern and Western countries, along with its military might.

During the existence of the ancient and medieval Armenian kingdoms a number of great states rose. Armenia pursuing its own state interests was an active participant in international relations and political life. In the course of the Armenian independent nationhood's existence the main principles of state doctrine pursued the solution of internal and external problems. The essence of the Armenian state political doctrine, with some variations, during those times was defensive in accordance with the political situation. Identical policy was also continued later, during the period of the First Republic of Armenia.

It is notable that at present "The Military Doctrine of the Republic of Armenia" (adopted in 2007) (aimed at ensuring the military security of the state) is also defensive

³⁵ Даниелян Э.Л., Армянское государство в IX- начале VI вв. до н.э., - см. Аветисян Г.А., Даниелян Э.Л., Мелконян А.А., История Армении, Ереван, 1999, с. 12-13; Դանիելյան Է.Լ., Հայոց պետությունը մ.թ.ա. IX-VII դարերում, Երևան, 2008, էջ 35-36.

³⁶ Մովսես Խորենացի, էջ 64:

³⁷ Դանիելյան Է.Լ., Տիգրան II Մեծի քաղաքակրթական գործունեության ռազմավարությունը. - ՊԲՀ, 2006, N 2, էջ 3-12; Даниелян Э.Л., Цивилизационный вклад Армении в историю Шелкового пути и современные вызовы. - in: Civilizational contribution of Armenia in the history of the Silk Road, Միջազգային գիտաժողովի նյութեր, 21-23 նոյեմբերի, 2011, Երևան, 2012, с. 292-311:

in nature³⁸. Thus, the internal and external policies and protection of national values are guaranteed by the Armenian state³⁹.

(C) Governance and elements of a democratic participation in the ruling of the country. In the public administration's history prominent proponents⁴⁰ have contributed to the inception and development of the theory of public administration as a full-fledged discipline up until modern times⁴¹. The inception of the theory of public administration has been traced back by modern researchers⁴² applying the method of analysis of ideas relating to the formation of its concept in the works of Plato, Aristotle, Thomas Hobbes, Jean-Jacque Rousseau, John Locke, Charles-Luis Montesquieu, David Hume and Hegel.

Armenian thinkers also have made a contribution to the inception and development of the theory of public administration. The inception of the Armenian management thought is reflected in Armenian sources (the 5th century AD), particularly Movses Khorenatsi's "History of Armenia". The Father of Armenian historiography presents state activities of the Armenian king Vagharshak directed to the reestablishment of order in way of life of the country⁴³. Furthermore, a number of features of public administration have been traced, such as territorial administration of the state, activities of the courts, the authorities of executive power, etc., consequently, such a type of organization conditioned by determination of the relationship between the king and the landlords was an important factor for preserving stability in the kingdom. The evaluation given by the 5th-century historians to the government of the kings of the 4th century AD is vividly diversified; particularly the state activities of Trdat III⁴⁴ [along with his role in the adoption of Christianity, as the state religion in Armenia (301 AD), first in the world]⁴⁵, as it is noted, had a significant input in restoring the Armenian independent state, strengthening its government and waging numerous victorious wars.

Pavstos Buzand's information elucidates a legislative nature of Ashtishat's⁴⁶ *council* (354 AD). There were introduced some norms for improving secular order, definition of universal canons and establishment rules and regulations between the rulers and the subjects⁴⁷. It has been noted that concerning the time of Arshak II (350-368) "such kind of public administration could not have been implemented or even proposed without the consent and partaking of the King". The King Pap's reforms have

³⁸ <http://www.mil.am/files/mil-doctrine-eng.pdf>

³⁹ http://www.mfa.am/u_files/file/doctrine/Doctrineeng.pdf

⁴⁰ Auguste Comte, Herber Spencer, Emile Durkheim, Karl Marx, Vilfredo Pareto, Max Weber, Gabriel Tarde, Gustave Le Bon, Georg Simmel, Thorstein Veblen, Woodrow Wilson, Herbert Simon, Luther Gulick, Marshall Dimock.

⁴¹ Richard Stillman, Robert Denhardt, Michael LeMay, Leslie A. Pal, David Osborne, Ted Gaebler, Frank Goodnow.

⁴² Suvaryan Yu., V.Mirzoyan, R.Hayrapetyan, op. cit., pp. 14-22.

⁴³ Մովսէս Խորենացի, էջ 104:

⁴⁴ Նույն տեղում, էջ 224-250:

⁴⁵ Ազգաթանգեղայ Պատմութիւն Հայոց: Աշխատութեամբ Գ. Տէր- Մկրչեան և Ստ. Կանայեանց, Էջմիածին – Տփղիս, 1909, 832:

⁴⁶ A village in Taron gavar (a district) in Western Armenia.

⁴⁷ Փաւստոսի Բիւզանդացոյ Պատմութիւն Հայոց: Երևան, 1987, էջ 118:

been introduced as good examples of the background of today's "milder" concepts of public administration⁴⁸.

An ancient and medieval expression of a democratic participation of the Armenian people was the Popular Assembly (*Ashkharhazhoghov*), which discussed important affairs of the country⁴⁹. Along with the Armenian royal decision-making system of governance, *Ashkharhazhoghov* - Popular Assembly was a kind of democratic institution going back to the times of the Kingdom of Hayasa. In the "Treaty of Hukkana" as a side of the Treaty are mentioned "people of Hayasa"⁵⁰, which developed into an institution called *Ashkharhazhoghov* in medieval Armenian sources. This public institution, as a consultative body, existed both in times of kingship and its absence, when the Armenian statehood continued to function in the form of the *nakharar system* and the country was governed by the *nakharars* (princes).

(D) Elections of the Head of the Church-Catholicos; constitutional elements in Armenian canonical legislation. Another kind of democratic expression of the will of population was the election of the Catholicos of the Armenian Apostolic Church. Such elections were documented by the early medieval Armenian sources. The joint council of spiritual and secular representatives of Armenian society and the Church elected the Head of the Armenian Apostolic Church – Catholicos⁵¹. This procedure, with some changes, extends till the present day.

As far as it concerns constitutional elements in Armenian canonical legislation it has been noted that "the accounts by the Armenian historians and religious and political thinkers, too, are full of episodes of state, community and territorial administration, as well as comprehensive theories around different issues of public administration"; these accounts testify to the writing constitutions - Canonical Constitution (*Սահմանադրութիւն կանոնական*)⁵² by Vachagan Barepasht (the Pious)⁵³ and *The Snare of Glory* (Որոգայթ փառաց) by Hakob and Shahamir Shahamiryan, as well as *The Armenian Canon-Book* (the 8th century) (Կանոնագիրք Հայոց)...⁵⁴ containing

⁴⁸ It is underlined that Pavstos Byuzand told us about one of the exceptionally positive features of Armenian social-political thought, that is, tolerance towards the opinions of others, at the same time King Pap initiated radical reforms, strengthening the independence of the Armenian Church and the Armenian state in general (Yu. Suvaryan, V.Mirzoyan, R.Hayrapetyan, pp. 59-67, 69).

⁴⁹ Հայ ժողովրդի պատմություն, հ. II, Երևան, 1984, էջ 142:

⁵⁰ Friedrich J., Der Vertrag des Šuppiluliumaš mit Hukkanaš und den Leuten von Hayaša, S. 106, 132; Ղազարյան Ռ., Հայաստ. քաղաքական և մշակութային պատմություն, Երևան, 2009, էջ 69, 86:

⁵¹ Ագաթանգեղայ Պատմութիւն Հայոց, 791-792:

⁵² Vachagan Barepasht (484-the first half of the 6th century) was the Armenian King of the Kingdom of Artsakh and Utik (eastern regions of Great Armenia) (Բ.Ուրուբաբյան, Հայոց Արևելից կողմանց եկեղեցին և մշակույթը, Երևան, 1998, էջ 31, 41, 45, 64-65; Է.Լ. Դանիելյան, Գանձասրի պատմութիւն, Երևան, 2005 էջ 37, 42-45:

⁵³ Մովսէս Կաղանկատուացի, Պատմութիւն Աղուանից աշխարհի, Երևան, 1983, էջ 89-94: Ղահրամանյան Կ., Հովհաննիսյան Վ.Լ., 1550-ամյա հայկական սահմանադրությունը. ընդունման հանգամանքները և նշանակությունը, Երևան, 1999, էջ 3-61:

⁵⁴ Կանոնագիրք Հայոց, հտ. Ա-Բ, աշխատասիրությամբ Վազգեն Հակոբյանի, Երևան, 1964-1971:

along with ecclesiastical, spiritual, and moral theses, some legal ones valuable for state and public administration.

(E) Federal elements of governance in Armenian history. The Armenian principalities constituted the backbone of the Armenian ancient and medieval state system. They held the offices of the state and some of them gave birth to the royal dynasties. It also took place in the period of the Bagratuni Kingdom when the royal Bagratuni dynasty's branches and some other mighty principalities formed kingdoms. This period of Armenian history was marked by federal-like power in the country⁵⁵. One of the peculiarities of such an early federalism was that after the fall of the Ani-Shirak Bagratuni Kingdom (885-1045) (as a result of the aggression of the Byzantine Empire) some of the other Armenian kingdoms survived and the Cilician Princedom and later the Kingdom became the successors of the Armenian nationhood.

(F) The historic background of the Armenian society's infrastructure. Since ancient times the infrastructure of Armenian society due to the entity of its ethno-spiritual, social-political and cultural constituents has been the backbone of the Armenian nationhood; but its integrity suffered great losses from the second half of the 11th century AD when the wild nomadic tribes⁵⁶ invaded and ravaged Armenia, which was then devastated by the Ottoman⁵⁷ and Safavid invasions, wars and divisions (16th-17th cc.) with grave consequences. During the 18th century, due to the Armenia's innermost vital state-preserving potential national-liberation programs were adopted and movements rose in Syunik and Artsakh aimed at liberation of the Motherland and restoration of the Armenian state.

The reality is that the Armenian statehood, due to political circumstances, the national-liberation struggle and legitimate activities since 1991 is developing in the Republic of Armenia and the Artsakh Republic in a very complex geopolitical situation. The use of scientifically elaborated Armenian historic experience may help in this process taking into consideration the deeply rooted Armenian national values.

⁵⁵ Մաթևոսյան Ռ., Բագրատունիներ, պատմա-տոհմաբանական հանրագիտարան, Երևան, 1997, էջ 96-97:

⁵⁶ Seljuk and Oghuz-Turkic tribes (the ancestors of the present-day Turks) began their devastating invasions from far away Trans-Altai and Cis-Aral steppes and deserts since the second half of the 11th century AD; then followed devastating invasions of Mongol-Tatars (1236 – 14th c.), Kara-Koyunlu (14th-15th cc.) and Ak-Koyunlu (15th c.) nomadic tribes.

⁵⁷ A monastic scribe in Crete wrote with horror about the capture of Constantinople by the Ottoman Turks in 1453: "There never has been and never will be a more dreadful happening" (A.Palmer, The decline and fall of the Ottoman Empire, New York, 1992, p. 1).