

Naira Zh. Mkrтчhyan

Possibly we're in the process of experiencing a new relationship between theory and practice¹.

Gilles Deleuze

ON AN EMANCIPATORY VISION AND THE ARMENIAN EXPERIENCE OF ITS APPROPRIATION

Key words - emancipatory (liberation) struggle, political (social) ontology, political independence, a quasi-nodal point, Armenian discursive reality, political-ideological spectrum

Introduction

The ideas of emancipation (or liberation) and closely related emancipatory (or liberation) struggle are widely articulated in the discourses concerning social and national, as well as, local and global issues. What opportunities are opened for these ideas in some contexts, what opportunities do they make available in terms of formulation of problems and modulation of themes are questions which certainly need more detailed and empirical researches for each case separately. Here is the consideration of Armenian case, as the ideas of emancipation (or liberation) and related emancipatory (or liberation) struggle are among the most articulated ones in Armenian discursive reality at least of the last two centuries. Most probably it will shed light on how that reality has been constructed and actually operating.

Of course, it does not mean that behind of the latter is the assumption that Armenian discursive reality has not undergone shifts or inner transformations for this period. In order to make such assumption or the opposite one, anyone needs a more detailed and longitudinal research from a certain perspective. Abstaining from any kind of such assumption or statement, this article tends to scrutinize the trajectory of the ideas of emancipation or liberation and related emancipatory (or liberation) struggle targeting at the episodes of Armenian experience of their appropriation and articulation. Mainly taking into account the perspective of their ideological 'charge' and embodiment in political spectrum, the whole examination is guided by Paul Gilroy's ideas of 'selective use of ideologies of the western

* Հոդվածն ընդունվել է տպագրության 10.05.2018:

¹ **Foucault M.**, and **Deleuze G.**, 1980, Intellectuals and Power, in: **Michel Foucault**, Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews, ed. by **Donald F. Bouchard** (Ithaca/New York, Cornell University Press) 205-217, p. 205.

Age of Revolution'² and 'the variations and discontinuities in modern experience'.³ Meanwhile, the article invokes some poststructuralist concepts as methodological devices acknowledging certain limits and constraints of their usage.

1. Formation of Political ontology

The fact that any human coexistence can be described and also aims at a self-description is a scientifically accepted standpoint. In terms of the poststructuralist perspective they appear in forms of different narratives and discourses, which construct realities by ordering and giving a meaning to any human coexistence in question. In this sense, there is a wide range of descriptions, as well as of self-descriptions of Armenians that were carried out in different discursive practices and emerged in various historical times.⁴ Roughly resuming some of them, it can be stated that one of the dominant topics, if not the most dominant one, is the topic of the (recurrent) losses of statehood (or political independence and sovereignty) because of foreign invasions and its restorations.⁵ By preliminary evaluation this topic occupies the central position among the others, thus forming some kind of axis. In other words, it collects and 'attracts' at least the most part of other topics and issues in Armenian studies. The latter, concerning various areas of social life- from economy to art and education etc., are in a unique way linked to the issue of political independence and sovereignty and interpenetrated by it. Hence, in philosophical terms a social ontology, which because of its own so to speak 'destiny' covers all these issues under one rubric, foremost and rather predominantly appears and develops as a political ontology. It is enacted and ensured by the primacy of the political (in a wide sense of the word⁶) over the social and its constitutive role- a circumstance which is not always acknowledged nor properly reflected throughout the history of Armenian social-political thought. Of course, it does not mean that the role of an axis once and for all belongs to the issue of political independence and sovereignty, or that the field of discursivity can only be organized around one topic (centre). Here displacements and shifts are also possible. But it is a matter of future developments and longitudinal researches.

As poststructuralist understandings of discourse and narrative are taken as forms of description and of self-description of any human coexistence, it would be proper to invoke another poststructuralist idea or concept to further due consideration. And the concept of nodal point, elaborated within the Lacanian Left, fits that 'position', as it enables to identify some crucial points which in their turn determine the priorities made and indicate how a social reality is explained, interpreted and understood in those discourses.

As it is elucidated in *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*, a seminal work by Lacanian Left thinker E. Laclau and Ch. Mouffe: "Any discourse is constituted as an attempt to

2 Gilroy P., 1993, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (London, New York, Verso), p. 44.

3 Ibid, p. 46.

4 For this case it is illustrative to compare *History of Armenia* by LazarP'arpec'i and *Armenia in the Period of Justinian* by Nikolayos Adonc'.

5 This cyclical image, which emerges at first glance, probably, is not incidental, as it generally crystallizes the repetitive vision dominant for a long time in the frame of premodern horizon.

6 The concept of 'the political' has two different and even opposite aspects: associative (the aspect of acting in concert or acting together), which, it is thought, has its roots in Arendt's political thought and dissociative stressed within the Schmittian tradition, see Marchart O., 2007, *Post-Foundational Political Thought: Political Difference in Nancy, Lefort, Badiou and Laclau* (Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press), pp. 38-40. Here 'the political' implies both aspects as well as all phenomena identified as political by nature.

dominate the field of discursivity, to arrest the flow of differences, to construct a centre. We will call the privileged discursive points of this partial fixation, *nodal points*”.⁷ And this strategy of identifying the nodal points is proper when it is assumed ‘a surplus of meaning’ in the field of discursivity which must be fixed by a dominant discourse, otherwise the social cannot be constituted.⁸ Hence, identification of some nodal points in Armenian discursive reality can provide an opportunity to outline the dominant discourse, how meanings are fixed in it and the way in which the social is constituted in general.

If conditionally to accept that the field of discursivity in Armenian case is described by ‘a surplus of meaning’, which is partially fixed by a discourse, and to try to identify the nodal points in it, then nowadays there are at least two of them widely articulated: the first one is the idea of emancipatory (liberation) struggle, the other one - historical (in) justice.⁹ The articulation of these two and other closely related ideas creates a certain political (social) ontology as well as an epistemological and methodological stands on Armenian reality with their particular frame(s), objects constituted by cognitive interests¹⁰, postulates and visions. At the same time it should be emphasized that these two ideas don’t perfectly meet the criteria of being a nodal point in a sense that the Lacanian Left proposes. As it is already stated, in order to be so, the field of discursivity needs to be described by a ‘surplus of meaning’, by the competition between different meanings, visions and perspectives. Only then does it make sense to consider which discourse has a predominance over the field of discursivity whereby bringing more or less an unfixed field of discursivity into a partially fixed one.

Armenian discursive reality of the last decades is operated within a narrow supply of meanings, perspectives and visions: strictly speaking, it is characterized by the deficit of meanings.¹¹ But even in this case it is still possible to discern some alternatives. Hence, factually, the ideas of emancipation (or liberation) and emancipatory (liberation) struggle as well as of historical (in) justice are quasi-nodal points. In other words, they function as nodal points only with a certain proviso, and this circumstance warns any investigator cautiously to apply the theoretical schemes, ideas and concepts, elaborated on a different ex-

7 **Laclau E., Mouffe Ch.**, 2014, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*(London, New York,Verso), pp. 98-99.

8 *Ibid.*, p. 97.

9 Here the concept of historical (in) justice is defined as ‘those harms or wrongs committed by individuals, groups, or institutions against other individuals and groups who are now dead, but whose descendants live today’. This definition by **Duncan Ivison** implies that “descendants” are not only individuals, but various kinds of groups made up of individuals who identify with a collective identity (embodied in various institutions and practices) that has persisted through time, see **Ivison D.**, 2006, *Historical Injustice*, in: *The Oxford Handbook of Political Theory*, ed. by **John S. Dryzek, BonnieHonig, Anne Phillips** (Oxford, Oxford University Press), 507-525, p. 509.

10 Here the idea of cognitive interests is used in the sense in which **Jürgen Habermas** and **Karl-Otto Apel** have proposed ‘as conditions of the possibility for the meaning-constitution of possible objects of experience’. They distinguish three cognitive interests: the interest in controlling an objectified environmental world, the interest in communicative understanding and the interest in critically emancipatory self-reflection, see **Apel K.-O.**, 2003, *Types of social science in light of human cognitive interests*, in: *Philosophies of Social Science: The Classic and Contemporary Readings*, ed. by G. Delanty, P. Strydom (Maidenhead, Philadelphia, Open University Press), 246-258, pp. 246-248; **Habermas J.**, 2003, *Knowledge and human interests*, in: *Philosophies of Social Science: The Classic and Contemporary Readings*, ed. by G. Delanty, P. Strydom (Maidenhead, Philadelphia, Open University Press) 234-239, p. 237.

11 In contrast to Western discursive reality where modernity has given birth to a wide range of different political doctrines and ideologies, their diverse variations and fusions- liberalism, socialism, nationalism, conservatism, anarchism, fascism etc., Armenian discursive reality still needs a diversity and abundance of visions, political doctrines and ideologies. The factors, causing this deficit of meanings, are another topic for a research. But among them is surely the weakness of political parties as political institutions within the political system of the third republic vis-à-vis strength of the institution of presidency before the constitutional reform of 2016 and their later enactment as well as the peculiarities of functioning of the political parties in Diaspora where narrow task of preserving of nation has been adopted throughout the decades after the fall of the first republic.

perience, to a local case, in particular, the notions and concepts of the Western tradition of theorization into Armenian context.

With regard to the ideas of emancipatory (liberation) struggle and historical (in)justice the following aspects are to be noted. In general, from the academic perspective both of these ideas have emerged successively: at first emancipation (or liberation) and emancipatory (or liberation) struggle in the second half of the 19th century, then historical (in)justice in 80-ies and 90-ies of the 20th century. The same succession is traceable in Armenian context due to the historical-political circumstances.¹² But in case of their successive articulation in Armenian discursive reality there are two features worth to be mentioned here: the first one is the historically fecund apocalyptic-eschatological tradition¹³ in Armenia¹⁴ which provides an easy access for and a contextualization of the idea of historical (in)justice at the end of the 20th and at the beginning of the 21st century.¹⁵ The second one is the presence of the idea of emancipatory (liberation) struggle in the discourse constructed on the idea of historical (in)justice but transformed into the idea of national emancipatory (liberation) struggle which, according to that discourse, enables the restoration of historical justice.

This transformation can be historically explained from the different angles. In general, it is resulted from an eagerness to be liberated at first from the oppression of various Muslim conquerors throughout centuries which later grows up into the eagerness to be politically independent at all. But in order to be more specific and to draw attention to the situation historically not so far from now, it is also due to the role and objectives of the first Armenian political parties established in the 19th century whose main struggle was against the Ottoman Empire as well as the Russian Empire. Being deprived of an opportunity to operate as classic political organizations inside of national boundaries within a political system- a struggle for political power, formation of government, execution of economic or social policy, these political parties had to set an agenda prioritizing political independence and sovereignty of Armenians.¹⁶ Hence, regardless their positioning in political-ideological spectrum between the Right and the Left, the nationalistic ideological elements are necessarily part of their ideological propaganda which makes the Armenian case of appropriation and articulation of the ideas of emancipation (or liberation) and emancipatory (liberation) struggle quite interesting and worth of examination. Then, it will not be vain to trace the trajectory of the emergence of these ideas in order to grasp the intention behind their articulation.

12 Before the constitution of the first republic and till the constitution of the third one the dominant position of the leftist ideologies and parties in Armenian context enabled the articulation of the idea of emancipatory (liberation) struggle. Since 2000-ies when mainly the conservative ideologies and parties are in power during the history of third republic the idea of historical (in)justice has replaced it.

13 Among the first historians who considers this topic is **Ashot Hovhannisyan**, see **Հովհաննիսյան Ա.**, Դրվագներ հայ ազատագրական մտքի պատմության, հատ. 1, Եր., «Հայպետհրատ», 1957; **Հովհաննիսյան Ա.**, Դրվագների հայ ազատագրական մտքի պատմության, հատ. 2, Եր., «Հայպետհրատ», 1959.

14 **La Porta S.**, 2014, Introduction to Part I, in: *The Armenian Apocalyptic Tradition: A Comparative Perspective*, ed. by **B. K. Bardakjian, S. La Porta** (Leiden, Boston, BRILL), 3-14, p. 6.

15 More detailed on this see **Մկրտչյան Ն. Փ.**, «Պատմական (ան)արդարություն գաղափարը և հայտնությունական ավանդույթը. Հայկական տրամասային կառուցումները անցյալից ներկա», «ՎԷՆ» համահայկական հանդես, N 2 (58)], 85-100, 2017, 89-98.

16 On how the ideas of political independence and sovereignty, articulated throughout centuries in Armenian context, develops into political organizations in historical perspective, see **Nalbandian L.**, 1963, *The Armenian Revolutionary Movement: The Development of Armenian Political Parties through the Nineteenth Century* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, University of California Press), pp. 30-66.

2. Emancipation (or Liberation) and Emancipatory (or Liberation) Struggle

In English there are two words with the Latin origins - *emancipation* and *liberation* which actually bear the same meaning and in the meantime provide a possibility for different political-ideological articulations both the Left and the Right oriented. Armenian language has one word-*ազիւրազրնւլ* to express both of them which can let an investigator presume, taking into account the aforementioned, too, that the term in Armenian language has also incorporated different doctrinal as well as ideological meanings thus revealing heterogeneous and interpenetrated layers inside it and, in general, in Armenian discursive reality. So here these two words in English are used interchangeably in some places acknowledging that this interchangeability can cause distortions because of their inevitably different ideological ‘charge’. As the scientific-philosophical aspect is of main concern, it would be necessary to outline the genesis of these ideas and their first conceptually elaborated usage.

The emergence and articulation of the idea of emancipation or liberation from the perspective of societal processes is basically correlated to the transition of western societies from premodernity to modernity.¹⁷ Most probably, that transition has not taken place in a manner of an absolute rupture and of an absolute beginning in all possible aspects, but some sort of ‘inheritance’ between them can be traced. That ‘inheritance’ manifests itself also in some schemes and themes transformed and reformulated in a new context and modulated with regard to modernity. The assumption, taken here, is that that perhaps the idea of emancipation (or liberation) is one of them. If to follow the history of that idea, then at first the Platonic idea of body as a prison for soul¹⁸, then the religious (or Christian) idea of salvation is in some sense transformed into the idea of emancipation (or liberation) in the modern age or enables its emergence.

Of course, preserving some structural configuration between those ideas of emancipation (or liberation) and salvation, in the latter case, human sins and the ways as well as possibilities of saving (read: liberating) of human soul from them and their consequences are questioned.¹⁹ With regard to emancipation (or liberation) the configuration replaces its elements with the new ones: instead of soul and sin (or body and its wants) we find a tyrant or a despot and his subjects, capitalists and the laboring classes in different theories and doctrines. Symptomatically, liberalism as a political doctrine and an ideology was born on the Christian value of charity and out of concern for religious toleration in post-reformation Europe stating the autonomy of human being in private matters and the necessity to limit the jurisdiction of government as well as the power of church.²⁰ Then, the idea of liberation (or emancipation) from the excessive use of power is part and parcel of this ideology where

17 On this **Marx K.**, 1978, On the Jewish Question, in: The Marx-Engels Reader, ed. by R. Tucker (New York, London, W. W.NORTON & COMPANY), 26-52, pp. 30-46; **Arendt H.**, 1998, The Human Condition, (Chicago, London, The University of Chicago Press), pp. 38-126.

18 This means that soul must be liberated from the shackles of body and its wants, **Plato**, 2002, Phaedo translated with Notes by David Gallop (Oxford, Clarendon Press), pp. 6-11.

19 In her famous book *The Human Condition* **Arendt** mentions that: “[...] Although Christians have spoken of the earth as a vale of tears and philosophers have looked upon their body as a prison of mind or soul, nobody in the history of mankind has ever conceived of the earth as a prison for men’s bodies or shown such eagerness to go literally from here to moon.”, **Arendt H.**, 1998, The Human Condition, (Chicago, London, The University of Chicago Press), p. 2.

20 **Shklar N.J.**, 1989, The Liberalism of Fear, in: Liberalism and the Moral Life, ed. by **Nancy L. Rosenblum** (Cambridge(Ma), London, Harvard University Press), 21-38, p 23; **Ryan A.**, 2007, Liberalism, in: *A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy*, vol. 1, 2nd Edition, ed. by **Robert E Goodin, Philip Pettit** and **Thomas Pogge**(Malden, Blackwell Publishing), 360-382, pp. 368-373.

evidently, the issue of power- its source, constitution, as well as the asymmetrical nature of power relations, described by domination/subordination dimension, is at stake.

Not intending to trace the whole path of the history of these ideas, which is an impossible task due to the given limits and aims of this article, it should be noticed that in general, an emancipatory (or liberation) vision is taken as an important part of the horizon of modernity and related project of modernization. Of course, ideologically the paths of the notions of emancipation and liberation are in some aspects parted. But at this point it would be important to mention the contribution made by Hegel, the influential thinker of modernity, to the emancipatory (liberation) vision which predetermines the further elaboration of the idea of emancipation (or liberation) in many aspects. In particular, his famous examination of “Lordship and Bondage” in *The Phenomenology of Spirit* already scrutinizes a complicated social relationship and the phenomenal aspect of liberation with all of its controversies.²¹ There, as Judith Butler provides a brilliant reading of it, life and death, body and soul, work and property are actually at stake.²² Then, whenever emancipation (or liberation) is of research interest, those issues come to the surface specifying reflections on social-political reality.

But it is Marx, in effect, inspired by Hegel, who first places emancipation at the heart of his famous article ‘*On the Jewish Question*’ written in 1843 (nearly forty years after *Phenomenology of Spirit*) and published a year later. Although the title of the article hints at an examination of an ethnic-national question, however, Marx succeeds in making emancipation one of the central categories of social-political thought, thereby, as Hegel, bringing a new vision on the contradictions of modern society and shedding new light on transformations from premodernity to modernity²³.

Seen in the opposition to oppression and domination caused by (any form of) power and meaning a process as well as an act of freeing from them, throughout the history of Marxism as well as post Marxism the idea of emancipation not only maintains its principal conceptual status within a certain social and political ontology but also enlarges its scope of operation indicating new forms of oppression or domination and signifying new points of struggle.²⁴ But what distinguishes any emancipatory vision from an alternative one is the intention of changing the world. ‘Such a vision contains two elements. First, it entails a conception of a better world, an image of what the world could (should) be. The realization of this better world is the *aim* of theory with practical intent. And second, it involves a claim concerning how such a world can be realized, one predicated on a belief that the intentional actions of social actors can play a role in determining the dynamics and direction of change. This second element of the emancipatory vision concerns *agents* and *actions*; this element identifies the agents of change and the practical actions necessary for bringing about such change’.²⁵ In other words, this vision enables to point out the problematic aspects of any social fabric as well as those possibilities of alternative reality (or even realities) the realization of which brings to radical transformation.

Thus, bearing a sense of ‘freeing from oppression and domination’, emancipation

21 Hegel G. W. F., 2009, *Phänomenologie des Geistes* (Stuttgart, Philipp Reclam jun.), pp. 140-149.

22 Butler J., 1997, *The Psychic Life of Power* (Stanford, Stanford University Press), pp. 31-62.

23 Marx K., 1978, *On the Jewish Question*, in: *The Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. by R. Tucker (New York, London, W. W. NORTON & COMPANY), 26-52, pp 26-48.

24 Laclau E., 2007, *Emancipation(s)*, (London, New York, Verso), pp. 1-18.

25 Alway J., 1995, *Critical Theory and Political Possibilities: Conceptions of Emancipatory Politics in the Works of Horkheimer, Adorno, Marcuse, and Habermas*, (Westport, (Con), London, GREENOOD PRESS), p. 2.

emerged in the frame of modernity and indicating its contradictions, confirms the primacy of (political) freedom which in itself is part and parcel of modernity. At first glance it is only the sense of ‘freeing from...’ is assumed in the ideas of emancipation and emancipatory struggle.²⁶ But taking into consideration the idea of a better world inherent to any emancipatory vision the sense of ‘originating a state’ is also implied.²⁷As Hannah Arendt accurately notices: “[...] Liberation and freedom are not the same; [...] liberation may be the condition of freedom but by no means leads automatically to it; [...] the notion of liberty implied in liberation can only be negative, and hence, that even the intention of liberating is not identical with the desire for freedom”²⁸

The latter one becomes completely evident when these senses or concepts of freedom are more widely explicated. So does one of the prominent political thinkers of the 20th century- I. Berlin. Having the intellectual heritage of his predecessors (Hobbes, Locke, Kant, Mill) as a background, he strictly distinguishes between the two- the negative and positive concepts of freedom noticing possible colliding potential between them as well. In his well-known essay ‘*Two Concepts of Liberty*’ he writes: “The first of these political senses of freedom or liberty (I shall use both words to mean the same), which (following much precedent) I shall call the ‘negative’ sense, is involved in the answer to the question ‘What is the area within which the subject - a person or group of persons - is or should be left to do or be what he is able to do or be, without interference by other persons?’ The second, which I shall call the ‘positive’ sense, is involved in the answer to the question ‘What, or who, is the source of control or interference that can determine someone to do, or be, this rather than that?’ The two questions are clearly different, even though the answers to them may overlap”²⁹

So, the ‘freeing from...’ and ‘originating a state’ as well as the source of control and interference come true through and after an emancipatory action which necessitates an agent taking that action (or most probably actions) and a proper vision of a better world. The notion of struggle, mentioned above and constitutive for one of the quasi-nodal points distinguished, refers to the aspect of contradiction as well as conflicting parties who acknowledge the antagonistic nature of their relations. Then, why is this emancipatory vision so willingly incorporated into Armenian discursive reality? How many aspects of emancipation (liberation) and emancipatory (liberation) struggle are discriminated in it? What does it mean with regard to some political (social) ontology worked out?

3. The Appropriative Effort and its Realization

Both ideas of emancipation (or liberation) and emancipatory (liberation) struggle have

26 This sense is well-elaborated in *Leviathan* by **Th. Hobbes**. He writes: “By liberty is understood, according to the proper signification of the word, the absence of external impediments: which impediments, may oft take away part of a man’s power to do what he would but cannot hinder him from using the power left him according as his judgement and reason shall dictate to him”, **Hobbes Th.**, 1998, *Leviathan* (Oxford, Oxford University Press), p. 86.

27 The prominent philosopher of modernity **Im. Kant** states: “... There does exist freedom in the transcendental sense, as a peculiar kind of causality, operating to produce events in the world— a faculty, that is to say, of originating a state, and consequently a series of consequences from that state. In this case, not only the series originated by this spontaneity, but the determination of this spontaneity itself to the production of the series, that is to say, the causality itself must have an absolute commencement, such that nothing can precede to determine this action according to unvarying laws”, **Kant Im.**, 2010, *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* (Stuttgart, Philipp Reclam jun.), p. 489.

28 **Arendt H.**, 1990, *On Revolution*, (London, Penguin Books), p. 29.

29 **Berlin I.**, 2002, *Two Concepts of Liberty*, in: **I. Berlin**, *Liberty*, ed. by Henry Hardy (Oxford, Oxford University Press), 166-217, p. 169.

emerged in Armenian discursive reality as a result of intellectual influences of Western modernity with its political-ideological spectrum between the Left and the Right.³⁰ But at the end of the 19th century and at the beginning of the 20th century it is Leftism, committed to revolutionary change, that mainly influences. First of all, Leftism is widely represented by the first Armenian political parties³¹, hence, necessary channels are created to direct the adopted ideas and vision to a wider public. Of course, the major event, strengthening and accelerating those influences, is the sovietization of Armenia in the 20th century.

In fact, the ideas of emancipation (or liberation) and emancipatory (or liberating) struggle as well as other related ideas appear to provide some sort of framework within which the agenda of those political parties gets formulated, simultaneously, enabling the shaping of public needs and interests from the angle of a certain ideology. Their incorporation and, naturally, proceeded localization in Armenian discursive reality have brought to the discrimination of two relevant aspects: the national and the social³² which is an indication of an indispensable fusion of ideologies or at least ideological elements from the different segments of political-ideological spectrum. The national aspect concerns freeing from the foreign oppression and domination embodied in imperial forces and achieving political independence and sovereignty. The social aspect has to do with the matters of class relations (or in Marxist terms class contradictions) due to the socio-economic oppression and domination, embodied both in imperial and domestic forces³³, and must be resulted in the equal prosperity of all regardless of their social standing.³⁴

Then, the adoption of an emancipatory vision inspired by Western modernity is not only for formulating a political agenda narrowly targeted at the ‘freeing from oppression and domination’. In fact, it reveals a more profound commitment of political parties as well as intellectuals to provide a ground for transformation of Armenian reality from its premodern state to a modern one³⁵ with all suitable attributes of modern society - national state, developed and sophisticated forms of social and economic organization, modern sciences and arts- in other words, for accomplishing a vision of a better world (or the sense of ‘originating a state’).³⁶ [...] There is nothing more futile than rebellion and liberation unless they are followed by the constitution of the newly won freedom’.³⁷ This statement by Hannah Arendt provides an opportunity not only to notice this very dimension of emancipatory vision in case of Armenian experience of its appropriation but also to pay attention to all possible effects emerging in the process of its appropriation-realization and, perhaps, from this perspective comprehend and evaluate historical events evolved at the end of 19th century but mostly at the beginning of the 20th century.

30 Nationalism, liberalism and socialism as modern ideologies hugely influenced the articulations of Armenian discursive reality.

31 Armenian Revolutionary Federation (ՀՅԴ) and Social Democrat Hunchakian Party (ՄԴՀԿ) are those parties.

32 These aspects are considered by **Ashot Hovhannisyán** in his two books, see **Հովհաննիսյան Ա.**, Նալբանդյանը և նրա ժամանակը, հատ. 2, Եր., Հայպետհրատ, 1956, 18-258; **Հովհաննիսյան Ա.**, Դրվագներ հայ ազատագրական մտքի պատմության, հատ. 1, Եր., «Հայպետհրատ», 1957, 110-162.

33 Besides drawing this distinction between the national and social aspects, which serves to analytical objectives, too, it is not less interesting to notice the possible reciprocal reflections of these two aspects, an issue worth to be considered from a historical as well as a social-political aspect.

34 It must be mentioned that the traditional Armenian parties include both aspects in their political agenda. The case of ARF (ՀՅԴ) is analyzed by **Gevorg Khudinyan**, see **Խուդինյան Գ.**, ՀՅ Դաշնակցության քննական պատմություն (սկուսքներից մինչև 1895 թվականի վերջերը), Եր., Հրատարակություն ՀՅ Դաշնակցության, 2006, 371-396.

35 On how some Armenian intellectuals put effort to formulate the priorities of this transformation at the end of 19th century and at the beginning of 20th century, see **Ազատյան Վ.**, Արվեստաբանություն և ազգայնականություն: Միջնադարյան Հայաստանի և Վրաստանի արվեստները 19-20-րդ դարի Գերմանիայում, Եր., «Ակտուալ Արվեստ», 2012, 243-292.

36 See **Հովհաննիսյան Ա.**, Նալբանդյանը և նրա ժամանակը, հատ. 2, Եր., «Հայպետհրատ», 1956, 79-258.

37 **Arendt H.**, 1990, On Revolution, (London, Penguin Books), p. 142.

Of course, the soviet period of Armenian history provides a partial and at the same time a unique realization of this vision resulted in various structures- political, economic, social.³⁸ But if to shift the focus to the philosophical aspect of the issue and narrowing the consideration ask a question ‘*What does it mean to adopt and appropriate an emancipatory vision in terms of its philosophical underpinnings?*’, it should be stated that whereby an opportunity emerges to break with the dominating religious-metaphysical tradition (with its political (social) ontology, concepts and discursive constructions) and to incorporate a new one. Based on the tradition of apocalyptic eschatology, the religious-metaphysical tradition has its own vision on how to achieve political independence and sovereignty. In particular, it stresses upon the idea of external liberating forces which determine the course of history and where the efforts of the agents from within are not enough powerful to attain desired political independence and sovereignty. Besides, that vision does not consider the social aspect of liberation or emancipation. In Marxist terms, it actually ignores the class relations and possible contradictions and, in some respect, the double oppression and domination inherent to Armenian reality.

In contrast to it, an emancipatory vision, especially in its leftist version, focuses on the internal sources of liberation and transformation whereby opening the critical aspects within that reality across the whole canvas of social fabric. But at the same time given the religious-metaphysical background of the modern ideas of emancipation or liberation and the dominance of apocalyptic tradition throughout the centuries in Armenia, it can be stated that in some sense that tradition enables the incorporation of the modern understanding of emancipation or liberation and appropriation of emancipatory (liberation) vision in general.

Thus, taking into account the articulation of the ideas of emancipation (liberation) and emancipatory (liberation) struggle in Armenian discursive reality, the appropriative effort made reveals a unique example of a selective use of the ideologies of western modernity, of their fusion and of the effect of its realization.

Conclusion

Summing up the consideration of an emancipatory vision and the Armenian experience of its appropriation, taken from the poststructuralist perspective, some inferences can be drawn. First of all, as one of the dominant topics in the discourses and narratives on Armenians is the topic of the (recurrent) losses of statehood (or political independence and sovereignty) because of foreign invasions and its restorations, in Armenian case a social ontology, covering up a wide range of issues on social reality, predominantly appears as a political ontology. At the same time, noting the extensive articulation of the ideas of emancipation (or liberation) and emancipatory (liberation) struggle in Armenian discursive reality, the last one, as well as the idea of historical (in)justice, has been functioning as a nodal point or more strictly as a quasi-nodal point. This is due to the fact that Armenian discursive reality of the last decades is operated within a narrow supply of meanings, perspectives and visions, i. e. it is characterized by the deficit of meanings. In their turn, the ideas of emancipation (or liberation) and emancipatory (or liberation) struggle, emerged in the era of modernity and being part of its horizon, have taken different doctrinal as well as ideological meanings in the political spectrum between the Right and the Left. Contradis-

38 Political independence and sovereignty are impossible during this period as Armenia was a part of the USSR.

tinguished from domination, it implies the following senses of freedom- the sense of ‘freeing from...’, the sense of ‘originating a state’ and the sense of the source of control and interference.

The Armenian experience of the appropriation of emancipatory (liberation) vision, following the logic of selective use of ideologies of the western Age of Revolution, incorporates and preserves heterogeneous layers from these ideologies in Armenian word-term *ազատագրում*. Meanwhile, at the end of the 19th century and at the beginning of the 20th century two aspects of it are discriminated: the national and the social. The national aspect concerns freeing from the foreign oppression and domination embodied in imperial forces and achieving political independence and sovereignty. The social aspect has to do with the matters of class relations (or in Marxist terms class contradictions) due to the socio-economic oppression and domination, embodied both in imperial and domestic forces, and must be resulted in the equal prosperity of all regardless their social standing. In some respect being enabled by previously dominating religious-metaphysical tradition in terms of appropriation, but fundamentally breaking with it, an emancipatory vision changes the whole perspective on how to achieve political independence and sovereignty emphasizing the role of internal sources of liberation and transformation and the double oppression and domination inherent to Armenian reality.

Naira Zh. Mkrtychyan - YSU lecturer, the scope of scientific interests covers philosophical (ontological, epistemological and methodological) problems of social and humanitarian sciences and, especially, modern philosophical studies.

Անփոփում

ԱԶԱՏԱԳՐԱԿԱՆ ՏԵՍԼԱԿԱՆԻ ԵՎ ԴՐԱ ՅՈՒՐԱՑՄԱՆ ՀԱՅԿԱԿԱՆ ՓՈՐՁԱՌՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՇՈՒՐՁ

Նաիրա Ժ. Մկրտչյան

Բանալի բառեր – ազատագրական պայքար, քաղաքական (սոցիալական) գոյաբանություն, քաղաքական անկախություն, քվազի հանգուցային կետ, հայկական տրամասային իրականություն, քաղաքական-գաղափարաբանական սպեկտր:

Հետկառուցապաշտական տեսանկյունից մարդկային համակեցությունների նկարագրման ու ինքնանկարագրման փորձերը ի հայտ են գալիս տարբեր տրամասությունների ու պատումների ձևով, որոնք կառուցարկում են իրականություններ և մարդկային համակեցությունների աշխարհում լինելը կարգաբերելու և իմաստավորելու կարևոր գործառույթներ ստանձնում: Այս առումով ուշագրավ են հայկական իրականության նկարագրման ու ինքնանկարագրման փորձերը, որոնք հենվում են իրենց տրամասությունների ու պատումների վրա՝ իրականացված որոշակի տրամասային պրակտիկաների միջոցով: Դրանցում տիրապետող թեմաներից մեկը օտար ներխու-

ժումների հետևանքով պետականության պարբերական կորուստների ու պետականության վերականգնումների թեման է: Նախնական գնահատմամբ՝ այս թեման կենտրոնական տեղ է զբաղեցնում այլ թեմաների ու հարցերի կողքին՝ ինչ-որ առումով դառնալով առանցք, որն իր շուրջ է ժողովում հայագիտական մյուս հարցերն ու թեմաները: Վերջիններս, որոնք վերաբերում են սոցիալական կյանքի ամենատարբեր ասպարեզներին՝ տնտեսությունից մինչև արվեստ, կրթություն և այլն, յուրահատուկ կերպով գալիս, հանգուցվում են քաղաքական անկախության ու սուվերենության հիմնախնդրին և փոխներթափանցում այդ հիմնախնդիրների միջոցով: Ուստի, այն սոցիալական գոյաբանությունը, որն «իր կոչմանը համապատասխան» մեկ խորագրի ներքո ընդգրկում է այս բոլոր հարցերը, ըստ էության, առաջին հերթին ու գլխավորապես քաղաքական գոյաբանություն է: Միաժամանակ հայկական տրամասային իրականության մեջ լայնորեն շրջանառվում են ազատագրման ու ազատագրական պայքարի գաղափարները: Վերջինս պատմական (ան)արդարության գաղափարի հետ միասին գործառում է որպես հանգուցային կետ կամ ավելի ստույգ՝ որպես քվադր հանգուցային կետ: Սա պայմանավորված է այն իրողությամբ, որ վերջին տասնամյակներում հայկական տրամասային իրականությանը բնորոշ է նշանակությունների պակասը:

Ազատագրման ու ազատագրական պայքարի գաղափարները երևան են եկել արդիության ժամանակաշրջանում և լինելով դրա հորիզոնի մի մասը, տարբեր գաղափարաբանական նշանակություններ են ձեռք բերել աջակնության ու ձախակնության միջև ընկած քաղաքական սպեկտրի սահմաններում: Հակադրվելով տիրապետությանը՝ այն ներառում է ազատության հետևյալ՝ «ազատություն ինչ-որ բանից», «դրության սկզբնավորման» և վերահսկման կամ միջամտության աղբյուրի իմաստները:

Ազատագրական տեսլականի յուրացման հայկական փորձառությունը, հետևելով հեղափոխության արևմտյան դարաշրջանի գաղափարաբանությունների ընտրողական կիրառության տրամաբանությանը, այս գաղափարաբանություններից ներառել ու պահպանել է տարասեռ շերտեր հայերեն «ազատագրում» բառ-եզրի մեջ: Միևնույն ժամանակ 19-րդ դարի վերջին ու 20-րդ դարի սկզբին ազատագրման երկու կողմեր են առանձնացրել՝ ազգային և սոցիալական: Ազգայինը վերաբերում է օտարի կեղեքումից ու տիրապետությունից ազատագրմանը, որոնք մարմնավորում են կայսերական ուժերը: Նպատակը քաղաքական անկախության և սուվերենության ձեռք բերումն է: Սոցիալական կողմը, դիտարկելով դասակարգային հարաբերություններին (կամ մարքսիստական եզրերով ասած՝ դասակարգային հակասություններին) առնչվող խնդիրները, գործ ունի սոցիալ-տնտեսական կեղեքման ու տիրապետության հետ՝ մարմնավորված ինչպես կայսերական, այնպես էլ տեղական ուժերում: Նպատակը անկախ սոցիալական դիրքից՝ բոլորի հավասար բարօրությունն է:

Ինչ-որ առումով ազատագրական տեսլականի յուրացմանը մեծապես նպաստել է հայոց մեջ նախկինում տիրապետող կրոնամետաֆիզիկական ավանդույթը: Սակայն ի տարբերություն վերջինի, այն հիմնարար առումով փոխում է քաղաքական անկախության ու սուվերենության հասնելու ողջ

հեռանկարը՝ ընդգծելով ազատագրման ու փոխակերպման ներքին աղբյուրների դերը և հայկական իրականությանը բնորոշ կրկնակի կեղեքումն ու տիրապետությունը:

Резюме

ОБ ОСВОБОДИТЕЛЬНОЙ (ЭМАНСИПАЦИОННОЙ) ПЕРСПЕКТИВЕ И АРМЯНСКОМ ОПЫТЕ ЕЕ ОСВОЕНИЯ

Наира Ж. Мкртчян

Ключевые слова - освободительная (эмансипационная) борьба, политическая (социальная) онтология, политическая независимость, квазиузловая точка, армянская дискурсивная реальность, политико-идеологический спектр.

С постструктуралистической точки зрения попытки описания и самоописания человеческих сообществ выражаются в виде различных нарративов и дискурсов, которые конструируют реальность, упорядочивая и осмысливая бытие этих сообществ. В этом смысле весьма примечательны попытки описания и самоописания армянской действительности, которые базируются на собственных дискурсах и нарративах и осуществляются в разных дискурсивных практиках. Одна из господствующих тем в них - тема потери государственности из-за иностранных вторжений и ее восстановления. По предварительной оценке, эта тема по отношению к остальным занимает центральное место, в некотором смысле становясь стержнем и концентрируя вокруг себя другие вопросы и темы арменоведения. Последние, касаясь таких сфер общественной жизни, как экономика, искусство, образование и т. д., своеобразным путем сплетаются с проблемами политической независимости и суверенности и переплетаются друг с другом через них. Поэтому та социальная онтология, которая, «согласно своему предназначению», включает в себе все эти темы, становится политической онтологией. Одновременно в армянской дискурсивной реальности широко артикулируются идеи освобождения (эмансипации) и освободительной (эмансипационной) борьбы. Последняя, вместе с идеей исторической (не)справедливости, функционирует как узловая точка или, точнее, как квазиузловая точка. Это связано с тем, что армянской дискурсивной реальности последних десятилетий присущ дефицит значений.

Идеи освобождения и освободительной борьбы были выдвинуты в эпоху модерна и, находясь в его смысловых горизонтах, приобрели разные доктринальные и идеологические значения в пределах политического спектра от правых до левых. Противопоставляясь господству, они вобрали в себя следующие смыслы “свободы”: смысл “свободы от чего-то...”, смысл “порождать положение” и смысл источника контроля или вмешательства.

Армянский опыт освоения освободительной перспективы, следуя логике селективного применения идеологий западных революций эры модерна, включила и сохранила гетерогенные пласты в армянском слове-термине *ազատագրում*: В конце

19-го и в начале 20-го века были различены два аспекта освобождения - национальный и социальный. Национальный аспект касается освобождения от внешнего угнетения и господства, которые воплощаются в имперских силах. Цель - добиться политической независимости и суверенности. Социальный аспект, касающийся проблемы классовых отношений (или, используя марксистский термин, классовых противоречий), связан с социально-экономическим угнетением и господством, воплощенными как в имперских, так и в местных силах. Целью является равное благоденствие всех, независимо от социального положения.

В каком-то смысле освоению освободительной перспективы во многом содействовала доминирующая прежде религиозно-метафизическая традиция. Но по сравнению с этой традицией фундаментально изменилось видение того, как нужно добиться политической независимости и суверенности, подчеркивая важность внутренних источников освобождения и трансформации и двойное угнетение и господство, наличное в армянской действительности.

REFERENCES

1. **Hovhannisyan A.**, Drvagner hay azatagrakan mtqi patmutyan, Yerevan, hat. 1, 1957, hat. 2, 1959.
2. **Hovhannisyan A.**, Nalbandyany yev nra zhamanaky, hat. 2, Yerevan, 1956.
3. **Mkrtchyan N.**, Patmakan (an)ardarutyan gaghapary yev hajtnutenakan avanduty.
4. Haykakan tramasayin karucumneri ancyalic nerka // Vem, hamahaykakan handes, N2 (58), 2017, ej 89–98.
5. **Khudinyan G.**, HY Dashnakcutyan patmutyun (akunqneric minchev 1895 tvakani verjery), Yerevan, 2006.
6. **Azatyany V.**, Arvestabanutyun yev azgaynakanutyun: Mijnadaryan Hayastani yev Vrastani arvestnery 19–20 dari Germaniayum, Yerevan, 2012.