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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

THE STUDY DESIGN

Most Australians are unaware that their country contains a thriving, albeit small, Armenian population. This is not surprising because, prior to the 1960's, there were only a few hundred Armenians residing in Australia. Even with the tenfold increase in population which occurred during the 1960's and 1970's, the number of Armenians is still relatively small in comparison with other immigrant groups. It can also be described as a "rare" population, in that it is not easily distinguishable and not readily accessible for study. These circumstances can be assumed to account for the fact that, prior to the present thesis, no other systematic studies of the Australian Armenians have been undertaken.

The only published material available on the Australian Armenians is that written and published privately by a priest of the Armenian Apostolic Church in Sydney.1 This material, although useful, has limited academic applications, as it consists largely of biographies of prominent Armenians and much of the commentary is based only upon the author's personal knowledge and opinions. There is also available one unpublished paper on the migration and settlement of the Australian Armenians which was written jointly by this priest and Dr Charles Price of the Demography Department of the Australian National University (Price and Mirzaian, 1976). This provided relevant background information and was useful during the formative stages of the present study.

Worldwide, there are a considerable number of publications on the Armenians available in the English language. The great majority of these are concerned with aspects of the history of the Armenian people and, while

1 See Mirzaian (1966; 1970a; 1970b; 1975; 1976).
useful as background material, are of little use as comparative material for contemporary studies. Even the more current publications fall into this category, as can be seen by a perusal of recently published bibliographies of such works and an examination of journals which are concerned almost entirely with Armenian subjects.1

There are also a number of academic studies concerned with Armenian migration, settlement and adjustment. Most of those which I could find written in English2 have dealt with Armenians in the United States,3 while a few others dealt with those in other countries, such as India (Basil, 1969). In most cases, the subjects studied were the first, second or third generation of Armenian refugees who settled in the United States during the early years of this century. Again, such material has limited application with regard to comparisons with Armenians who have only recently migrated to Australia. Even though most of those in Australia today are "first generation immigrants",4 they are contemporaries of second and, in some cases, third generation Armenian refugees in the United States. Because of the difference in the nature of these migrations and the fact that these groups have been exposed to very different cultures and societies over many decades, the first generation Australian Armenians can be equated with neither the first nor any subsequent generation of American Armenians. The studies of the latter, however, can still provide valuable

1 See Nercessian (1975) for a recent bibliography of articles written in Western journals. Also see the Armenian Review for an example of a prominent journal devoted to material on the Armenians.

2 There are a considerable number of works on Armenian migrations and communities of the Diaspora which are published in Armenian. See Sanjian (1958) for a list of many of these works.

3 For examples of these see Balayan (1927), Kernaklian (1967), Kulhanjian (1975), Mahakian (1935), Malcolm (1919), Minasian (1961), Nelson (1954b), and Yeretzian (1923).

4 "First generation immigrants" refers to the first generation in the host country, i.e., the original migrants. "Second generation" migrants are generally considered to be those children of the first generation who were born in the host society. In this respect these "generations" are, in fact, birthplace categories. Price and Zubrzycki (1962b: 61) draw a distinction between these generations and sociological generations of immigrants. For example, an overseas-born infant raised in the host country is sociologically no different from one born in the host society. For the present study, however, the former distinction is used since only seven respondents were under age 10 at arrival.
insights into the adaptation of Armenian immigrants to new environments.

A question which has been constantly posed to this researcher - by Armenians and non-Armenians alike - is "Why did you choose to study the Armenians in Australia?" The answer to this requires some explanation. First of all, it was suggested by Dr Charles Price of the Demography Department, A.N.U., that a study be made of a Middle Eastern immigrant group, as there was a dearth of available information on migrants from this region. Accepting this suggestion, all information obtainable on the various Middle Eastern migrant groups which were known to be in Australia was examined with a view towards selecting one for possible study. In choosing the study group, a number of "selection criteria" were employed. Firstly, it should be an immigrant population which had not been studied previously in Australia. Secondly, it should be a group on which information for the study could only be obtained by a survey or fieldwork of some sort. Thirdly, it was considered preferable to pick a group which was mainly concentrated in one major city or area, so as to make the collection of data more manageable and the group more likely to represent the overall population of the immigrant group in Australia. Fourthly, I wanted a group which was small enough to make possible an attempt at a complete "census" of households and to allow a sociological/anthropological, as well as demographic, approach to data collection in the field. Lastly, I preferred to study a group whose history and background I found interesting. The Sydney Armenians, out of the various immigrant groups considered, best met all of these criteria.

The study had two main purposes. First, it would provide information on a portion of the Australian population about which little was known - and would very likely not become known without such a study. Secondly, it was to contribute a "descriptive" work on the migration, settlement and adjustment of an immigrant group as yet unexamined, to widen our understanding of the adjustment and assimilation of immigrants in general. The term "descriptive work", as used here, is that defined by Price (1969: 192) to mean more than mere "reports" or "accounts" of the lives or careers of immigrants. In his words, "Description involves setting out something in terms of its characteristic features, leaving the
reader with a clear understanding of how an immigrant group works and what is the relationship of the forces and factors within it".

The scope of such a study as this is necessarily broad because "Only after the requisite elements necessary for a comprehensive portrait of the migration process are isolated and interrelated can we locate the junctures of migration and social, demographic, and economic processes ..." (Goldscheider, 1971: 58). Therefore, it must not only take into account the background events which led to emigration, but also describe the patterns of migration and settlement and examine the principal aspects of adjustment in the host society. It therefore cuts across a number of different disciplines - Anthropology, Sociology, Demography, Geography, History, Economics and Psychology. Because no researcher can be expected to be competent in all of these areas - for example, I have formal training in only the first three - the study framework adopted must serve to restrict the focus of the subject matter within each discipline, while at the same time permit an integration of the findings which relate to the various fields. This is accomplished here by structuring the study in the framework of immigrant adjustment. Since the above disciplines all have specialist areas which deal with migrant adjustment or assimilation, such an approach permits a sharp delineation of the relevant literature within each field. At the same time, it is possible to link the findings which relate to the various disciplines since they are concerned with different aspects of the same topic, i.e., migrant adjustment.

The principal concern of the thesis is not to determine the extent to which Armenian immigrants have changed to become more like Australians, that is, assimilated into Australian society, although it does consider this aspect of their settlement process. It is mainly an examination of the ways and means by which they have adjusted or adapted to their new circumstances. By "adjustment" and "adaptation" are meant the changes -

1 Although there are almost as many different approaches to studies of immigrant assimilation as there are meanings assigned to the term "assimilation" (See Price, 1963: 200-203; 1969: 181-237), its basic definition is that the immigrants change to become more like the members of the host society; at the same time members of the host society may change to become more like the immigrants. True assimilation, then, takes place when the immigrant is no longer distinguishable - even to himself - from other host society members.
no matter how minor - which the immigrants have undergone in order to fit better with their new environment. This approach is based on the assumption that true assimilation is highly improbable for first generation immigrants, especially those who have only recently arrived, and that the adjustment process may in fact, for a time at least, increase rather than diminish differences between immigrants and hosts; as instance the concentration of an immigrant population in special "niche occupations" or in quasi-ghetto areas of settlement. For this reason, it seems more relevant to show how and why the Armenians have adjusted in particular ways since arrival than it is to attempt to determine the degree to which they have assimilated.

The broad scope of the study has made it necessary to obtain data from a number of different sources and by a variety of means. The dearth of published material and the lack of official statistics for Armenians in Australia has already been mentioned. For this reason, practically all the Australian data used in the study was obtained by means of a social survey of the Sydney Armenians. This survey, described in detail below, was designed to collect a wide variety of personal history information. It was supplemented by extensive participant-observation during fieldwork and by examination of church records of births, marriages and deaths, and of naturalization records for the period 1901-1946. The original study population was taken to be all persons in Sydney who considered themselves either to be Armenian or of Armenian descent, including those who were part-Armenian or who were married to non-Armenians.

Since the validity of the findings of the thesis depends almost entirely upon the methodology and quality of the data collected, it is necessary to explain in detail what was collected and how.

DATA COLLECTION

Data collection took place in two stages: the Pre-Fieldwork Stage and the Fieldwork Stage. The former lasted approximately four months and took place just prior to starting fieldwork in Sydney in January 1977. During the early part of this period, extensive preparations were made to
ensure, first, that the proposed study would be favourably received by the Sydney Armenians and, second, that as many Armenians as possible were fully aware of who would be conducting the study, why it was being done and what would become of the results. In accomplishing these aims, I made a number of trips to Sydney and met with the officers and committees of all the Armenian organizations, clubs and societies; also the person in charge of the Armenian portion of Ethnic Radio and the priests of the three Armenian churches. At these meetings the proposed study was explained in detail and the help of the organizations was solicited with respect to publicizing it. Also, we reviewed a preliminary questionnaire to be posted to all Armenian households in Sydney in order to determine the reactions of those present to such a scheme, to try to allay any suspicions that its purpose was to collect "highly confidential" information from Armenians, and to elicit comments and criticisms concerning its length, the kinds of questions it asked, whether or not the questions would be easily understood, and whether any questions would be adversely received. Although in some of the organizations there was considerable suspicion concerning my "true" motives in wanting to do such a study - one organization, the Armenian Historical Society, was openly opposed to it - the generally favourable reaction received from most of the organizations and the churches suggested that, if properly approached, the study would be successful.

The postal questionnaire was then revised in the light of these comments and criticisms and pre-tested on the Armenian population of Canberra to ascertain any last-minute problems, especially in the questionnaire's design and length. During this pilot survey it was also determined that it would not be necessary to prepare the final questionnaire in the Armenian language, as doing so would not appreciably influence the response

---

1 The questionnaire had already undergone two revisions in Canberra, made after receiving comments and criticism from various faculty members of the Demography and Sociology Departments, Research School of Social Sciences, A.N.U.

2 Suspicion was a major difficulty encountered in data collection. Although extensive public relations efforts overcame most of this, considerable suspicion still existed even after six months in the field.

3 At the time of the pilot survey there were 13 Armenian families in Canberra.

4 The pilot questionnaire was conducted in Canberra in order to prevent any confusion from developing in Sydney concerning the main survey.
rate. Upon completion and analysis of this pilot survey the questionnaire was again revised before being prepared for distribution in Sydney.

In its final form it consisted almost entirely of objective, factual questions on personal history and demographic material to avoid the problem of distortion of information so impersonally obtained (See B.3., Appendix I). The more personal and attitudinal elements were left for later coverage during fieldwork interviews and informal discussions. The principal purpose of this questionnaire was to provide a "census" of the Sydney Armenians, to be used for determining the parameters of the group rather than to rely on a sample of these parameters.

Approximately one month before commencing fieldwork the questionnaire was mailed to 1,515 households in Sydney. This was the total of all Armenian households for which addresses could be obtained from all available sources. Of these, 27.7 per cent were returned within two weeks of posting, while another 16 per cent were returned soon after the follow-up letter to the questionnaire was sent (See B.4., Appendix I). Thus, prior to commencing fieldwork, a total of 661 (43.6 per cent of total mailed) completed questionnaires were received.

The Fieldwork Stage of the data collection started in January 1977 and lasted for six months. The initial two months were allocated to conducting an extensive follow-up to the postal questionnaire which, in addition to increasing the questionnaire response rate, was intended to serve a number of other purposes. Firstly, by personally making contact with a large number of Armenians in their homes, I was able to observe how and where they lived and to gain a "feel" for the Sydney Armenian community.

---

1 It was still thought prudent to include a cover letter in Armenian with the final postal questionnaire which not only explained the study but also asked the household to seek help in completing it if he had difficulty with English (See B.2., Appendix I).

2 The addresses for the postal questionnaire were obtained primarily from a directory of Armenians in Australia compiled by an Armenian priest in Sydney (Mirzaian, 1976). In addition, the Sydney telephone directory was scrutinized for all distinctive Armenians names, as identified in the Armenian directory, and names and addresses were obtained from a few of the Armenian organizations. However, most organizations flatly refused to divulge the names and addresses of their members.
Secondly, this extensive contact gave the study much wider publicity, helped to build greater rapport and provided contacts for the more intensive interviews to be conducted at a later date. Thirdly, this follow-up period allowed for a determination of why some persons failed to respond to the questionnaire and helped in locating for study a number of those persons who were not actively involved in the Sydney Armenian community. Fourthly, the wide contact with Sydney Armenians of all backgrounds helped reveal particular aspects of Armenian life which warranted more intensive investigation.

Over this two-month period a total of 225 individual Armenian households were visited in Sydney, mostly during the evenings and weekends. Though these lasted anywhere from a few minutes to a few hours, the majority were of approximately one hour's duration, during which time the host usually offered strong Turkish coffee and something to eat. It soon became evident that if something to eat and drink was proffered, it had to be accepted or the host would be insulted. This led to many sleepless nights due to drinking innumerable cups of very strong Turkish coffee during an evening's visiting! Such visits, however, were valuable and often enjoyable. After the usual preliminaries, when I explained who I was and what I was doing - sometimes having to give an entire life-history - the conversation was brought round to whether or not a questionnaire had been received and, if so, had it been returned? In a number of cases the questionnaire form was pulled out of a bottom drawer where it had been hidden (many had not thrown it away, although it appeared they had not intended to return it) and was promptly completed on the spot. In other cases, where I thought it more appropriate, another questionnaire was left for later completion and mailing. If, during a visit, the family seemed favourably inclined towards the study, they were asked if it would be possible to return at a later date for a more extensive discussion and interview. Of the 225 households visited, only seven flatly refused to complete the questionnaire, while 89 either completed one on the spot or else returned a completed one later. The response rate, then, of those who had not returned the questionnaire and who were visited was 40 per cent.

In addition to the personal visits a total of 316 Armenian householders from whom questionnaires had not been received were contacted by
telephone. On average, these calls lasted approximately five minutes, during which time I explained who I was and asked if the questionnaire had been received and returned. In many cases, the householders requested that another questionnaire be sent as they had thrown theirs away. Out of the 316, 40 refused to complete and return the questionnaire. Most refusals were courteous, although one threatened legal action if ever contacted again. A total of 99, or 31 per cent of those contacted by telephone eventually returned a completed questionnaire.

These two follow-ups yielded an additional dividend with respect to determining the true response rate to the questionnaire. Out of the original 1,515 questionnaires mailed, a total of 356 were either not received or not completed for the following reasons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of 1,515</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Returned by the Post Office (No forwarding address/moved, no trace/no such address)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Duplicate (two or more addresses for same person(^2))</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Not Armenian(^3)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Left Australia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dead</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Determined during the follow-up in Sydney

---

1 Although a total of 429 households were called I only made contact with the person called in 316 cases.

2 Duplicates occurred where individuals who had moved were listed at both their former and present addresses. Most of the duplicates occurred in Mirzaian's (1976) directory of Armenians.

3 Mirzaian (1976) included in his directory those persons in the Sydney telephone directory whose names ended in *-ian*, the traditional ending to Armenian names. Many of these were not Armenian.
Discounting these 356 resulted in a study population of 1,159 households assumed to have received the questionnaire; of these, 856 returned questionnaires and 303 did not. During the follow-up period in Sydney, however, another 34 Armenian households were located by inquiring during visits if the host knew of any other Armenians in the vicinity. Those found by this means, who were determined to have not been included in the original survey, were approached and asked to complete a questionnaire. Surprisingly, the non-response rate for these additions was nil.

By including these 34 new respondents, the questionnaire population was increased to 1,193 households, from which a total of 890 questionnaires were obtained, i.e., a response rate of 74.6 per cent. In one case, however, the respondent was found to be Australian-born and, because the study concentrates on first generation immigrants, he has not been considered in any of the analyses in the thesis.

Forty per cent of the questionnaires were found to be fully complete, i.e., every question was answered in its entirety. In most of the others, all but one or two questions were answered. The number who failed to answer a substantial portion of the questionnaire was very small. Table 1.1 shows the percentage of the respondents who fully completed the various sections of the questionnaire, only partially completed them or failed to complete them entirely.

As already shown, questionnaires were not received from 303 households, even though 219 of these had been personally contacted by the end of the fieldwork period, 169 indicating that they would return the questionnaire. Fifty of those contacted, however, flatly refused to complete the questionnaire. Forty of these refusals took place over the telephone, seven during personal visits and three by letter. Table 1.2 presents the reasons these individuals gave for refusing to complete the questionnaire. It is clear that the two most common reasons were that the questionnaire was considered an invasion of privacy and that the person was simply not interested in participating in the study. The first reason is probably the most likely cause for much of the other non-response. This judgement is based on discussions with a number of Armenians, especially
those from the Middle East. They often said that many were afraid to complete any kind of form like the questionnaire because in their former countries it "would be in the hands of the police the next day". Such an explanation helps to account for the constant suspicion encountered, and why in a number of the households visited the questionnaire form had been hidden but not thrown away.

Since a quarter of the survey population were non-respondents an attempt was made to obtain certain basic information on these households in order to determine if they differed in any significant ways from the respondent population. The specific information sought was: age, sex, country of birth, approximate length of residence in Australia, approximate
Table 1.2
Main Reasons Given for Refusing to Answer
Postal Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>N=1</th>
<th>% of Refusals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Considered it an invasion of privacy/questions were too personal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Not interested/did not want to participate in Armenian study</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Did not want to take the time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Didn't consider themselves to be Armenians because were Australian-born, English-born, or only half-Armenian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Didn't want to participate because was married to a non-Armenian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Old and/or too sick to complete</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Not interested since had no contact with other Armenians</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Turks may get hold of completed questionnaire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Wanted nothing to do with Armenians since they had not helped when first arrived in Australia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Too much like what the government does</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) No reason given</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 50 100

1 Only those Armenians who refused to complete the postal questionnaire.

educational level of household head, marital status, spouse's ethnic origin, religion and proficiency in English (See E.1., Appendix I). Although an attempt was made to acquire this information on all those households heads
known not to have responded, it was only possible to get information on 54 per cent of them (164/303). This information was obtained from church records and from the priests of the three Armenian churches and other church officials, as it was felt that these individuals would probably have the greatest knowledge of the largest number of people within the community. However, using only these sources must be considered to bias the information on the non-respondents in favour of members of the three Armenian churches. Those on whom no information was obtained, therefore, can be fairly safely assumed to be on the periphery of the Sydney Armenian community, since very few Armenians are considered not to be members of one of the Armenian churches, whether or not they actively participate. Nevertheless, with these limitations in mind, an examination of the information acquired on non-respondents can still indicate if non-response has probably caused a bias in the respondent population. Also, it can possibly show those characteristics which may have contributed to this non-response.

For all the characteristics on which information was obtained, with the exception of sex, marital status and ethnic origin of the non-respondent's spouse, the distribution of the non-response sample was found to differ significantly from that of the respondents. They were found to be older, to have resided in Australia longer, to have a higher percentage who were members of Armenian churches – especially the Armenian Apostolic Church – to be less educated and less proficient in English, and to have a higher proportion who came from the countries of South, East and Southeast Asia. This particular combination of characteristics makes difficult any explanation of non-response. For example, it was originally assumed that those who had resided in Australia longer would have been more inclined to return the questionnaire than would the more recent arrivals. Also, it was felt that non-response would almost certainly be greater for those who intermarried, i.e., married non-Armenians. Neither of these assumptions was true with regard to the non-response sample. On the other hand, it was thought likely that, because the questionnaire was in English, there would be greater non-response among older Armenians and those with less education or a lower proficiency in English. These assumptions do appear to have some validity. Although the findings from this examination of
non-response cannot by any means be considered conclusive, they do indicate that the respondents and non-respondents differ significantly in certain characteristics. From this it can be assumed that non-response has introduced some degree of bias into the respondent population. However, since it is not possible to determine this degree of bias for individual characteristics, the respondent population, which represents three-quarters of the survey population, is taken here to be representative of the Sydney Armenian community and, except for a determination of population size, is the base population used for all analyses in the thesis.

Upon the completion of the extensive follow-up to the questionnaire the final phase of the fieldwork began, that of intensive interviews with a sample of the respondents. A preliminary analysis of the questionnaire indicated that this sample should be stratified on the basis of the respondents' countries of last residence, while a representative sample within each country group could be selected on the basis of the distribution of certain principal characteristics. The selection of a representative sample within each country group was considered preferable to a random sample for two reasons: the characteristics of the different country groups were known from the questionnaire information and, since some of the country groups were small, such a sample would be much more representative than that which would likely occur by random selection. The characteristics which were used in selecting these sub-samples for interview were: age on arrival in Australia; religion; marital status; duration of residence in Australia. The original intention was to conduct as many intensive interviews as possible during the remainder of the fieldwork period, with a minimum goal of 10 per cent of the respondent population.

The interview schedule itself was prepared just prior to the commencement of the interviewing (See C.1., Appendix I), to give me as much

1 To be able to determine with precision the degree of bias introduced by non-response it is necessary to have information on the total study population. Since no information is available on 139 members of the study population the bias for individual characteristics can only be estimated very roughly.

2 Since the principal concern of the study was the adjustment of the Armenians the characteristics selected were those which I felt would have an important influence on adjustment in Australia.
time as possible to gain those valuable insights which come from being in
the field. In its preparation, I used all material obtained up to that
time, such as field notes and comments on questionnaires, and my own
judgement concerning those aspects of Armenian life which were of most
importance. Upon completion of a preliminary schedule, six respondents
with very different backgrounds were selected for a pre-test to determine
any problems in the schedule and how long an interview would take. Upon
completion of these interviews, the schedule was substantially revised
prior to its final preparation and use.

Over the last three months of the fieldwork period, I conducted a
total of 97 interviews, or 11 per cent of the questionnaire respondents.
Because of the length of the interview sessions, which ranged from two to
five hours and averaged just over three, and the fact that the great majority
could only be done during the evenings, it was only feasible to conduct
around eight per week. The time involved in the actual interview session,
moreover, usually only accounted for about half of the time which had to be
devoted to one interview. Because a minimum of two hours was required, it
was necessary to make appointments, which meant that the interview could
only be done when and where the respondent specified. In many cases, I
spent considerable time driving across Sydney, often in rush-hour traffic;
with rare exceptions the time spent driving to and from an interview was at
least one hour, while often it was closer to two. Once at the appointed
place – commonly the respondent's house\textsuperscript{1} – it was necessary to spend some
time in general conversation, drinking coffee and eating, before starting
the interview. This prelude was of utmost importance to the success of
the interviews since it served to relax the respondent, to build his trust
and to establish a closer rapport. Quite often this preliminary conver-
sation covered my own life and background; which proved useful as it showed
the respondent I was very willing to answer any questions about my own life
and resulted, I feel, in the favourable response by interviewees to the many
detailed questions on their lives.

\textsuperscript{1} There were a number of exceptions to this however. For example, I con-
ducted one interview at two o'clock in the morning in a pizza parlour in
central Sydney.
by food and drink. On the average these informal discussions, both before and after the actual interview session, lasted for a total of one and a half hours.

Another factor which apparently had an influence on the interviews—especially with regard to questions concerning Australia—was my nationality. Although many found it difficult to understand what an American was doing in Australia studying Armenians, the fact that I was also a foreigner in Australia allowed them to express their views about Australia and Australians more openly. It is possible that they would have been just as frank with an Australian interviewer but, from the way in which their views were often presented, this was not the impression I received.

During the period of interviews, a total of seven respondents failed to keep appointments, either by not being at home at the appointed time or by not showing up at the appointed place. Attempts to reschedule these interviews proved futile, indicating either that they had no intention of being interviewed in the first place or that, after initially agreeing, they had changed their minds. In replacing these individuals, other respondents with the same or very similar characteristics were selected and contacted for interviews. By this means, the overall representativeness of the sub-samples was maintained.

The representativeness of the completed sample of interviewees to the total respondent population proved good, although they were found to differ in some respects (Table 1.3). A comparison of the distribution of the characteristics of the sample to the whole indicates that the interviewees showed a greater tendency to be in the higher occupational categories, to have a better command of the English language and to be more concentrated in North Sydney.¹ The difference in distribution of these three characteristics between interviewees and the respondent population are all statistically significant at the .05 level. Although no explanation can be offered for the difference in occupational categories, the differences in the latter two characteristics can be partly attributed to the facts that:

¹ This refers to the area of Metropolitan Sydney north of Sydney harbour and not to the Local Government Area of North Sydney.
Table 1.3

Chi Square Tests of Significance on the Distribution of the Interviewed Sample Compared in Selected Characteristics with the Distribution of the Overall Respondent Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Value of $X^2$</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present age</td>
<td>2.566</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0&gt;p&gt;0.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of birth</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.750&gt;p&gt;0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of last residence</td>
<td>2.781</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.995&gt;p&gt;0.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year arrived in Australia</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.750&gt;p&gt;0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age upon arrival</td>
<td>4.823</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.500&gt;p&gt;0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of residence</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.990&gt;p&gt;0.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalized Australian</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.750&gt;p&gt;0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjugal status</td>
<td>0.974</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.500&gt;p&gt;0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td>13.327</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.050&gt;p&gt;0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse's ethnic origin</td>
<td>3.814</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.100&gt;p&gt;0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.750&gt;p&gt;0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of English proficiency</td>
<td>15.872</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.001&gt;p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of education (males)</td>
<td>2.190</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.500&gt;p&gt;0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of education (females)</td>
<td>2.082</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.500&gt;p&gt;0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current area of residence</td>
<td>6.529</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.050&gt;p&gt;0.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

first, the majority of those interviewed were contacted by telephone, which meant that if there was no-one in the household who could speak English well it was generally not possible to make an appointment for interview; second, because I resided in North Sydney (Ryde), individuals who lived in this area
were generally more accessible for interview. Also when a "no-show" took place with an Armenian in another area of Sydney, a replacement was usually obtained from the population in North Sydney.

In this study, the fact that, for the majority of the characteristics, the differences between the interviewees and the larger population from which they are drawn are not statistically significant is taken here to mean that the former are quite representative of the latter. For this reason, in the analyses of this study, the interviewed sample and the respondent population are both used to refer to the Sydney Armenian population as a whole. In cases where the former is used, they are referred to as "those interviewed", the "interviewed respondents" or the "interviewees", in order to distinguish them from the larger population of Survey "respondents". In the presentation of the results of the analyses of both, however, they may be simply referred to as "the Armenians" or "the immigrants", indicating in each case the first generation Armenian immigrant population in Sydney.

Other Data Collected

In addition to obtaining questionnaires and interviewing the sample I undertook extensive participant-observation throughout the fieldwork period. This entailed attendance at parties, formal dinners, baptisms, funerals, protest meetings, student meetings, Saturday schools, church services, club meetings, sporting events, concerts, dances and many informal get-togethers in the homes of individuals for dinner, barbeques, and so on. In fact, every opportunity was taken during this period to meet as many Armenians in as many different circumstances as possible. This yielded invaluable insights into the community and allowed for much informal discussion of the lives and backgrounds of the Sydney Armenians. It was also extremely important with regard to publicizing the study, building rapport and allaying the ever-present suspicion concerning what was being done and why. It was not uncommon when contacting a prospective interviewee to be told that they had seen me at such-and-such a function or meeting. This seemed to mean to many that the Armenian community had given
both me and the study the "stamp of approval" and was felt to have contributed to the favourable response received.

Another factor of importance in both participant-observation and gaining the acceptance of the Armenian community was the presence of my wife at functions, meetings, and other gatherings. Her appearance was interpreted by the Armenians as a compliment - that I thought highly enough of the situation to want to include my wife. This, in itself, appeared to enhance my reception in such situations.

The other information collected during the fieldwork period consisted of: a questionnaire completed on all Armenian organizations (see D.1., Appendix I); a copy of all church records on baptisms, marriages and deaths from the three Armenian churches - much of which had to be translated from Armenian; tape recordings of the life histories of 10 of the interviewees.

DATA ANALYSIS

Upon completion of the fieldwork period in July 1977 all data were brought back to Canberra. The postal questionnaire was coded for analysis by computer while the interviews and other data were analysed by hand. There were two basic reasons for not preparing the latter information, especially the interviews, for computer analysis: by continuously dealing first-hand with the interviews and the more subjective information, I felt I would maintain closer contact with the individuals studied and with their personal situations; secondly, I felt that much of the richness of the individuals' replies would be lost if an attempt was made to code answers to the open-ended questions on the interviews. The principal means by which the questionnaire data were analysed were programmes of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and the chief statistical test of significance employed in the analyses was that of Chi-Square ($x^2$).

ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

This thesis is presented in a chronological framework. It can be
perceived as an historical continuum, beginning with the origins of the Armenians in antiquity, proceeding to the events which prompted their emigration from the Middle East and elsewhere, chronicling their migration and settlement in Australia (particularly in Sydney) and culminating with an examination of the principal aspects of their adjustment in their new country. Since the Armenians in Sydney today are the principal interest, the attention devoted to the above aspects increases as the focus shifts from their history up to the present.
CHAPTER II

ARMENIAN HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

INTRODUCTION

In the long history of the Armenian people their settlement in Australia is a very recent event. Although some settlement took place over one hundred years ago, substantial immigration began only after World War II. Thus, in the light of their recorded history, which spans almost 3,000 years, the arrival of Armenians in Australia has only just occurred.

Like other ancient peoples, such as the Jews, the Armenians cannot be considered separately from their history. Their evolution as a distinctive people and their continued survival under the greatest of hardships are due, in large part, to their particular historical development. Even though very recent events can be identified as the principal causes of their migration to Australia, the patterns of this migration and their later settlement and adjustment can be fully understood only with reference to their history.

This chapter will cover those events which have shaped Armenian historical development and which have had a continuing influence on the Armenians up to the present day. Because of the importance of the social aspects of Armenian life in the present study, their history is here divided into three chronological phases which also reflect stages of their social development. These phases, entitled Ancient History, Modern History and Recent History, deal respectively with the period prior to the Ottoman conquest of Turkey, the Ottoman Period itself and the years since the close of the Ottoman Period.

Although these particular divisions imply that Armenian history is largely a chronicle of the Turkish Armenians, this is not the case. With the Ottoman conquest of Turkey, the Armenian people were effectively divided
into two population components, those who came under Ottoman rule and those who were under Persian, and later Russian, control. This separation led to the development of two major Armenian dialects and the designation of the former population as the "Western" Armenians and the latter as the "Eastern" Armenians. The historical development of the two has followed different courses, but with each eventually making significant contributions to Armenian settlement in Australia. The Armenian "pioneers" in Australia, as well as the early founders of the Sydney Armenian community, were drawn mainly from the Eastern Armenian population, while almost all subsequent immigration consisted of Western Armenians. In addition to constituting the bulk of the present-day Australian Armenian population, the most significant social and historical developments which still affect Armenians today have largely concerned the Western Armenians. It is for this reason that the major emphasis of this chapter is on the history of this group.

ANCIENT HISTORY: THE PRE-OTTOMAN PERIOD

Historic Armenia, known as Greater Armenia, occupied the mountainous lands on the northern borders of the Middle East just south of the Caucasus. Although it varied in size at different times in its history, it is generally taken to be that area with a western boundary situated between Kharput and Malatya in Turkey, an eastern boundary running between Khoi in Persian Azerbaijan and Soviet Karabagh, a northern boundary located between Ardahan and Lake Sevan and the southern boundary located below Lake Van (Lang and Walker, 1976: 5-6). The most famous landmark of the area, and one which is of singular importance to the Armenian people, is Mount Ararat, the legendary resting place of Noah's Ark. It represents the epicentre of ancient Armenia.

Although this area is generally considered the Armenian homeland, it does not include a second area of historic settlement, known as Little Armenia, which occurred in the region of Cilicia in the eleventh century. Since Ottoman times this latter region and that part of Greater Armenia which lay within the Ottoman domain have constituted what has become known as "Turkish Armenia" (Price and Mirzaian 1976: 1).
The exact origin of the Armenian people is still not known, although it is generally accepted that they are an Indo-European speaking people of Caucasian racial stock (Der Nercessian 1969: 20; Morgan 1918: 67). They entered recorded history in the sixth century B.C., when Armenia was represented as the thirteenth satrapy of the Achaemenid Empire in the Behistun Inscription of Darius I (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1938, Vol. 1: 378; Kurkjian, 1964: 24). Since that time the Armenian people have played a part in almost every major event in the Middle East - a fact which can be attributed largely to the geographical position of Greater Armenia (Der Nercessian, 1969: 90). Besides being "a citadel coveted by neighbouring States" (Morgan, 1918: 35), it was also virtually the "doorway" between the East and the West through which the important caravan routes from Persia, India and Babylon passed to the Black Sea (Der Nercessian, 1969: 24). The combination of its strategic military and commercial importance, while serving to involve Armenians in many political struggles throughout the centuries and resulting in its almost continual domination by foreign powers, also provided the people with the material advantages of active trade and led to them becoming efficient traders at an early date (Nansen, 1928: 243).

The Moulding of a Distinct Armenian National Identity

"... the Armenians, like their neighbours the Georgians, have forged a national and cultural unity which has stood the test of centuries of alien domination. This unity, based on a common language, civilization and religious faith and backed by uncommon personal tenacity and courage, has survived persecutions which were intended to result in the nation's total extermination" (Lang, 1970: 39).

Although the beginning of Armenian "nation formation" can probably be traced back to the founding of the Urartian Kingdom in the ninth century B.C., the first major influence on the development of Armenian identity was the evolution of a distinct social structure which differed from those of surrounding peoples (Hewson, 1972: 286). The mountainous configuration of the Armenian homeland precipitated the development of a feudal type of system which did not lend itself to strong central government. This system had strengths as well as obvious weaknesses. By fostering inner dissensions among the feudal lords it facilitated the domination of the Armenians by
their more powerful neighbours since it inhibited Armenian political unity. However, at the same time, this social structure made sustained control by an enemy almost impossible (Burney and Lang, 1971: 128-129; Der Nercessian, 1945: 16-17; 1969: 30-42, 54, 57; Kurkjian, 1964: 311-316; Lang, 1970: 130-137, 165-166). Thus, notwithstanding the outward dependence of Armenia on, and domination by, much more powerful neighbours, these feudal lords were for a long time able to save the country and population from destruction. This feudal system persisted in Greater Armenia until the Byzantine annexation in the eleventh century A.D., at which time the Armenian people shifted their allegiance from the feudal lords to the Armenian Church (Der Nercessian, 1969: 42, 57).

Religious Nationhood and Linguistic Identity

Given the centrifugal tendencies of feudal Armenian society, it is highly likely that the Armenians would eventually have been assimilated into or eliminated by one of the great powers which surrounded and alternately sought to dominate them, had it not been for the introduction of a second major force in Armenian national development - the Christian religion (Lang, 1970: 166; Nansen, 1928: 268). In 301 A.D. Armenia was officially converted to Christianity by St. Gregory the Illuminator, making it the first kingdom in history to adopt Christianity as the state religion (Atiya, 1968: 305; Ormanian 1912: 10-13). During the century which followed, however, the Armenian Church suffered from two interrelated weaknesses: Christianity remained largely the religion of the aristocracy, rather than that of the general populace; the people as a whole had no direct access to the Christian literature which was written in either Greek or Syriac (Atiya, 1968: 321). The Church decided that this state of affairs could only be rectified by the development of a written language which would allow for the translation and wider dissemination of Christian literature. A critical stage was reached at the beginning of the fifth century when the Armenian Church was faced with an even greater problem - the assimilationist threat of intensive Mazdaist propaganda from Persia. At this time it was felt both by the Church and the State that the development of an Armenian script could serve the dual purpose of strengthening the Church and providing an effective barrier to Persian assimilation within the Mazdaist religion (Dekmejian, 1976: 27; Der Nercessian, 1969: 84).
The task of developing an Armenian alphabet was entrusted to a learned cleric, Mesrop Mashtots, who was well-versed in the Greek and Syriac languages. Mashtots succeeded in 406 A.D. in creating a 36 character alphabet which reproduced the sounds of spoken Armenian. Following this, he and a number of assistants spent 30 years translating the Bible, the Greek liturgy and many Western authors into the Armenian language, thus laying the foundation of a national literature (Aslan, 1920: 48-51; Chakmakjian, 1965: 15; Kurkjian, 1964: 333-334).

This new symbiosis of religion and language greatly contributed to the strengthening of the national character of the Church and must be regarded as second in importance only to the introduction of Christianity in helping to instill a consciousness of national identity in the Armenian people (Dekmejian, 1976: 27; Der Nercessian, 1969: 84; Nalbandian, 1963: 12). In the words of the Armenian historian Morgan (1918: 133-134), "The Church and the people became one through the bond of a written language". Also, the development of a standardized Armenian Bible became a unifying influence on the multitude of dialects in Armenia and, especially during the Byzantine Period, served to prevent the two sections of the nation under Greek and Persian, and later Arab, rule from growing apart (Atiya, 1968: 325-326).

The distinctiveness of the Armenian Church was further reinforced when it effectively broke relations with the Greek Church in 551 A.D. over the "monophysite" dispute concerning the true nature of Christ. Ultimately, this resulted in the isolation of the Armenian Church since all subsequent attempts at reuniting it with the Church of the Byzantine Empire failed (Chakmakjian, 1965: 15-21; Sarkissian, 1965: 196-218); its only friendly contacts were with other "monophysite" churches – Syrian Jacobites, Copts and Abyssinians – but these were relatively small and weak. Indeed, by its doctrinal separation from the powerful Roman and Orthodox Churches to the west and, later, north, the Armenian Church was literally creating its own "brand" of Christianity. This went beyond the possession of doctrinal peculiarities to include a plethora of architectural, liturgical and musical

1 The "diophysites" held that the divine and human natures of Christ remained complete and distinct after their union, each one retaining its specific properties and acting according to them. Monophysites, on the other hand, insisted on the intimate union of the two natures of HIS person (Lang, 1970: 169-170).
manifestations, all of which were practiced within the confines of the Armenian Church (Dekmejian, 1976: 27). Thus, by this series of events the Armenian Church came to be "the principal source of national unity: the one organization that remained active when the country was overrun and occupied by the enemy and political life was destroyed" (Der Nercessian, 1969: 78). It also accompanied people wherever they went in their dispersion and proved, together with the Armenian language and literature, the most important bond of their cultural unity (Sanjian, 1965: 29).

Though the Church later became divided in terms of episcopal jurisdiction, it generally reckoned its senior patriarch to be the Supreme Patriarch or Catholicos, after 1441 located at Etchmiadzin, an old monastic centre near Erevan, the ancient capital of Armenia, some 30 miles to the north of Mt. Ararat.

The fusion of the principal components of Armenian identity was timely, as the Armenians were shortly confronted by the joint forces of Islamization and Arabization following the Arab conquest of the Middle East in the seventh century (Dekmejian, 1976: 27). Surviving as a national group for over two centuries of Arab rule, the Armenians in 886 A.D., under one of the leading feudal families - the Bagratids - regained their independence until Byzantium annexed the kingdom 160 years later (Der Nercessian, 1969: 39; Lang, 1970: 196-197). Following this annexation there occurred a series of other invasions of the Armenian lands, by the Seljuk Turks in 1048 A.D., by the Mongol hordes in 1220 A.D., by the Tartars under Tamerlane in the fourteenth century and, after Tamerlane's death in 1405, by the Turkoman tribes who remained until the conquest by the Ottoman Turks in the sixteenth century (Der Nercessian, 1969: 40-41; Lang, 1970: 205-207).

Armenian Movements During the Byzantine Period

The period of independence under the Bagratids and the subsequent invasions of the Armenian lands led to major shifts in the Armenian population. The founding of the Bagratid kingdom was accompanied by a concerted eastward expansion of the Byzantine Empire which, beginning in the second half of the tenth century, resulted in large numbers of Armenians moving into the Empire and settling in the regions of Sivas, Kharput and
Kayseri - areas of Turkish Armenia where their descendants were to remain for a thousand years (Charanis, 1960–61: 146; 1961: 215–216; Der Nercessian, 1969: 39).

With the fall of the Bagratid Dynasty and annexation by Byzantium in 1045, emigration intensified. In addition to the forced movements of the Armenian aristocracy to other parts of the Byzantine Empire, the raids of the Seljuk Turks, which began in earnest at about this time, caused the flow of emigrants from Armenia to reach the proportions of a mass migration. The greatest numbers moved to the regions of Cilicia where, in 1080, they founded the kingdom of New Armenia. This kingdom survived for a further 300 years until it fell to the Egyptian Mamluks in 1375 (Burney and Lang, 1971: 210–211; Der Nercessian, 1969: 44–53; Lang, 1970: 197–198, 200–211).

After the mass movements which followed the Seljuk invasion, the geographical distribution of the Armenians stabilized and did not greatly change until the latter part of the Ottoman Period.

MODERN HISTORY: THE OTTOMAN PERIOD

In 1453 Byzantium fell to the Ottoman Turks and Constantinople became the Turkish capital. Turning east, the Ottomans seized the Armenian lands from the Safanid Persians in 1514–16. The region again became the battleground for two powerful armies, with the Armenians caught in the middle. During the war that broke out in 1603, the Persian Shah Abbas I strove to regain the lost territory from Turkish rule. In 1620 the two powerful neighbours concluded a peace and divided Armenia between them. The dividing line ran from north to south, crossing the Aras, the Armenian range, and running along the Vaspurakan Mountains east of Lake Van to the Armenian Taurus (Aslanyan et al., 1971: 68). The greater part of the Armenian homeland remained in Ottoman hands and became known as Western, or "Turkish" Armenia, while Persia regained the regions of Erevan, Nakhchevan and Karabagh, henceforth known as Eastern Armenia. The strength of the division of the Armenian people which accompanied this territorial partition was to prove of great significance in their subsequent history, since events after this time followed quite different paths for the Eastern and Western Armenians.
Historical Development of the Eastern Armenians

In the period between the division of the homeland and the annexation of almost all of Eastern Armenia by the Russians in 1828, few developments of importance occurred in this region. Suffering continual oppression at the hands of the Persians the economy stagnated and Eastern Armenia continued on the level of a backward feudal country with a primitive agriculture and a weak handicraft industry. This situation was further exacerbated by repeated attempts to cast off the Persian yoke, only one of which succeeded. At the beginning of the eighteenth century a group of Armenian noblemen in the mountainous region of Karabagh managed to gain independence for this area. However, after only eight years, in 1730, they were reconquered and again brutally suppressed. Thus, from the seventeenth until the nineteenth century the most significant events in the history of the Eastern Armenians occurred outside Eastern Armenia (Aslanyan et al., 1971: 69).

During the course of military campaigns to regain the Persian Armenian lands seized by the Ottoman Turks, Shah Abbas I transplanted a population of between 10,000 and 40,000 Armenians from the Nakhchevan and Julfa regions of Armenia to the outskirts of his own capital at Isfahan, resulting in the establishment of the Armenian city of New Julfa in 1605 (Lockhart, 1950: 257; Raffi, 1914: 175, 184). By doing this the Shah was accomplishing the military objective of quelling the separatist tendencies of the Armenians of these areas, as well as gaining their commercial and trading expertise (Ferrier, 1973: 39-40; Hovanessian, 1962: 30-31; Raffi, 1914: 175-176, 184-186). The latter was especially important at this time since international trade in the East was largely in the hands of the Christians (Dutch, Portuguese, English) with whom the Moslems often found it difficult to deal directly. The Armenians, being Christians, were therefore the ideal middlemen the Shah needed in order to enter this trade and thus bring prosperity to his domains (Kurkjian, 1964: 469; Morgan, 1918: 333).

With the encouragement of the Persian court the New Julfa Armenians not only prospered but also managed to forge trading links in the busiest ports of India, Burma and many of the countries of Southeast Asia.
As trade increased, large Armenian colonies were founded in these ports and trading centres, only to decline or die out as the trade in an area diminished or shifted elsewhere. Thus, the history of significant Armenian settlement in the Far East can be traced to the establishment of New Julfa, since "It was from this city that the Armenian settlement of India and the East stemmed" (Hovanessian, 1962: 31).

Although there are indications of Armenian contact with India before the Christian era and concrete evidence exists of contacts as early as 1497, these early-comers were transient merchants who did not settle permanently. The first Armenian colony developed in Agra during the reign of the Great Mogul Emperor Akbar (1542-1602), apparently at Akbar's invitation. From this time Armenians began to settle in cities all over India - Delhi, Surat, Bombay, Calcutta, Dacca, Chinsurah, Saidabad, Madras, among others - and were well established in almost all of India's commercial centres before the arrival of the Europeans (Abrahamian, 1968: 272-273; Basil, 1969: 13-75; Ferrier, 1970: 430; Hovanessian, 1962: 31).

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the Armenians of New Julfa and those of the trading centres in India attained positions of such strategic commercial importance that they were practically indispensable in the establishment and maintenance of trade links between Persia, India and countries of the Far East, and, to a lesser extent, between these areas and the major Western trading powers. In the silk trade, which was of major importance during this period, the Armenians became so dominant that the British East India Company was obliged to conclude an agreement with them in 1688 which allowed Armenian merchants to handle a great deal of the trade between India, Persia, and Europe. This agreement, which gave the Armenians the status of Englishmen in all respects, prompted the East India Company to invite them to participate in a joint trading venture aimed at "squeezing" the rival Levant Trading Company out of the silk trade (Abrahamian, 1968: 273; Christopher, 1975: 276; Ferrier, 1970: 427, 431; 1973: 49-62). This relationship with the British proved disadvantageous to both parties, resulting in a decline in the prominence of the Armenians in the India trade during the eighteenth century (Kaloustian, 1947-48: 253). Nevertheless, by this time the colony in Calcutta had become the largest and
most important Armenian community in the East, as well as the economic, cultural, educational and social centre of the Armenians in India. New Julfa, however, continued to serve as the religious centre for these Armenians (Hovanessian, 1962: 31-33).

With the decline in their influence over the India trade, the Armenians began to spread further afield in Southeast and East Asia. During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries they founded small trading colonies in Rangoon, Mandalay, Penang, Singapore, Batavia (Djakarta) and Surabaya, with a few families settling in Manila, Saigon, Hong Kong and Japan. Almost all of these maintained active ties with Calcutta and New Julfa and continued as flourishing communities until World War II (Colless, 1969-70: 32-34; 1970-71: 117-119; 1971: 15-19; 1973-74: 6-13; 1974-75: 11-14; Hovanessian, 1962; Mirzaian, 1966: 184-216). It is from these Armenian colonies in India and Southeast Asia that Australia received its earliest Armenian settlers.

When Russia took possession of the Armenian territory under Persian control in 1828 the focus of the historical development of the Eastern Armenians shifted back to the Armenian homeland. Despite the discriminatory policies of the Romanov bureaucracy, the Armenians under Russian rule made impressive cultural and economic strides, especially during the latter half of the nineteenth century, which resulted in an Armenian intellectual and political renaissance. Significantly, however, the major developments took place outside the Russian Armenian provinces, which, apart from the ancient centres of Erevan and Etchmiadzin, the Eastern Armenians generally regarded as a relatively unimportant part of the historic homeland. Although this renaissance certainly affected the population of Eastern Armenia, its principal influence was felt in the eastern Ottoman provinces - Turkish Armenia - which was considered the "cradle of the nation" at that time (Hovannisian, 1971: 3-4). Here it was to be instrumental in the "awakening" of Armenian national consciousness which occurred during the latter half of the nineteenth century.

**Historical Development of the Western Armenians**

When Mehmed II made Constantinople his capital in 1453 he was faced
with the dilemma of how to administer an empire comprised of many areas in which non-Moslems constituted a majority. He succeeded in reducing this administrative problem by building on the earlier practice of the Caliphs (Tritton 1970: 1-17) and establishing religious communities, or "millets". Each subject community was allowed to retain its own laws concerning matters of civil status and to enforce them under the general jurisdiction of a "millet bashi", or community head, who was responsible to the Sultan. Although the millet was an ecclesiastical institution, with the "millet bashi" being the patriarch of the particular religious group, in its internal functioning it was also political. These religious superiors had almost unlimited authority over the members of their communities and were responsible for maintaining order, overseeing all personal matters such as marriage, inheritance, the founding of schools, and even levying taxes on behalf of both the community and the Sultan. Moreover, the status of all non-Moslems in the Empire was derived exclusively from membership of one of the millets. It was a fundamental law of the Ottoman Empire that every Christian or other non-Moslem subject must be enrolled in one of the existing and recognized communities. Thus, this system permitted a form of dual loyalty, both to the religious community and to the Sultan, while legitimately separating the subject minorities from the ruling Ottomans (Atamian, 1955: 20-21; Bryce, 1916: 617-618; Burtt, 1926: 45-46; Conybeare, 1889-90: 299; Ormanian, 1912: 60-61; Zeidner, 1976: 467).

The Greek Patriarch of Constantinople was originally appointed as the millet bashi of all Christians in the Empire in 1453. In 1461, in fear of the Patriarch becoming too powerful, the Sultan transferred the Armenian bishop of Bursa to the capital and appointed him Patriarch of all the monophysite Christians (Ormanian, 1912: 76). His community, the "Ermeni Millet", joined the Greek Orthodox and Jewish millets to become the three official non-Moslem establishments within the framework of the Empire; a situation which was to continue until the nineteenth century when the Armenian Catholics and Protestants came under the jurisdiction of two newly established Catholic and Protestant millets (Hovannisian, 1967: 25; Sanjian, 1965: 32-33; Sarkissian, 1938: 14).

Following his appointment, the Armenian Patriarch at Constantinople gradually brought all the Armenians within the political boundaries of the
Ottoman Empire under his administrative control, thus becoming both the religious and temporal leader of all the Armenians in the Ottoman dominions. Since the majority of the Armenian people dwelt in the Empire, the Patriarch became not only the most important, but, in effect, the most powerful dignitary among the Armenians everywhere. Also, since his patriarchal seat was located in Constantinople, that city gradually became the centre of Western Armenian ecclesiastical and national life (Sanjian, 1965: 33-37; Sarkissian, 1969: 500). At about the same time that the special see in Constantinople was created there developed a split in the Church caused by the attempts of the Patriarch of Sis (Cilicia), who in fact was, at that time, the Supreme Patriarch or Catholicos, to unite the Armenian Church with the Roman Church. This led to the election in Persian Armenia of a second Catholicos who established himself in the ancient religious centre of Etchmiadzin (Atiya, 1968: 333). Neither Catholicos, however, was to exercise much power amongst Western Armenians during the Ottoman Period.

The millet system proved both workable and beneficial to the Armenians (Bryce, 1916: 618; Hovannisian, 1967: 25; Sarkissian, 1938: 16), enabling them to maintain their religious and cultural institutions virtually intact. Moreover, by being able to remain loyal to the national faith they safeguarded their national identity throughout the centuries of Turkish domination. By preserving the only records of Armenian history and culture, the Church provided an additional force to help "bind the faithful together" (Matossian, 1967: 65; Nalbandian, 1963: 30-31). These factors, therefore, ascribed a national character to the millet while serving to strengthen the ethnocentrism of the group (Atamian, 1955: 20, 23; Sarkissian, 1938: 126).

However, not all aspects of the millet system benefited the Armenians. By their very nature those aspects which helped preserve Armenian identity and distinctiveness, e.g. social and political separation from the Moslems and internal autonomy, also served to legitimize discrimination against them. Atamian (1955: 23-24) illustrates this well when he says:

"One of the unintended consequences of this system was that it justified, on moral grounds, the intolerable
living conditions of the subject peoples since these people were outside the pale of the law and of religion. Indeed, they were something less than human beings. It is obvious that such an adjustment between conquerer and conquered could lead only to an incorrigible prejudice and to a scape-goat system in which the infidel took the blame for all the shortcomings of the ruling elite."

Thus, by automatically separating them from the Turks and other Moslems, and by perpetuating the ethnic differences, the millet system helped to sustain Ottoman prejudice and discrimination against the Armenians. Nevertheless, during the first 400 years of Ottoman rule the Armenians were considered the most pacific of all the racial and ethnic elements of the Empire, acquiring the title of "sadik millet", the "obedient millet" (Mirak, 1965: 25; Sarkissian, 1938: 16). Even in periods of bloody insurrections, such as during the revolts of the Djelalis in the first decade of the seventeenth century when the Armenians were subjected to inhuman treatment, they refused to side with the rebellious group (Aslan, 1920: 105; Nalbandian, 1963: 41; Sarkissian, 1938: 16). This unquestioning acceptance of the "Turkish Yoke" continued well into the nineteenth century (Bryce, 1896: 344; Hovannisian, 1971: 8-9).

The Condition of the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire

During the early centuries of Ottoman domination, when the Empire remained strong and its government efficient, the Armenians fared quite well (Sarkissian, 1938: 16; Yale, 1958: 119), but this situation had changed radically by the nineteenth century due to the Empire's accelerated decline. By the turn of the century the Empire had degenerated to the point that it was beset by a myriad of problems: a stagnant economy, a crumbling transportation system, uncontrollable brigandage, and burgeoning corruption and oppression.

The Empire's decline did not affect all Armenians to the same degree. They were scattered throughout the length and breadth of Turkey, with large numbers living in the coastal cities (Bryce, 1916: 611-616). The greatest concentration, however, was still found in the historical and traditional Armenian homeland of Eastern Turkey, which the Ottoman Government
had divided into six administrative provinces, or "vilayets". While these vilayets - Erzurum, Van, Bitlis, Mamouret-ul-Aziz (Kharput), Diyarbekir and Sivas - contained some moderately large cities, three-fourths of the Armenian population consisted of peasants who resided in small villages (Atamian, 1955: 43-47; Nalbandian, 1963: 25). Moreover, with the exception of Van, none of the vilayets had an Armenian majority and overall the Armenians comprised only 39 per cent of the provincial population (Bryce, 1916: 619; Mirak, 1965: 3). It was this provincial population, notably the peasants, who were to suffer the full impact of the changes associated with the Empire's decline (Atamian, 1955: 47).

The social and political problems faced by the Armenian peasants of the provinces can be related to two principal causes - their relationship with the Kurds and the official Ottoman policy towards the Armenians (Atamian, 1955: 45-47; Sarkissian, 1938: 32-34). Their association with the Kurds was, in many ways, the typical relationship of sedentary agriculturalists to nomads which has formed so much of the history of the Middle East (Gulick, 1976: 53-100; Patai, 1971: 13-38, 73-83; Yale, 1958: 117). Living as they did at a subsistence level in rugged mountain country, the Kurds viewed the Armenians as fair game for looting and plunder. This they were able to practice with almost total impunity due both to the Ottoman Government's law against Christians owning and bearing arms and to the fact that the government sanctioned the "Kishlak", or Kurdish "right to quarter" (Atamian, 1955: 50; Nalbandian, 1963: 25-26; Nansen, 1928: 267; Zeidner, 1976: 469).

"The Kurds for the most part lived in the mountains and under tents when the weather permitted but in winter they used to fall upon Armenian villages, demanding free quarters for themselves and for their flocks of sheep. Sometimes the winter season lasted six months, and for six months they had to be quartered. For this 'right' the Kurdish chiefs paid a sum of money to the governor-general. No wonder that the latter did not interfere when Kurds molested and mistreated and even murdered the Armenians. And the villagers were forced to give such quarters. Such was the practice at least throughout the nineteenth century, and if the Armenians resisted, the Kurds would fall upon them as helpless and defenseless prey" (Sarkissian, 1938: 34).
Such conditions made the life of many of the provincial Armenian peasants unbearable, stimulating emigration to other areas of the Empire, especially the various parts of Western Asia Minor.

Official Ottoman policy towards the Armenians did not help matters. Of the numerous problems which beset the Armenian peasantry, perhaps the most important was that of taxation and the methods by which it was administered. The Armenians were discriminated against and were required to carry the heaviest tax burden. In fact, in the provinces many of the taxes were levied only on the Armenians since they were primarily responsible for maintaining the economy in the vilayets. Of all the taxes, the policy of "tax farming" was perhaps the most abusive since the right to collect this tax was purchased from the government. This allowed the tax collectors to line their pockets at the expense of the Armenian peasants who were denied redress of any kind (Atamian, 1955: 55; Nalbandian, 1963: 25-26; Sarkissian, 1938: 32). The plight of the Armenian peasant during this period has been described as follows:

"Thus thrown outside the pale of law, subjected to an unequal system of taxation, and suffering under a system of tax-farming that had shown its notoriously corrupt features in all lands at all times; barred from military, naval and other government services; not permitted to bear arms at a time and in a land where his nomadic and marauding neighbour was armed to the teeth; his family exposed to the unlicensed brutality of these neighbours for which there was no redress; the native Christian of the Ottoman Empire, especially if he dwelt in the Eastern provinces of Asia Minor, led a life that was quite different from that of his Mohammedan neighbour" (Sarkissian, 1938: 18-19).

The Armenian peasant also led a life quite different from his counterpart in the city, especially in the large coastal cities like Constantinople. The city-dweller was spared Kurdish raids and pillage and the occurrences of violence so common to the rural areas. Moreover, the abuses to which he was subjected were those which could be handled, and even compensated for, such as excessive taxation. Thus, the better conditions of the city-dweller placed him apart from the peasant and often resulted in his having a vested interest in maintaining the status quo, even at the
expense of the peasant (Zeidner, 1976: 469-470). This was partly due to the fact that the Armenian peasant, who was considered socially inferior by the Armenian city-dweller, not only failed to elicit compassion for his plight but was often met with scorn (Atamian, 1955: 59).

The problems besetting the Armenians at this time were not all caused by forces outside the community. During the first half of the nineteenth century the Armenian community in Turkey was torn from within by bitter controversies between the Apostolic Church and the rapidly growing Armenian Catholic and Protestant groups. Although the Armenian Catholic Church had been founded in 1740 (New Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1974: 524), it was not until the early period of the nineteenth century that religious conflict resulted in placing Armenian Catholics, who were legally under the jurisdiction of the Armenian Patriarch, in a very precarious position. At this time the Patriarch, the Apostolic community and the Sultan all became hostile to these Catholics, but for different reasons. For the Patriarch, increasing conversion represented a loss to the Apostolic community both numerically and financially, while for many members of this community conversion to the Catholic faith was seen as synonymous with relinquishment of Armenian nationality (Sarkissian, 1938: 127).

"Thus it is that, to the bulk of Armenians, the transference by one of their countrymen of his allegiance from the national Church to the Latin appears to be a giving up of race and of patriotic memories ... it is hard to convince an orthodox Armenian that a Uniate, or one of his countrymen who recognizes the Bishop of Rome rather than the Catholicos of Edschmiadzin as his spiritual head can yet continue to be a patriotic Armenian" (Conybeare, 1889-90: 298-299).

For the Sultan, the Catholics represented possible subversive elements within the Empire because of their suspected friendly relations with the Europeans who, in 1827, had defeated a Turkish fleet at Navarino (Aslan, 1920: 121). However, through the intervention of the French ambassador in Constantinople, the Ottoman Government issued an edict in 1831 by which the Armenian Catholics were recognized as a separate community with their own church head. This politically separated them from the centuries-old Ermeni Millet (Ormanian, 1912: 90; Sarkissian, 1969: 501).
The first contact of the Armenians with Protestant missionaries dated from 1821, although it was 1831 before the American Protestant Mission was established in Constantinople (Chopourian, 1972: 1; Ormanian, 1912: 90-91). From this time Protestant proselytism increased considerably among the Armenians due primarily to the lack of success in converting Moslems. By 1846 more than 1,000 Armenians had withdrawn from the national Church (Arpee, 1909: 41; Nalbandian, 1963: 42), causing a bitter reaction against the foreign Protestant missionaries who, together with their Armenian converts and associates, were teaching doctrines and spreading ideas not in harmony with those of the Apostolic Church (Chopourian, 1972: 71-79). Various kinds of pressures were put upon those who followed the teachings of these missionaries, but, in spite of this and due partly to the precedent already established with the Armenian Catholic community, the Ottoman Government granted the Armenian Protestants legal status as a millet in 1850 (Chopourian, 1972: 23-32, 62-91, 117-123; Ormanian, 1912: 91; Sarkissian, 1969: 501-502). Such a move, however, did not soften the hostility of the Armenian Apostolics towards the Protestants (Mirak, 1965: 30).

A second source of division among the Armenians was the struggle for democratic representation within the framework of the Ermeni Millet which began in the 1830’s and lasted until the establishment of the Armenian National Constitution in 1860 (Atamian, 1955: 29-42; Lynch, Vol. 1, 1965: 436-437; Ormanian, 1912: 92-94). By the nineteenth century the Patriarchal office had become so weak and corrupt that the real power was held by an oligarchy comprised of "amiras", wealthy bankers, merchants, or government officials, whose positions stemmed not from their election or appointment but essentially from their wealth (Nalbandian, 1963: 43; Sanjian, 1965: 36-37; Yale, 1958: 120-121). By dominating the office of the Patriarch, these amiras virtually controlled much of the national and religious activity of the Armenians of Constantinople. This oligarchical rule continued unhindered until the 1830's when a rising middle class of Armenians in Constantinople began to demand more democratic representation in the Millet. These demands led to a bitter intra-community dispute which lasted for almost three decades, finally resulting in the defeat of the oligarchical elements and the codification of the Armenian National Constitution (Lynch, Vol. 1, 1965: 445-467). This constitution, which was officially sanctioned by the
Sultan in 1863, provided for a liberal, democratic and representative system of government for the Millet which was based on universal suffrage (Atamian, 1955: 29-42; Nalbandian, 1963: 42-48; Sanjian, 1965: 36-45). Although it did not materially reform the Church it did place a veto on the many arbitrary acts of the Patriarch (Sarkissian, 1938: 127). It also provided for a system of public education for the Armenians, thus laying the foundation for the Armenian cultural renaissance and national development which was to characterize the second half of the nineteenth century (Nalbandian, 1963: 48; Sanjian, 1965: 44; Sarkissian, 1969: 502).

With the realization of the Constitution and the Assembly, however, the Armenian people were again divided into two opposing classes, this time based on wealth. The wealthy class of Constantinople, who were subject only to the Porte, accepted a policy oriented toward their own economic aggrandizement through co-operation with the Ottoman Government. This separated them from the masses living on the plateau, who were subject to a completely different set of circumstances, and resulted in the provincial peasantry being left to its own resources (Atamian, 1955: 40-41).

The Armenian "Awakening"

Armenian "national culture" had largely ceased to exist for the Armenians in general and for those of the Ottoman Empire in particular up to about the mid-nineteenth century (Sarkissian, 1938: 115), to the extent that it was "frequently difficult to distinguish the Turkish from the Armenian family ..." (Curzon, 1854: 232-233). The period between the Treaty of Paris (1856), which ended the Crimean War, and the Treaty of Berlin (1878), which ended the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78, can be considered the formative years of a new national and cultural "awakening" of the Armenian people. The forces which prepared the ground for this "awakening", however, were multitudinous and came from many directions. Principally, these were: the Apostolic Church, which had served as the centre of learning since the fall of New Armenia; Roman Catholic missionary activities which, from the time of the New Armenian Kingdom, served to introduce Western thought to the Armenians; the Armenian Mekhitarists who, in Venice, wrote and published works in the Armenian vernacular, enriching
Armenian literature and introducing Western ideas; the achievements of the Armenians of the Diaspora, where the first books and journals in Armenian were published and where the first calls were made for the liberation of Armenia; the contributions of certain gifted individuals like Khatchatur Abovian, the father of modern Armenian literature, who wrote in the vernacular glorifying the revolutionists and inciting his countrymen to act (Nalbandian, 1963: 30-40; Sarkissian, 1938: 116). Although almost all of these developments occurred outside Turkish Armenia, their influence was such that by the mid-nineteenth century the Armenians of the Ottoman Empire had begun to examine their situation in the Empire and the possibilities for improving it.

Of all the factors which led to the awakening of Armenian nationalism, the two most important were the spread of Western ideas and the increase in educational opportunities for the Armenians, especially those in the Eastern provinces. Both factors had their initial impact on the populous Armenian community of Constantinople, which had long been familiar with European culture (Lewis, 1961: 62). By the 1830's and 1840's the expanding commercial contact with the West brought with it a large thriving Armenian middle class in Constantinople which increasingly sent its youths to European universities for their education (Mirak, 1965: 27; Zeidner, 1976: 472). Through these channels, progressive ideas and institutions began to penetrate the Armenian Millet, sowing the seeds of change (Megrian, 1963: 33-39).

Western ideas and educational opportunities were often introduced at the same time. With the coming of the American Protestant Mission to Turkey came also the establishment of schools which provided a Western education. As the Protestants established missions throughout Turkey - at Trebizond, Erzurum, Smyrna and elsewhere - they started schools which catered mainly for the Armenians (Stookey, 1976: 362). This spread of Protestant education had an additional unplanned, but beneficial, effect on the Armenian educational system. It stimulated competition from the Apostolic Church which, in turn, led to an upgrading of its educational facilities both quantitatively and qualitatively (Chopourian, 1972: 125-126; Mirak, 1965: 31; Nalbandian, 1963: 50).
After 1860 the number of Armenian schools and associated organizations had multiplied, exposing the once illiterate or semi-literate provincials to Western education and Western ideas (Mirak, 1965: 33; Nalbandian, 1963: 48-49). This development was further enhanced by the new form of literary expression which came into use—vernacular Armenian—thus making it possible to reach the vast majority of the population who understood only the spoken language (Atamian, 1955: 85-86; Nalbandian, 1963: 33-34, 38-40, 49; Sanjian, 1965: 75-76).

The acceleration in educational advancement of the Armenians was accompanied by an Armenian literary revival, both within Turkey and within Russian Armenia, which was characterized by the establishment of a number of journals and other works; these reflected both the new nationalistic ideas and the traditional ones of the Armenians (Atamian, 1955: 72-89; Sanjian, 1965: 70-78; Sarkissian, 1938: 118-128). In the space of a few decades this movement culminated, towards the close of the 1870's, in a profound change in the outlook of the Armenian people. Having known abject servility and lived in subjugation for almost six centuries, they finally began to take stock of their situation and to seek amelioration of their plight within the Ottoman Empire.

The "Armenian Question" and the Armenian Revolutionary Movement

The Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 and the events which immediately succeeded it brought about two significant developments: the beginning of Western intervention in Ottoman affairs on behalf of the Armenians of the Eastern Provinces; a change in the character of the Armenian awakening. Prior to this time, whenever the Western powers had demanded reforms from the Sultan they had meant reforms for the European provinces alone. After 1878, however, all areas of Turkey were included. It was this struggle for the improvement of the Armenians' situation in the Eastern provinces which produced the so-called "Armenian Question" of international politics (Nalbandian, 1963: 25; Sarkissian, 1938: 12, 23; Toriguian, 1973: 18).

Before 1878 the Armenian awakening was largely cultural and conservative, devoted primarily to educational and economic reforms. After
this time and for the 30 years that followed, a small minority turned to a more radical and revolutionary nationalism. Except for a small political group, the Armenakans, founded in 1885 in Van, Turkey, the principal sources of Armenian revolutionary thought developed outside Turkey, notably in the Caucasus and Russian Armenia (Atamian, 1955: 93-94; Nalbandian, 1963: 82, 90-103).

This nationalistic revival in Russian Armenia was assisted by the substantial increase in population which resulted from the large influx of Turkish Armenians during the two Russo-Turkish Wars of 1828-29 and 1877-78 (Atamian, 1955: 64-70; Bryce, 1916: 623). During a period of liberal rule by the Tzar, this immigration helped to stimulate a minor industrial revolution and, with it, an expanding middle class—especially in the large Caucasian cities like Tiflis and Batum—which spurred a nationalistic revival bringing schools, a vigorous press and a nationalistic literature (Hovannisian, 1967: 15-16; Matossian, 1962: 12-25; Missakian, 1950: 3; Sarkissian, 1938: 121).

Although during the 1860's and 1870's the Russian intellectuals and press voiced the need for reforms in the Turkish provinces, no organization which could push for these reforms developed until after the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 and the subsequent atrocities committed against the Armenians by the Kurds (Atamian, 1955: 86). Attempts at organization were also stimulated by the success of the Balkan uprisings which had resulted from the War (Hepworth, 1898: 128-147; Sarkissian, 1938: 43; Yale, 1958: 122).

The first revolutionary committee, the Hunchakian Party, was organized by a group of Russian Armenian students in Geneva in 1887. This party, influenced by contemporary Russian revolutionary thought, had as its programme two principal objectives, the liberation of Turkish Armenia from the Ottoman yoke and the establishment of a state modelled on Eastern European socialism (Atamian, 1955: 94-100; Nalbandian, 1963: 104-131). These goals, which were to be reached by any means available, including insurrection and bloodshed, reflected a loss of confidence in, and reliance on European diplomatic measures to bring about the needed reforms (Aslan, 1920: 127; Bryce, 1916: 622; Sarkissian, 1938: 87-114; Yale, 1958: 121-122).
Until 1894 the Hunchaks were primarily engaged in organizing and consolidating their position. In August of that year they staged an ill-fated uprising in the village of Sassoon, which resulted in a swift and merciless retaliation on the part of the Ottoman Government. Not only Sassoon but the entire vicinity was completely devastated, leading to the Hamidean massacres of 1894–97 (Aslan, 1920: 128–129; Atamian, 1955: 130–155; Hepworth, 1898: 225–243; Nansen, 1928: 288–289; Sarkisian and Sahakian, 1965: 18; Yale, 1958: 124–126). For over 12 months cities from Constantinople to Van were subjected to brutal massacres. Estimates of the death toll range from 30,000 to 300,000 Armenians (Mirak, 1965: 37). These massacres ended the first and, in many ways, the most active phase of the Armenian revolutionary movement. Not only had the possibilities for a full-scale revolution been thwarted, but the massacres had also severely depleted the Hunchakian ranks. For more than a decade revolutionary agitation was to remain at a low ebb (Nalbandian, 1963: 127–131).

A second political party, the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, or the Dashnaks, had been established in 1890 in Tiflis, a centre of Armenian intellectual and political life in the Caucasus (Atamian, 1955: 101–129; Nalbandian, 1963: 151–178). While the Hunchaks were launching their campaign in Turkish Armenia, the Dashnaks were busy establishing a firm foothold among the Armenians in the Caucasus, and slowly beginning to assert themselves as a force among the Turkish Armenians as well. Due to the popularity of its singular purpose — the liberation of Turkish Armenia without any Marxist implications — and the weakening of the Hunchakian Party because of a rift in its membership (Nalbandian, 1963: 128–131), the Dashnaks soon developed as the central force of the Armenian revolutionary movement (Atamian, 1955: 104; Missakian, 1950: 28). This central position in Armenian national life has persisted up to the present day. To quote Atamian (1955: 101): "In one way or another, the entire social and political history of the Armenians since that time has been inextricably bound up with it". The Dashnaks therefore have not been merely a political party, but also an entire historical and ideological movement.

In 1908 a dramatic change took place in the relationship between the Armenians and the Turks when the "Young Turks" seized power, compelling
Abdul-Hamid to submit to a constitutional regime (Hovannisian, 1967: 28-29; Lang, 1970: 287). They proclaimed an end to the oppressive policies of Abdul-Hamid and a new deal for the minorities of the Ottoman Empire based on civil and religious liberties and parliamentary representation. For the majority of the Armenians, who embraced this change wholeheartedly, it was hoped that a Young Turk-Armenian rapprochement would result in a favourable solution to the Armenian Question (Bryce, 1916: 625-626; Lang, 1970: 287). The massacres of Armenians in Cilicia and Northern Syria in April of 1909, however, confirmed that the Young Turk policy towards the Armenians did not differ substantially from that of the previous regime (Aslan, 1920: 130; Hovannisian, 1967: 29-30; Morgenthau, 1974: 19).

In many ways the arrival of the Young Turks placed the Armenians in a worse position than before, since a programme of "Pan-Turkism" was instituted whereby "The Turkish leaven was to permeate the non-Turkish lump until it had become one uniformed Turkish substance" (Bryce, 1916: 633). To accomplish this the millet system was to be dismantled and with it what little autonomy the Armenians had hitherto enjoyed (Atamian, 1955: 179; Bryce, 1916: 634).

**Armenian Movements During the Ottoman Period**

In addition to the movements of the Eastern Armenians to India and the countries of the Far East during the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Armenians were also travelling in the opposite direction, to the countries of Western Europe. Here again the pioneers were primarily transient merchants, but, as the level of trade increased between Europe and Asia, Armenian colonies began to spring up in the large trading centres like Amsterdam and London. This movement of Armenians came primarily from the large coastal cities of Turkey, especially Constantinople and Smyrna, and from New Julfa and its satellite communities in India (Kurkjian, 1964: 470-471; Minasian, 1961: 15).

In 1612 a treaty was concluded between the Ottoman Sultan and the Dutch which forbade the use of other than Dutch ships in the exportation of Turkish or Persian products from Turkish ports. Henceforth, Turkish
Armenian merchants confined their shipping exclusively to Dutch ships, leading them to open warehouses in Amsterdam. During this same period certain Armenians of New Julfa established businesses in Amsterdam, due to the monopoly held by the Dutch East India Company of the trade with Persia. A contract was also signed between these Armenian and Dutch merchants in East India in 1645. The first known settlement of Armenians in Holland, however, did not take place until after 1605 following the establishment of New Julfa. This settlement, accompanied by the arrival of Armenians from Smyrna, led to the development of a thriving Armenian colony which lasted until the Napoleonic Wars, when Amsterdam was almost depopulated after the French occupation. Before this time the Armenian business houses of Amsterdam had established branches in other European cities and countries such as Venice, Leghorn, Marseilles and in Spain (Ferrier, 1973: 44; Kurkjian, 1964: 472).

The growth of the English trade with Persia and India led to a similar development in England, with Armenian colonies being founded in London and Manchester. These colonies, which did not reach the scale of the one in Amsterdam, were primarily concerned with the silk-cloth trade discussed earlier.

With the advent of the nineteenth century the scene of movements shifted back to the Armenian homeland. Russia's appearance in the Caucasus and the ensuing Russo-Persian and Russo-Turkish Wars of 1827-28 and 1828-29 stimulated the migration of over 100,000 Armenians from the Persian and Turkish lands to Russian Armenia (Atamian, 1955: 70; Hovannisian, 1967: 9; Morgan, 1918: 334; Raffi, 1914: 208; Sarkissian, 1938: 31), and started a continuous exodus of the Turkish Armenians of the eastern provinces to other parts of the Empire. The greatest numbers migrated to other parts of Asia Minor, especially to the large cities like Constantinople, while others migrated from Asia Minor to the large trading and commercial centres of the Empire, such as Aleppo and Damascus. This latter group migrated primarily during the period after the war of 1877-78, attracted by the increasing international trade in these centres (Christopher, 1975: 275; Sanjian, 1965: 65). This continuous emigration of Armenians from the provinces during the remainder of the Ottoman Period made it almost impossible
to ascertain the exact number of Armenians present in Eastern Turkey at any given time (Hovannisian, 1967: 10; Sarkissian, 1938: 31).

The nineteenth century also saw the first large-scale migrations of Armenians to North America. During the early part of the century a number of Armenians had migrated there primarily to pursue educational goals or to make their fortunes and then return home. After 1880, however, with the relaxation of the Ottoman restrictions on the departure of subject peoples, considerable numbers began arriving in United States ports (Tashjian, 1975: 239-240). This flow increased to thousands after the political upheavals of the 1890's, especially during and after the Hamidean massacres of 1894-97. After 1899, when the Sultan prohibited any further emigration, the volume of immigration decreased, although it remained substantial up to the end of the Ottoman Period (Balayan, 1927: 2; Kurkjian, 1964: 472-473; Malcom, 1919: 72; Tashjian, 1947: 18). The majority of these immigrants came from the Armenian provinces of Turkey, from the lower middle and poorer classes, but large numbers also came from the larger Armenian colonies in Western Turkey, especially Constantinople and Smyrna, and from Eastern Europe (Mirak, 1965: 1). Most of these Armenians drifted initially into mills and factories, but in time began opening up shops and stores and establishing thriving communities in the northeastern cities and in Fresno, California (Avakian, 1974: 34; Balayan, 1927: 4-7; Kulhanjian, 1975: 42-68; Mahakian, 1935; Mirak, 1965: 1; Tashjian, 1975: 240-259; Yeretzian, 1923: 31-37).

RECENT HISTORY: THE POST-OTTOMAN PERIOD

The Pre-World War I Period (1909-1914)

The Young Turk coup of 1908 hardly lessened the plight of the Turkish Armenians, for government directives did not affect the armed Kurdish marauders of the Eastern provinces (Buxton and Buxton, 1914: 112-113). In a short time the situation had degenerated to unbearable anarchy, leading the Armenians once more to seek effective measures to improve their situation. When their pleas to the new government met with the same empty promises of help as before, they appealed for help beyond the borders of
the Empire (Davidson, 1948: 482-484; Hovannisian, 1967: 30-31; Nansen, 1928: 296). This call for European intervention was soon echoed by both Armenian communities of the Diaspora and sympathetic organizations, making it again necessary for the Western Powers to take some notice.

The first country to respond was Russia, which, after years of calculated silence, found it expedient to protest anew the excesses to which the Turkish Armenians were subject (Davidson, 1948: 486-487; Hovannisian, 1967: 31-33). Foreign policy considerations, alarm over German economic maneuvers in Anatolia and the fear that a desperate Turkish Armenian population would rebel, bringing with it insurrection in Transcaucasia, led Russia to propose a fresh scheme of Armenian reforms in 1913. After months of discussion and debate a compromise was finally reached by the Western Powers and the plan imposed on the Ottoman Government in 1914 (Bryce, 1916: 635-636; Hovannisian, 1967: 33-34; Nansen, 1928: 297; Royal Central Asian Society, 1931: 102).

This plan, the most satisfactory and workable reform programme proposed to that date, granted considerable cultural and political autonomy to the Armenian provinces, which were to be consolidated into two administrative regions headed by European inspectors-general (Corbyn, 1932: 587; Hovannisian, 1967: 33-38). The Armenian hopes which these reforms engendered, however, were shattered by the surprise Turkish attack against Russia that same year (Hovannisian, 1971: 12; Nansen, 1928: 298). This event not only annulled the reform plan but also initiated what became "the most devastating calamity in the turbulent history of the Armenian people" (Hovannisian, 1967: 40).

The Armenians of Turkey were not in favour of going to war with Russia, since it would mean fighting over their own territory against Russian Armenians. Nevertheless, when war came, many apprehensive Armenian leaders strove to convince the Turkish Government that they were patriotic citizens of the Empire. These manifestations of loyalty were not entirely sincere, for it was well-known that the true sympathies of almost all Armenians throughout the world lay with the Allies, not with the Central Powers. This fact was brought home to the Turkish Government during the
latter part of 1914 when several prominent Turkish Armenians, including a former member of Parliament, fled to the Caucasus in order to collaborate with the Russian military authorities (Hovannisian, 1967: 41-42; 1971: 11).

The initial Turkish military thrust into the Caucasus in 1914 was successful for only two weeks before it collapsed against a wall of Russian and Armenian soldiers. The part played in this defeat by the Russian Armenian volunteers infuriated the Turks, who blamed their lack of success on the Turkish Armenians' "luke warm" loyalty, compared to the Russian Armenians who were going beyond the call of duty (Atamian, 1955: 185-187; Bryce, 1916: 638; Burtt, 1926: 67-68; Hovannisian, 1967: 42). No more excuses were needed. In April of 1915, using the pretext that the Armenians who inhabited the war zone offered aid and comfort to the enemy and were fermenting a rebellion, the Ottoman Government ordered their deportation from the Eastern Vilayets (Hovannisian, 1971: 12-13).

Deportation and Massacre of the Turkish Armenians

It is not the purpose here to discuss the reasons for the Turkish deportations and massacres of the Armenians. The literature supporting both the Turkish stance and the Armenian stance is voluminous and often emotionally charged. The important fact for our purposes is that these deportations and massacres took place and affected almost the entire Armenian population of the Ottoman Empire (Hovannisian, 1967: 48-49).

The events started with the disarming of all the Armenians, both military and civilian. This was often accompanied by open violence (Bryce, 1916: 639). This violence became particularly bad in the Vilayet of Van, where the Turkish soldiers were exasperated by the recent reverses on the Russian front. Seeing what was happening around them, the Armenians of the city of Van prepared for a Turkish attack. This came on 20 April 1915. The Armenians withstood their attackers for a month until help arrived in the form of Russian and Armenian troops and, when the Russians withdrew two months later, almost the entire population of the Van Vilayet accompanied them to Russian Armenia (Atamian, 1955: 190; Bryce, 1916: 627-628, 639; Hovannisian, 1967: 53, 55-57; Nansen, 1928: 300-302; Simpson, 1939: 30-31). The Turkish solution to the Armenian Question was now underway.
In a systematic fashion and with unusual speed and efficiency, the Armenian intellectual, religious and political notables were arrested, deported or executed. The thousands of Armenians in the Ottoman army were segregated into unarmed labour battalions and ultimately slaughtered. Under various guises the young men of hundreds of Armenian villages were marched away; in some cases they were massacred a short distance from the village, while in others they had to walk for many days before being killed. Once the young men had been removed, the remainder of the population - women, old men and children - were driven southward, most to their deaths (Morgan, 1918: 307-312; Morgenthau, 1974: 30-32; Nansen, 1928: 303).

From the moment these deportees left the outskirts of their towns and villages they were subjected to every outrage imaginable. The Moslem peasants mobbed and plundered them as they passed through the cultivated areas, often joined in these acts by the gendarmes. When they came to the mountains they were met by bands of Kurds and "chettis", brigands recruited by the Turks from the public prisons to assist in killing the Armenians. These bands slaughtered and raped at will, killing men, women and children (Atamian, 1955: 193; Bryce, 1916: 643; Nansen, 1928: 304-305). Of those who were not killed outright, great numbers died of starvation, exposure and disease. To all appearances it was a deliberate, systematic attempt to eradicate the Armenian population throughout the Ottoman Empire (Bryce, 1916: 648; Nansen, 1928: 307).

Aleppo, Syria, was the place upon which the Armenian convoys converged, with the southeastern desert of Syria the intended destination. Although some of the exiles were left in the vicinity of Aleppo itself, at places like Moubidj, Bab and Ma'ara Idlib, these were comparatively few. Many more were deported southward from Aleppo along the Syrian railway and distributed in the districts of Hama, Homs and Damascus and an even larger number were sent eastward and deposited on the banks of the Euphrates in the desert section of its course. Deir-el-Zor was to be the largest depot of all (Bryce, 1916: 644-645; Nansen, 1928: 308).

By November 1915 the Armenian population of Turkey was, at most, only a third of its former number of approximately 2,000,000, while the
Eastern provinces were almost completely bereft of their Armenian population. With the Russian advance into Anatolia in 1917, however, many of the Armenians, who had taken refuge in the Russian areas and elsewhere, returned to their villages in the Eastern Vilayets. Their stay was to prove short since the Russian armies withdrew after the Russian Revolution and in 1918 the Turks again advanced and carried out yet more deportations and massacres (Nansen, 1928: 311-312).

The Armenians in the Caucasus had meanwhile organized an independent Armenian republic with its capital at Erevan (Hovannisian, 1967; 1971). This republic, proclaimed on 28 May 1918, concluded peace with Turkey in June 1918 and sought protection from one of the Western Powers. None could be found to accept a mandate for its protection, however, and so, in 1920, Turkey invaded the new republic. To escape almost certain destruction the Armenian Government signed a treaty with the Russians in August 1920, which resulted in full Russian control of the Republic in 1922. The members of the Dashnak Party, who had held power during the period of independence, were expelled and the Republic was incorporated into the U.S.S.R. Although final efforts to secure the creation of an independent Armenia were made in 1922 and 1923 at the Lausanne Conference, they proved unsuccessful and the project was finally abandoned (Atamian, 1955: 204-256; Corbyn, 1932: 589-593; Nansen, 1928: 312-317, 320).

During this same period some of the Armenians who had survived the deportations and massacres returned to their homes in Anatolia (Nansen, 1928: 317), while others, especially in Cilicia, remained under Allied protection (Corbyn, 1932: 589; Simpson, 1939: 33). However, with the evacuation of the British troops, the remaining French troops proved insufficient to provide the necessary protection, with the result that in February 1920 some 30,000 Armenians were massacred in Hadjin and Marash. This was soon followed in October 1921 by a mass emigration of Cilician Armenians to Syria and other countries, when the French decided to evacuate Cilicia. Of these refugees, about a fourth remained in the Sanjak of Alexandretta (Hamalian, 1974: 72; Nansen, 1928: 317; Simpson, 1939: 33).

However, Armenian sufferings were not yet over. In 1922 the Turks turned their attention to the Turkish territory under Greek occupation,
routing the Greeks at the battle of Afyon Kara Hissar and eventually sacking Smyrna (Housepian, 1972). Some 100,000 Armenians were driven out of this area and scattered to Greece, Bulgaria, Constantinople, Syria and Russian Armenia. This was the last great wave of Armenian emigration from Turkey, although refugees continued to leave in small numbers during the years 1923-25 and a considerable exodus from the Sanjak of Alexandretta took place both in 1929-30 and in 1937-39, mainly to Syria and Lebanon (Burtt, 1926: 88-95; Corbyn, 1932: 593; Hamalian, 1974: 72; Nansen, 1928: 317).

The Turkish Armenian Population

Various estimates have been made of the number of Armenians who died due to deportation or massacre, but no two agree. This is partly because the estimates of the Armenian population of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries tend to vary greatly (Bryce, 1916: 648). The 1878 Patriarchate placed the total Armenian population at that time at 3,000,000, while the Patriarchate of 1882 estimated the population at only 2,600,000. In 1886, however, an Armenian clerical writer placed the entire Apostolic population of the Empire at 1,263,900 souls, leading him to estimate the total Armenian population of the Empire at 2,500,000, of whom some 500,000 inhabited the Eastern Provinces (Lynch, Vol. 2, 1965: 427-428). Sarkissian (1938: 31), on the other hand, has estimated the population of the vilayets before the massacres to be at least 1,000,000, while the Patriarchate of 1882 placed it at 1,630,000.

According to the 1912 figures of a Patriarchal inquiry, the number of Armenians in the Empire was 2,100,000, with 1,163,000 in the six vilayets, 407,000 in Cilicia and 530,000 in the rest of the Empire (Bryce, 1916: 648). This estimate was approximately half a million below the 1882 estimate, a decrease which might be explained by the 1894-97 massacres, the continual exodus towards the Caucasus, Europe and America, and by the unreliability of the statistics (Hovannisian, 1967: 36). The Ottoman figure for this period was substantially lower, being only 1,100,000 for the Empire, of which 600,000 were said to live in the Eastern Provinces (Bryce, 1916: 649).

Since both the Armenian Patriarch and the Ottoman Government had an equal, but opposing, political interest in the size of the Armenian
population, it is obvious that the truth probably lies somewhere between their two contrasting estimates. Bryce (1916: 649) "halved the difference", with the qualification that the true figure certainly lay between the Ottoman estimate and 2,000,000 - and probably approached more closely the latter. This is the range generally accepted today (Hovannisian, 1967: 37; Nansen, 1928: 318), with over 1,000,000 believed to have resided in the six vilayets (Morgan, 1918: 314).

The numbers given for those who perished show similar variation. Bryce (1916: 651) estimated that 600,000 died, although his figure did not take into account the deportations and massacres after 1915.

Lepsius estimated that 1,000,000 perished and 200,000 were converted to Islam, while 200,000 remained in their homes, 200,000 were in concentration camps, and another 250,000 took refuge in the Caucasus. This amounted to a total of 650,000 survivors, apart from the 200,000 who converted to Islam (Nansen, 1928: 318; Simpson, 1939: 33-34). Vernant (1953: 57), however, states that in 1919 it was estimated that 1,000,000 Armenians had become expatriates since 1890, while 1,500,000 had been massacred. This must be considered the upper figure of the number who died. Most authorities place it around 1,000,000 with the true number probably lying somewhere between 1,000,000 and 1,500,000 (Atamian, 1955: 194; Lynch, Vol. 2, 1965: 648; Morgan, 1918: 314).

Armenian Dispersions and Settlement

Thus, in a period of seven years, from 1915 to 1922, the Turks had either killed, deported or forced out almost all of the country's Armenian population. Many of those who survived, being destitute or orphaned, were settled in refugee camps arranged by Armenian Near East Relief and other relief organizations. In 1923, the Council of the League of Nations took responsibility for the protection of these refugees who numbered about 320,000 and were scattered over the Near East, Europe, and elsewhere (Simpson, 1939: 34-36). The majority of these people, having no valid papers, were issued Nansen Identity Certificates which were to serve in the place of passports. Most of these people were now "stateless" and many would remain so for the rest of their lives.
The first problem confronting the League of Nations and the private refugee organizations was where and how to settle these refugees. Various proposals were made, the first of which was to settle in Erevan, Russian Armenia, 10,000 Armenian refugees from Greece and 5,000 from Constantinople (Corbyn, 1932: 600). Although this scheme did not materialize because the necessary finances could not be raised, either publicly or privately, a considerable number were eventually helped to move to Erevan from Greece and other countries, with the funds being provided from the Nansen Memorial Fund and the Armenian Benevolent Fund, among others. For example, between 1926 and 1936 some 15,500 Armenians migrated to Erevan, the majority coming from Greece, while another 6,000 in Greece and 5,000 in France planned to migrate there ultimately (Simpson, 1939: 38).

A second settlement scheme was instituted in Syria, Lebanon, and in the Sanjak of Alexandretta where, by 1926, it was estimated there were more than 100,000 refugees (Corbyn, 1932: 602; Simpson, 1939: 39). Most of these were gathered in camps in and around Aleppo, Alexandretta and Beirut and were living in very desperate circumstances (Corbyn, 1932: 608). The policy adopted by the Nansen Office was to create agricultural and urban settlements. The urban side of the scheme worked well and, during the first 11 years of its operation, over 35,000 persons were settled in the towns and cities. On the rural side, however, only eight villages were established, containing some 1,400 members. Most of this urban settlement was in the cities of Aleppo and Beirut, while the rural settlements were, with one exception, in the Sanjak of Alexandretta. By 1937 the Armenian refugee population of Syria and Lebanon was fairly well established, with only about 1,000 families still awaiting installation in their own houses. Also by this time almost all of these refugees had taken Syrian or Lebanese nationality, so, as far as the League of Nations was concerned, they constituted a minority rather than a refugee group (Corbyn, 1932: 603-610; Simpson, 1939: 445). In 1939, however, the French Mandate over the Sanjak of Alexandretta was abandoned in favour of Turkey in an attempt to propitiate the Turks on the outbreak of the Second World War. Forty-five thousand Armenians living there, including those recently resettled by the Nansen Organization, left to swell the numbers in Syria and Lebanon to about 200,000 (Lang and Walker, 1976: 15).
Although Syria and Lebanon had the largest numbers of Armenian refugees, a considerable number had also gone to other Middle Eastern and European countries and to the Americas. Greece initially received around 45,000 Armenian refugees, of which 25,000 were still residing there in 1939. Their position, however, was somewhat ambiguous, in that Greek citizenship was not fully open to them. This situation was compounded by the fact that the Greek Government, as well as many of the refugees, had hopes for their eventual transfer to Russian Armenia. This situation was duplicated in Bulgaria, which still had 14,000 Armenian refugees in 1936. Here, however, the fact that the second generation would be eligible for citizenship meant that the problem of statelessness would be solved within one generation.

In Romania the refugees were not considered a problem because of an existing Armenian community of 20,000 (Macler, 1930). Consequently, the 6,000 Armenians who took refuge there found economic and social absorption relatively easy and made no attempt to move elsewhere.

Settlement in Cyprus, which had approximately 2,700 Armenians in 1937, had also been rapid and successful, with the Armenians establishing themselves in businesses or the professions. Comparable results followed the settlement of a small group of 600 in Transjordan in 1916 (Simpson, 1939: 42).

In France, the number of refugees in 1936 was estimated at 63,000. These Armenians found many employment opportunities and became rapidly established. The fact that France, like Romania, had a prior Armenian community contributed to the rapid adjustment of these refugees who, to a great extent, became economically absorbed and formed a stable part of the population of the large cities, particularly Paris, Lyons, and Marseilles (Simpson, 1939: 41-43). Nevertheless, these refugees encountered initial problems in obtaining French citizenship, due to considerable opposition from the working and trading population of France.

Overall, by the start of World War II, the Armenian refugees were fairly well established in their countries of adoption. Also, through natural increase, they were slowly restoring a more normal sex and age
structure to their population which had been depleted of adult males as a result of the massacres. However, as a consequence of the dispersions and the resulting resettlement, they became an almost exclusively urban people, a factor which contributed to a breakdown of their traditional social structure of which the village community was an essential social unit. Nevertheless, the strength of the village tradition continued to persist in other forms such as charitable efforts and savings associations based on old village ties (Corbyn, 1932: 607; Fedden, 1947: 257; Hamalian, 1974; Royal Central Asian Society, 1931: 104-105; Simpson, 1939: 45).

The refugees also managed to retain much of their culture and traditions, largely through their churches and the cultural organizations which were established wherever an Armenian community developed. In some of the countries where they settled, as in France and Greece, the use of their native language began to diminish due to assimilation or compulsory use of the national language. This became especially pronounced in the second generation. On the other hand, in the Middle Eastern countries, such as Syria and Egypt, the Armenian language was not only retained but also reinforced through the establishment of Armenian schools. These schools had another unplanned effect on these Middle Eastern communities: by helping to eliminate the language differences which had originally existed among the refugees, many of whom had been predominantly Turkish or Arabic speakers, they helped to unify these communities. Overall the refugees retained a strong "national consciousness", enhanced by Armenian political party loyalties. This national feeling was one of the principal factors in the successful reestablishment of the refugees since, not only did it draw them together "as if in defiance of the Turkish attempt to wipe away the Armenians ..." (Hovannisian, 1974: 20), but it also resulted in great financial help from Armenians throughout the world who were concerned with the plight of their compatriots (Corbyn, 1932: 607-610; Dekmejian, 1976: 29; Simpson, 1939: 45-46).

The Armenian Middle Eastern Diaspora and the Rise of Arab Nationalism: An Overview

Although the Middle Eastern Diaspora has been a permanent aspect in the life of the Armenians, it was not until after the World War I
dispersions that sizable Armenian communities were created in the non-Turkish Middle East (Dekmejian, 1976: 28; Hitti, 1951: 37; Hovannisian, 1974: 19). At the same time that the massacres and dispersions abruptly shattered Armenian social existence, they also provided the survivors with shared experiences which were to become a binding force in the reconstitution of their social and national life under the different mandated governments and political systems (Atamian, 1955: 194-195; Hovannisian, 1974: 19-20). This "rebirth" of Armenian national life, moreover, was allowed to proceed practically unhindered by the host societies, since the Armenian position in the Arab social structure was basically that of the earlier millet system (Stirling, 1970: 160-161). The rights and duties of the Armenians vis-à-vis the other ethnic groups, including the dominant Arabs, were explicitly defined and delimited. As in the millet system, this structure formalized the social separation which was further reinforced by the fact that the Armenians were taught by their elders, if only by inference, that they were members of a superior minority (Hovannisian, 1974: 20). This position further served to forestall the kind of large-scale assimilation that had taken place with Armenians in past centuries, even though they were in constant contact with members of many other ethnic groups in most spheres of social intercourse outside the family group. To the Middle Eastern Armenian, linguistic and cultural self-preservation took firm precedence over the practicality of blending into the basic fabric of the host society (Hovannisian, 1974: 19), especially in those communities, such as the ones in Aleppo and Beirut, which were sufficiently large to allow the Armenians to lead chiefly Armenian lives (Churchill, 1970: 660). The extent of Armenian adaptation, in many cases, went no further than learning the Arabic language, almost a necessity for economic survival in these countries (Baer, 1976: 94; Simpson, 1938: 445). Nevertheless, until World War II the Armenian-Arab relations in the Middle East were characterized by a substantial degree of friendship and mutual respect.

Following World War II this relationship began to change, with the exception of that in Lebanon (Hourani, 1970: 15). Although the Armenians had managed to create their own niche in Arab society, filling important technical and entrepreneurial roles, inter-communal tensions began to develop. This was partially because the Armenians, who generally had been exposed to
Western influences and education earlier than their Arab neighbours, were often better educated in modern terms than the Moslem Arabs and usually more prosperous (Churchill, 1970: 647-648, 660). Also, their familiarity with Western languages and culture made them the key "brokers" in foreign commerce and mediators between the European mandatory authorities and the indigenous population. This position made the Armenians highly visible, particularly in the economic life of Syria, Lebanon and Egypt, and caused them to become intimately associated with the Western elements in these countries. Consequently, their Western orientation, combined with the fact that they did not involve themselves with the political and social currents which were beginning to influence Arab society, led to the arousal of Arab suspicions concerning the loyalty of the Armenians to their adopted societies. This situation was exacerbated by the post-World War II emigration of tens of thousands of Armenians to Soviet Armenia, despite Arab entreaties for them to remain (Vernant, 1953: 50).

The post-World War period also witnessed the rapid rise of Arab nationalism which, after the establishment of Israel, led to the development of leftist military regimes in many of the newly independent Arab states. Since the most radical and pervasive social changes during this period occurred in Egypt, where the old regime was totally demolished and efforts made to reconstruct society along new lines, the Egyptian Revolution under Nasser came to symbolize the "new nationalism", whose ideology spread throughout the whole Arab East.

One of the principal aspirations of this nationalism in most of the Middle Eastern countries was the eradication of "foreign" influences and the creation of a "national type". This was to be achieved by ridding the Arab States of the "imperialistic" European elements, which had hitherto dominated the commerce and industry of the Middle East and had allowed the Europeans, through the Jewish and Christian minorities, to manipulate policies through their pervasive control over the national economies. With the emerging Arab middle class after World War II this privileged position became more and more unpalatable, leading to a growing hostility towards the Europeans and their associated minorities, such as the Armenians, "to whom historical circumstances and special relations with the occupying powers had given positions of great power and influence" (Peretz, 1965: 155).
Furthermore, having attained affluence and prestige in these nations' economies far beyond their proportion in the population, it was to the advantage of these minorities to identify with the "status quo" regimes against whom the Arab nationalists were battling. Thus, when Arab nationalistic sentiment became inflamed against Israel and its Western "Christian" supporters, it also rose against the Armenians and the other non-Moslem minorities. Since 1956 this has had a detrimental effect on Armenian life in the Middle East. Although Armenian religious and cultural life was left largely untouched, the Armenian educational system was Arabized and brought under State control; in the economic sphere, the introduction of socialist laws had an adverse influence on Armenian-owned business interests (Dekmejian, 1976: 29). As a result of these measures, combined with the uncertainty of their position in the new Arab States, many Armenians began to emigrate to the Americas, to Europe, and finally to Australia.

ARMENIAN POPULATION ESTIMATES

For most of the countries of the world, Armenian population estimates are only rough approximations and in some cases no more than guesses. There are seldom objective means available by which to assess the accuracy of these estimates. In most countries of the Diaspora the Armenians account for but a small fraction of the population and usually lack visibility on the national scene. Consequently, they are often ignored as a distinct group when it comes to the collection of national statistics and are frequently combined with other groups to form larger categories. Only in cases where a distinguishing criterion - such as mother tongue, Armenian religion, or ethnic origin information - is collected on censuses is it possible to statistically separate the Armenians.

Most Armenian population estimates are therefore subject to gross inaccuracies. For example, estimates obtained from Armenian community or religious leaders may be biased in a number of ways. To name a few: (1) they may be based solely on the socially active, those who are members of Armenian organizations or who attend church, and not take account of those Armenians who are less active; (2) they may be based on misleading criteria, such as the number of individuals in telephone directories with Armenian sounding
surnames who may not be Armenian; (3) they may be unintentionally inflated, as when community leaders estimate average family size on the basis of the higher birth rates of earlier years; (4) they may be intentionally inflated in order to make the community seem more important, especially for political reasons. On the other hand, it is possible for governments to underestimate intentionally the number of Armenians in order to play down their political importance. This was obviously the case in the Turkish estimates during the late nineteenth century.

Many of the more recent estimates for the Armenian populations of various countries appear to be based on the number of refugees known to have arrived in these countries during and after World War I. Here again there is much room for inaccuracy, as the Armenian refugee population during this period was very fluid, often increasing or decreasing rapidly with mass movements into or out of the various countries. Such factors must be kept in mind in any consideration of Armenian population estimates.

Table 2.1 presents population estimates of the major Armenian communities at four times during their recent history: (1) the 1880 figures portray the population just prior to the Hamidean massacres; (2) the 1931 column of estimates represents the populations of the various communities during the Inter-War Period, when Armenian refugees from the deportations were settling and reestablishing themselves; (3) the 1947 estimates represent the populations of communities which had become fully established and stabilized; (4) the 1966-67 estimates are those most recently available and reflect in most cases substantial growth in many of the communities. Except for a few of the estimates of this last column, there is no indication in these figures of the events which have taken place in the Middle East and elsewhere since the early 1960's and which have altered this population picture.

At the present time, 3,500,000 Armenians of the world population of around 5,000,000 reside within the U.S.S.R., of whom 2,000,000 live in the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic. Of those who live outside the U.S.S.R., the greatest number still reside in Middle Eastern countries, although substantial numbers are also found in North America and Europe.
Table 2.1

Armenian Population Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1880</th>
<th>1931</th>
<th>1947</th>
<th>1966-78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S.S.R.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia S.S.R.</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia S.S.R.</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan S.S.R.</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>320,000</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
<td>560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.S.R. Other</td>
<td>420,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>390,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>2,040,000</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle East</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td></td>
<td>86,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td></td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>2,070,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>2,426,000</td>
<td>227,100</td>
<td>481,000</td>
<td>612,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Europe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roumania</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe Other</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>151,000</td>
<td>129,500</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Americas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>223,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>252,000</td>
<td>510,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India and Far East</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania (includes Australia)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>3,690,000</td>
<td>2,663,100</td>
<td>3,266,500</td>
<td>5,047,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 All estimates rounded to nearest 1,000, except where figure is under 5,000.
2 All estimates are taken from Price and Mirzaian (1976: 11).
3 Unless otherwise indicated estimates for 1931 are taken from Corbyn (1932: 610-611).
4 Unless otherwise indicated estimates for 1947 are taken from Armenian Youth Federation of America (1947: 30-31).
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5 Unless otherwise indicated estimates for 1966-67 are taken from Dekmejian (1968: 521).
7 Simpson (1939: 42). Based on refugees who settled in 1916.
8 Personal correspondence with Dr. V. Azarya, Sociology Department, Hebrew University.
9 Price and Mirzaian (1976: 11).
13 Royal Central Asian Society (1931: 104) gives a figure of 140,000 for this date.
16 Avakian (1977: 132) gives a figure of 545,000, which includes the Armenians in Mexico and Central America.
18 Estimated population in India only.
19 This would probably be an underestimation as it does not include many countries with very small Armenian communities. According to the Great Soviet Encyclopaedia (1973: 317) Armenians live in over 60 countries outside the U.S.S.R.