
Tofiq Kocharli

**ARMENIAN
DECEPTION**
(Historical Information)

Baku - 2004

T.Kocharli. Armenian Deception. Baku, Azerbaijan, 2004. -104p.

The book is presented with additions and changes in English. The first edition was published by the Institute of Socio-Political Studies and Information, National Academy of Sciences of Azerbaijan in 2001 in Azerbaijani.

ARMENIAN DECEPTION

(An open letter to the UN Secretary General Kofi Annan on the "Memorandum" distributed by Armenia to the United Nations Organization on April 30, 2001)

To the UN Secretary General Mr. Kofi Annan

Mr. Secretary General,

In response to the Statement by the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan Mr. Heydar Aliyev in Key West, USA (April 3, 2001), which was distributed as a UN document, the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Armenia at the United Nations distributed a letter and a "Memorandum" of the unrecognized "Republic of Nagorno-Karabakh" on April 30 of the same year.

The Armenian side characterized the Statement of the President of Azerbaijan as a document that "presented the Azerbaijani version of the history of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict," though there was only one reference to the history of the region in this Statement: "In 1923, the Azerbaijani government conferred the status of autonomous region on the Nagorno-Karabakh region of Azerbaijan, which then fully enjoyed all rights of autonomy."

All other facts and political assessments in the Statement concern the events following the anti-Azerbaijan uprising by Armenian separatists in Nagorno-Karabakh in 1988, the four resolutions of the UN Security Council on the conflict (1993), and particularly the activities and proposals of the OSCE Minsk Group Co-Chairmen.

The Armenian side did not express its attitude to either the facts or the key issues raised in the Statement by President Heydar Aliyev. Although the Armenian side claims that "we have always tried to avoid the discussions concerning the problems of the past," this time it has opened up discussions on issues that have no relation to Heydar Aliyev's Statement, even including events from the B.C. era, and has brought forward supposedly "irrefutable scientific facts on the history of the region."

However, the "irrefutable facts" presented to the United Nations by Armenia are actually lies, tales and distortions.

To deceive is immoral in any case. However, as far as history is concerned, it is twice as disastrous. Telling lies about the past, especially deliberate lies about territorial issues, has an influence on the politics of a state, since state politics based upon lies and mythical perceptions raises territorial claims on neighboring states, causes conflicts between or among nations, and results in bloody wars. Lies and deceitful territorial claims of one side on another have caused a number of confrontations and wars between nations.

Attempts by Armenia or any other state to deceive the whole world and the United Nations should be exposed. It is also particularly important since the regular spread of disinformation to the UN has become habitual to Armenia. For instance, on September 2, 1997, Armenia distributed in the UN a document on Nagorno-Karabakh. Reckless of the future responsibility one may have to take for a lie, it was stated in the document that "in 1918 the number of Armenians in Nagorno-Karabakh constituted up to 300.000-330.000," though the number of Armenians in the whole of Garabagh, including Nagorno-Karabakh, was then only 243.627 (with 321.712 Azerbaijanis!).

In a word, the degree of Armenian deception is limitless.

Mr. Secretary General, taking into account the above, I deemed it necessary to express my attitude, using facts and documents, to the supposedly "irrefutable scientific facts on the

history of the region" given by the Armenian side in the "Historical Information" sent to Your Excellency.

Assuming full responsibility, I declare that the "Memorandum" distributed in the UN by Armenia is a very rare document for its distortion of facts and invention of untruths. At the same time, the "Memorandum" is a piece of deception by a UN member, Armenia, aimed at misleading the United Nations Organization and its Security Council. This sort of provocation by Armenian officials should be rejected.

Mr. Secretary General, I hope that the United Nations will condemn those who openly deceive the international community at the state level, cast aspersions, and spread lies.

Sincerely,

Tofiq Kocharli,
Professor, Academician of the National
Academy of Sciences of Azerbaijan

ARMENIAN DECEPTION (Historical Information)

1. On the Ethnic Terms "Azerbaijan" and "the Azerbaijanis"

The "Memorandum" distributed in the United Nations by Armenia on April 30, 2001 claims, "The name "Azerbaijan" has only been related to contemporary Azerbaijani territory since 1918. Thus the Musavat Party that came to power in Baku intended to legitimize future claims on the provinces bordering Iran (Western and Eastern Azerbaijan). The ethnic term "the Azerbaijanis" came into being in the 1930s. Until then all Russian and Soviet sources referred to them as the "Caucasian Tartars" or "the Turks."

Let us, first of all, say that Azerbaijan is one of the first settlements of ancient people. This is proven by the Azerbaijani archaeologists' discovery in the Azykh cave of Garabagh in 1968: a part of the jaw-bone of a primitive man who lived 250 000-300 000 years ago was found in Azykh. This was the first archaeological find of this kind in the former Soviet Union, and the third one in the world.

Azerbaijan is one of the cradles of world civilization. The rock drawings in Qobustan near Baku, capital of Azerbaijan, are well-known in the world. From the 8th millennium B.C. our ancestors drew thousands of paintings (men, animals, etc) on the rocks in Qobustan (traces of ancient Romans were left on these rocks. An inscription in Latin on a rock is evidence of the 12th Roman Legion's presence in Azerbaijan during the rule of Domician (81-96)).

Azerbaijan is one of the countries in the world where ancient states were established. Cuneiform writing dating back to the 9th century B.C. tells us of the existence of the Manna state in Southern Azerbaijan. This state, as well as the states of Atropatena (Southern Azerbaijan) and Albania (Northern Azerbaijan) which emerged in the 4th century B.C., testify to the antiquity of statehood traditions in Azerbaijan.

"Azerbaijan" as a geographical term has been in use since the 2nd century A.D.: from then Atropatena was called "Azerbaigan," "Adurbadagan," and "Azerbaijan" from the 5th century.

The Arab Caliph, Muaviya I (7th century), asked his counselor Ubeyd ibn Shariyya: "What do the Turks and Azerbaijan mean?" "*Azerbaijan is the country where the Turks have been living since ancient times*" the counselor replied. (my italics-T.K.) In an anonymous work written in Persian in 1126, there was the same idea as expressed in the 7th century: "*Azerbaijan is the country ruled by the Turks since ancient times.*"² (my italics-T.K.)

Thus written sources confirm that our country's name "Azerbaijan" was already current in the 7th century.

According to academician Ziya Bunyadov, beginning from the 8th century, the term "Azerbaijan" covered both Northern and Southern Azerbaijan. The term "Azerbaijan" was used either in a politico-administrative, geographical or political sense.

While speaking of the country of Azerbaijan, a number of medieval Arab and Persian sources meant not only the territory to the south of the River Araz, but also the territory to its north.

The 9th century traveler, Al-Yagubi, referred to *the territory north of the River Araz as "Azerbaijan al-Ulya" (upper Azerbaijan).*³ (my italics-T.K.) At-Tabari (838-923) wrote: "*The Azerbaijani territory extends from the cities of Hamadan and Zanjan to Darband, and this territory is called Azerbaijan*"⁴ (my italics-T.K.) Having drawn a picture-map of the Caspian Sea, Ibn Havgal (10th century) *placed on it the word "Azerbaijan" along the coastline from Darband to Gilan.* That map was the first medieval map of its kind to unite both banks of the River Araz under the name of Azerbaijan.⁵ Ibn al-Fagih wrote in 902-903: "*The territory of Azerbaijan extends from the lands of Barda to the lands of Zanjan.*"⁶ (my italics-T.K.) Hamdullah Moustovfi, the Iranian author of the 16th century, emphasized that *Azerbaijan extended from Baku to Khalkhal.*⁷

Thus both the north and south of Azerbaijan, as Jahangir Zeynaloghlu said, were "*parts of greater Azerbaijan.*"⁸ (my italics-T.K.)

Jean Chardin, a French traveler (17th century), also touched upon the question of Azerbaijani boundaries and wrote that Azerbaijan, one of the largest provinces of the Safavid Empire, "bordered Dagestan in the north."⁹

Several Russian sources also referred to the northern part of the River Araz as Azerbaijan from early in the 18th century; for instance, in 1737, Nadir shah sent a punitive detachment to Jar (Balakan-Zagatala) headed by his brother Ibrahim khan. The Garabaghi baylarbay (prince) Ughurlu khan also joined that detachment. *Kalushkin, a Russian spy, informed the then Petersburg that on the way Ibrahim khan joined "troops stationed throughout Azerbaijan, namely in Shirvan, Mughan, Ardabil, Iravan, Ganja" to his troops.*¹⁰ (my italics-T.K.)

Thus, in the early 18th century, the Russian spy also knew that the northern part of the River Araz was called "Azerbaijan."

The Jarians wounded Ibrahim khan in the battle. The Garabaghi baylarbay immediately said to his brother Huseyngulu khan: "Get Ibrahim khan out of these horrors or else, God forbid, if something happens to him, the *whole Azerbaijani land* (my italics-T.K.) will fall victim to Nadir's rage and will burn with fire."¹¹ This was written by an Iranian historian Muhammad Kazim, who participated in Ibrahim khan's crusade.

As a matter of fact, in the early 18th century, the Iranian author referred to the northern part of the River Araz as "Azerbaijani land" just as Ughurlu khan, the baylarbay of Garabagh, did.

After Ibrahim khan was killed and his army was defeated, the Russian diplomat informed Petersburg of the following: "Due to the total defeat of Ibrahim khan... *there is no troop in the whole of Azerbaijan, that is from Iravan to Darband.*"¹² (my italics-T.K.)

Hence, in the early 18th century the Russian diplomat considered the area "from Iravan to Darband" to be "Azerbaijan."

In 1786, Colonel Burnashev, Russian representative to tsar Irakli II in Tiflis, in a book about Azerbaijan written by order of his government, stated: "*The territory now referred to as Azerbaijan borders Georgia, that is the Tsardoms of Kakhet and Kartali, the Caspian Sea and the province of Gilan in the East, and Turkey in the West.*"¹³ (my italics-T.K.) At the same time, the author stressed that "khans of Nukha, Shirvan, and Shusha" (Garabagh - T.K.) are "Azerbaijani khans."

Since the early 19th century, when the occupation of Azerbaijan began, the Russians have often referred to the northern part of the River Araz as Azerbaijan. Sisianov, Commander-in-Chief of the Russian Forces in the Caucasus, in his report (March 12, 1803) to the Emperor Alexander I, referring to Ibrahimkhalil khan of Garabagh and others, wrote: "The majority of the Azerbaijani khans openly hate the despotic Iranian rule."¹⁴ During the occupation of Ganja, Sisianov wrote to graf (count) Vorontsov on January 3, 1804: "The Castle of Ganja, which the Asians consider to be unconquerable, keeps the whole of Azerbaijan in terror."¹⁵ On February 5, 1804, on the occasion of the occupation of Ganja, the Russian Emperor Alexander I sent a "Supreme Order" to Sisianov. In that order he ordered Sisianov to "divert" the Iranian shah's "attention from Azerbaijan and the provinces on the western coasts of the Caspian Sea."¹⁶ Another fact: On March 7, 1808, I.V.Gudovich, Commander-in-Chief of the Russian Forces in the Caucasus after Sisianov, informed Petersburg of the following: "The Persians themselves confess that the part of Azerbaijan now governed by the Russians has never been loyal to Iran."¹⁷ Undoubtedly, in all these cases the primary reference was made to Northern Azerbaijan.

Let us, however, look at what was written in the "Славянин" (Slavyanin) newspaper in 1827: "The Castle of Ganja has an influence on entire Azerbaijan, so it is of primary importance for Russia to conquer it."¹⁸

Russian researchers of the Caucasus maintained that this "Muslim province" is Azerbaijan and in their works they (Berge, Butkov, Veidenbaum, Nadezhdin, Krivenko, Velichko, etc) considered the northern part of the River Araz to be "Azerbaijan" as well. In 1867, A.Berge even wrote a book called "Ashari-Shuarayi-Azerbaijan" (Poems of Azerbaijani Poets) in Germany. The book included a compilation of poems both from Northern and Southern Azerbaijan.

Thus historical sources, including many Russian ones prove that the claim that "the name "Azerbaijan" has only been related to contemporary Azerbaijani territory since 1918" is completely groundless. As to the idea that the Musavat Party pursued the aim "to legitimize future claims on the provinces bordering Iran (Western and Eastern Azerbaijan)" by naming the country "Azerbaijan," this is not only groundless, but also a political provocation aimed at sowing discord between the Republic of Azerbaijan and the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The claim that Musavat Party members "derived the ethnic term for the Republic from the Iranian *Azerbaijan* and changed it Turkic-wise into *Azerbaijan*"¹⁹ in 1918 is also a political provocation.

As for the ethnic term "the Azerbaijanis," we are Turks. After Russia occupied Northern Azerbaijan, it called us "the Tartars."

Even our being called "the Turks" was, in a sense, prohibited. The following fact is known: A "Hayat" (Life) newspaper headline included the words "in Turkic" and "Islamiyya." The Caucasian governor issued an official decree on this "harmful idea:" "The word "Turk" in a headline of the «Hayat» newspaper must be immediately replaced with the word "Tartar."²⁰

In spite of all this, our people continued both to consider and name itself a Turkic one. As was accurately stressed by Y.I.Chamanzaminli, "Even the ardent desire of Iran and the destructive blows of the Russians could not destroy our Turkic nature: our sweet language and literature survived."²¹

The process of national self-identification intensified at the end of the 19th century. The prominent persons of our nation expressed their objections to being called "the Tartars." In 1890, the "Kashkul" magazine used the ethnic term "Azerbaijani" for the first time. In 1891, M.Shahtakhtinski wrote in the «Каспий» (Caspian) newspaper, which was published in Baku in Russian: "It would be appropriate for the Transcaucasian Muslims to be called the Azerbaijanis and for their language to be called Azerbaijani." In his work "Turk-Azərbaycan dilinin müxtəsər sərf-nəhvi" (Brief Grammar of the Turkic-Azerbaijani language) published in 1899, N.Narimanov referred to our native language as "Turkic-Azerbaijani," to our nation as a "Turkic-Azerbaijani tribe," while in 1905 the Caucasian Sheikh-ul-Islam Akhund Abdulsalam Akhundzada called our language "the Azerbaijani Turkic."

At the beginning of the 20th century, Ali bay Huseynzada openly and consistently objected to being called "the Tartars," he confirmed and promoted our Turkic origins, and gave the green light to the establishment of our Turkicness in public opinion, consciousness, literature, and media. It was Ali bay Huseynzada who stressed that "the whole world called us "the Tartars" and no one opposed it." It was Ali bay Huseynzada who wrote:

- "We are not Tartars, we are Turks,"

- "We are Turks - make every effort to eliminate every barrier, every wall that impedes the development of our language,"

- "The Azerbaijani-Turkic language - is more Turkic than the Ottoman and even Jyghatay dialects."²²

Following A.Huseynzada, in 1914, M.A.Rasulzada wrote: "Others call us "Tartars" and "Persians," and we haven't objected to them either. "We, *the Azerbaijanis*" (my italics-T.K.) need to learn a lot about our history."²³

Neither did the Russian authors, who worked in Transcaucasia and knew Transcaucasian peoples very well, agree with naming the Turks "the Tartars." For example, V.L.Velichko, the editor of the «Кавказ» (Caucasia) newspaper, published in Tiflis in Russian, wrote at the beginning of the 20th century: "*The Azerbaijanis are called Tartars, but this is*

*absolutely wrong... According to their origin, the Azerbaijanis are Turks... In the palaces of Petersburg absorbed with cosmopolitanism it is required not to raise questions of tribal origin. However, in the Caucasus... the activities of the people are governed not only by their present, but also by their past, the blood of their ancestors is speaking in them... The blood of the Azerbaijanis is, undoubtedly, noble, they are born merciful, brave, generous, and are capable of intellectual and moral development."*²⁴ (my italics-T.K.)

Thus it was at the end of the 19th century, not "only in the 1930s" as the "Memorandum" claimed, that the ethnic term "the Azerbaijanis" began to be used, and at the beginning of the 20th century, the ethnic terms "the Azerbaijanis" and "the Azerbaijani people" became widespread.

In the course of the historical process, our country, state, people and the mother tongue bore the same name - "Azerbaijan." It is actually typical that a country, a state, a people and its mother tongue bear the same name. It is a common process when one or another branch of peoples of the same origin (e.g. Turks, Slavs, etc) forms a nation and its own identity by maintaining multiple bonds with its roots - Turks, Slavs, etc. The evolution of the present names of Turkic nations from names such as Aghturk, Goyturk, and Oghuz was a long historical process. In some places it occurred earlier than in others.

2. On the Issue of "the Armenian Nation being Alien in Transcaucasia"

According to the "Memorandum," Azerbaijan is an author of this idea. However, this is absolutely wrong.

The majority of authors, a number of them Armenians, maintain that proto-Armenians lived earlier in the Balkans and then moved to Asia Minor. (As early as the late 19th century, a Caucasian anthropologist, I.I.Pantukhov stated that most of the Armenians, who came to Transcaucasia from Turkey, were, according to their physical characteristics, "pure-blooded Kurds." Velichko, on the other hand, suggested that "the Armenians have *all kinds* of blood in their veins."²⁵ There is also an assumption about the Armenians being of Gypsy origin.²⁶)

A serious Armenian researcher N.Adonts wrote in 1908: "In the 7th century (B.C.-T.K.) the invasion of the Cimmerians caused a migration of peoples to Asia Minor. Ousted from their boundaries, the Armenians of Phrygia (an ancient country in the north-western part of Asia Minor - T.K.) crossed the Euphrates and mixed with the local Aramaic people... The mixture of the alien Phrygians with, first of all, aborigines of Aramaic origin formed the core of the Armenian nation.

The double name of the Armenians - among themselves "*Hai*" and among neighbors "*Armen-ius*"-is the best proof of their double composition: one name originating from the incomers, the other coming from the aboriginals."²⁷

Even Herodotus, referred to by the "Memorandum," stressed that the Armenians came from Phrygian.²⁸

When speaking of the Armenians during the epoch of *Akhaemenids* (550 B.C. - 330 B.C.), Adonts wrote: "...the Armenian nation has formed not only from different tribes, but also from different racial elements. During the *Akhaemenids* era, the territory later called "Armenia" was inhabited by different nations and consisted of two satrapies: the *Paktis* and the *Armenians* together with their neighbors inhabiting the territory up to the Black Sea formed the 13th satrapy... The Armenians bordered the *Cilicians* in the west and *Matiens* in the east, separated from the former by the Euphrates and from the latter by one of the branches of the Tigris."²⁹ (my italics-T.K.)

As one can see, in the past no Armenians lived in the land now called Armenia.

Another Armenian author B.Ishkhanian wrote at the beginning of the 20th century: "The real motherland of the Armenians... is Asia Minor, that is, outside Russia and, except for a few purely Armenian provinces in Transcaucasia (first of all, in the Ira van province), Armenians

scattered to different parts of the territory of the Caucasus only during the last few centuries."³⁰

Perhaps no one, not even an Armenian author, has ever refuted these very ideas of Adonts and Ishkhanian.

According to many serious and influential scholars, the Armenians are not indigenous but alien in contemporary Armenia, Transcaucasia.

The Echmiadzin Church played an important role in the influx of the Armenians into the present Armenia. The church *began to acquire the lands belonging to the Azerbaijanis by purchasing them*. There are numerous facts on this in the "Jambr", the work of the Echmiadzin Catholicos S.Erevantsi (18th century): for example, the Catholicos G.Makvetsi bought 7 villages from amir Rustam (in the document he is referred to as the attorney of Yagub Padishah of Garagoyunlu) for 530.000 Tabriz dinars by the deed of purchase of December 20-21, 1431.³¹

The deed of purchase of October 13, 1489 mentioned in the «Jambr» is of special interest: The court of the province of Chukhursa'd-Iravan confirmed Kamaladdin Abdin bay's *"sale of the Oshakan village situated in the Karbi nahiya (subdistrict -T.K.), the Chukhursa'd province, the country of Azerbaijan, for 8 thousand dinars"*³² (my italics-T.K.)

As one can see, this document underlined that the province of Chukhursa'd, i.e. the Iravan province, was then a part of the "country of Azerbaijan."

In 1968 in Yerevan a collection of documents «Персидские купчие Матенадарана. Выпуск первый (XIV-XVI вв.)» (Persian Purchase Deeds of Matenadaran. 1st Issue (14th-16th centuries)) was published. One of those deeds of purchase was signed in 1430. It is about the purchase of the *"Uchkilsa village which belonged to the country of Azerbaijan"* (my italics-T.K.) from the Azerbaijanis by Bishop Gregor, head of Uchkilsa. Terms such as "the country of Armenia" or "the country of Ararat" are not used in these documents even once. When referring to the Chukhursa'd and Nakhchivan provinces, one or another district and village of these provinces, it is stated in all cases that they belonged to "the country of Azerbaijan." The historical documents published once by the Armenian authors mentioned that *Mehri, Gafan and other Zangazur territories*, which are now parts of Armenia, *belonged to the "Nakhchivan tuman (an administrative-territorial unit in the Hulakid state -T.K.) of the country of Azerbaijan"* (my italics-T.K.) During the era of the Hulakid state (this state existed until 1357), which emerged after the occupation of Azerbaijan in 1257 and Baghdad on February of the next year by Hulaku khan, grandson of Chingiz khan, Southern Azerbaijan was divided into 9 tumans. Nakhchivan was one of those tumans (Gafan and Mehri were parts of the Nakhchivan tuman). It becomes clear from the documents in «Персидские купчие Матенадарана» that in the 16th century the same administrative-territorial unit still existed in Southern Azerbaijan, and Gafan and Mehri remained parts of the Nakhchivan tuman. Then the Nakhchivan khanate was established. The first khan of the khanate was Heydargulu khan, head of the Kangarli dynasty. As mentioned during the conversation between Kalbali khan of Nakhchivan and A.Yermolov, Russian general, on May 12, 1816, Nakhchivan had been ruled by his Kangarli dynasty for 3 centuries. The Nakhchivan khanate consisted of 4 districts: Nakhchivan, Ordubad, Mehri and Gafan. Mehri and Gafan were annexed to the Garabagh khanate in 1790.

One of the documents published by the Armenian authors in this book is about Garabagh. Garabagh was mentioned as *"Aran Garabagh of the country of Azerbaijan"* (my italics-T.K.) in that document of 1573.

As is seen from the letter by Ravan khan, galabay (castle-bay) of Iravan and baylarbay of western Azerbaijan to Shah Ismayil Khatai on October 1519, the Armenians came "by fives, by tens from Beynannahreyn to the shores of Lake Van and from there to the Gaf" (the Caucasus - T.K.) in order to work as "petty traders, stonemasons and carpenters" and make "claims on permanent settlement" there. "At the expense of the Armenian religious centre investments, the Catholicos finances the permanent settlement of two or three families of his

compatriots on the outskirts of Turkic villages, builds small churches for them, and thus creates an impression that this tribe has existed in the Gaf since ancient times."³³

The arrival of the Armenians "by fives and by tens" in the province of Chukhursa'd (Iravan) turned into a mass influx after Russia occupied and annexed the Iravan khanate in the early 19th century.

On the basis of the paper method calculation materials, a 19th century Russian author Chopin calculated that in 1832 there were 16.078 Muslim families (81.749 people) and 15.059 Armenian families (82.377 people) in the "Armenian Oblast" (an administrative-territorial unit in, Russia). Only 4.428 Armenian families (25.151 people) were "local Armenians." ("коренные армяне" in the source) The rest (10.631 families) had resettled from Iran and Turkey: 6.949 families (35.560 people) from Iran and 3.682 families (21.666 people) from Turkey.³⁴

"Who were the indigenous Armenians?" Let us see what Chopin wrote about this: "The Armenians in the Armenian Oblast are immigrants, moved here in different times and under different circumstances. If you look for real Armenians among them, perhaps you need to look in the villages of Vagarshabad and Gulpi!"³⁵ (Vagarshabad village of the Karbibasar district and Gulpi village of the Surmali district were among the villages where the number of "indigenous Armenians" was higher than in other places: 397 Armenian families in Vagarshabad and 173 in Gulpi.)

As soon as the Iravan and Nakhchivan khanates were occupied, the Russian Emperor abolished them and created an "Armenian Oblast" consisting of the territories of those khanates and added the oblast to his title, i.e. the Russian tsar was proclaimed "Tsar of the Armenians" as well.

In the "Armenian Oblast" of the tsar of the Armenians -the Russian Emperor - the number of Muslims (16.078 families) was almost 4 times greater than that of the local Armenians (4.428 families)! The "Armenian Oblast" consisted of two provinces and one okrug (an administrative-territorial unit in Russia): the Iravan province, the Nakhchivan province, and the Ordubad okrug.

There were 9.190 Muslim and 3.498 local Armenian families in the Iravan province (mostly the present-day Armenia). Thus even in the Iravan province itself, including the city of Iravan, the number of Muslims was 2.6 times higher than that of the local Armenians.

The resettlement of Armenians from Iran and Turkey to Transcaucasia continued on a larger scale in the following periods. As the Russian author N.Shavrov noted in 1911, more than 1.000.000 out of 1.300.000 Armenians living in Transcaucasia were "alien Armenians."³⁶

These are irrefutable facts.

That very Shavrov, raising the alarm, said: "One should investigate what the Russian government wants to create in the Caucasus: Russia or Armenia?"

3. On the Boundaries between Albania (historical Azerbaijan) and Armenia

The "Memorandum" claims, "the River Kur was the north-eastern frontier of Armenia."

True, it is possible to come across such an assumption in the works of classical authors. However, those very authors expressed contradictory assumptions as well. Strabon, for example, noted that the River Kur passed through Albanian

Azerbaijani researchers proved that the idea of the River Kur being a boundary between Albania and Armenia was completely groundless. They maintained that the southern frontier of Albania in the 1st-4th centuries was the River Araz.³⁸ Nobody seemed to doubt the existing boundary in the subsequent period.

An Albanian author of the 7th century, M.Kalankatuklu, writing about the Albanian tsar Javanshir, stated: "*Javanshir ruled the lands extending from the frontiers of Iberia to Hun*

gates (Darband - T.K.) and the Araz River (not the Kur, but the Araz River - T.K.) as an absolute monarch"³⁹ (my italics-T.K.)

4. On Arsakh

The "Memorandum" claims that Arsakh (a province of Caucasian Albania, which included the territory of Nagorno-Karabakh as well - T.K.) was a province of Armenia.

Another claim by Armenia is as follows: "Nagorno-Karabakh has been an integral part of the Armenian state for several thousand years."

One has to immediately ask: Did the Armenian state itself exist for "several thousand years" in order that Nagorno-Karabakh could be part of it for "several thousand years?"

Armenian authors consider the Urartu kingdom, which emerged in the 9th century B.C., to be the first Armenian state. Even that is so (most scholars reject this), there is no evidence proving that Nagorno-Karabakh was a part of Urartu, which existed until 590 B.C.

The area inhabited by the Armenians was occupied by the Persian Akhaemenid state in 520 B.C. Only after the conquest of the Akhaemenid state by Alexander the Great in 330 B.C. was an Armenian kingdom, sometimes independent sometimes subjugated, established.

Armenia was divided between the Persian Sassanid state and the Byzantine Empire in 387 A.D. From then until 1918, i.e. for 15 centuries the Armenians were deprived of statehood. Even if we supposed for one moment that Urartu was an Armenian state and the Armenian state existed from the 4th century B.C. to 387 A.D., we can see that the Armenian state wasn't "several" but a maximum one thousand years old.

If the Armenian state itself existed at maximum for "one thousand years" in one form or another, could Nagorno-Karabakh be a part of the Armenian state for "several thousand years?"

The general view of Armenian authors on this matter is as follows: "After Armenia had been divided between the Byzantine Empire and Iran in 387, Arsakh remained within Armenia until the abolition of the Armenian kingdom in 428. Then the Persians annexed Arsakh to the Albanian kingdom on the left bank of the Kur River."⁴⁰

Let us assume for a moment that the Armenian authors are right: Arsakh had remained within Armenia until 428, and then the Persians, committing "historical injustice," annexed Arsakh to Albania. Even if it were so, could such a "historical right" serve as a basis for one nation to make territorial claims on another 15 centuries later? (15 centuries later!) We would like Armenia to address the UN and international law concerning this issue.

Was Arsakh really a part of Armenia until 428?

According to experts, the Albanian kingdom was created in the 4th century B.C.. Strabon (64/63 B.C. - 23/24 A.D.) stressed the existence of three states in our region - Albania, Armenia and Georgia. Strabon, as well as Plutarch, Orosius, Eutropius, Fest and other classical authors wrote about the resistance of "the Albanians" and the "Albanian tsar" to the Roman Commander Pompeii in 65 B.C.

A number of researchers assume that in the 1st-3rd centuries Albania retained its sovereignty and statehood more than Armenia and Georgia.⁴¹

Arsakh was part of Albania from the 4th c. B.C. to the 8th c. A.D.⁴² and different Muslim states such as Sajids, Salarids, Shaddadids, Atabays, Hulakids (Elkhanids), Garagoyunlu, Aghgoyunlu which replaced one another in Azerbaijan after its occupation by the Arabs.

As mentioned before, from the 4th century A.D. to 1918, i.e. during 15 centuries, there was no Armenian state. The term "Armenia" was used as a geographic one. Hence, Arsakh could not be and was not a part of an Armenian state that did not exist.

True, as Velichko said, "some phantom ("некоторый призрак государственности") of the Armenian statehood emerged in small Cilicia (a province in Turkey - T.K.) at the end of the

11th century and this phantom disappeared in 1375 completely,"⁴³ but Arsakh had nothing to do with Cilicia.

Beginning from the early 16th century Garabagh was one of the principalities of the Safavid state, the founder of which was a great son of Azerbaijan - a poet and a statesman - Shah Ismayil Khatai. Ganja was the centre of the principality. The administrative-territorial unit called Garabagh was created for the first time. Hafiz Abru (died in 1430) in his work «Zeyli Jami-at-Tavarikh-i Rashidi» (The sequel to Rashid-ad-Din's «History of the World») referred to Garabagh as "Garabage Azerbaijan" (Azerbaijani Garabagh), thus emphasizing that Garabagh was the territory and a province of Azerbaijan.

The Safavid state retained the long-established name of the . province - "Garabagh," and called the newly established principality by this name.

The Garabagh principality covered a large area from Beylagan to Tiflis. In the early 18th century there were 7 livas (district) in the principality: Barda, Ganja, Arasbar, Bargushad, Khykhyna, Chulandar, and Lori. Every liva was divided into several nahiyas. Non-Muslim nahiyas of Garabagh were called *malikates* (county). There were 5 malikates as local administrative-territorial units: Dizag, Varanda, Khachyn, Chilaberd and Gulustan, and they were ruled by *maliks* (count). Maliks and heads of other nahiyas of the principality were equal in terms of authority. They were all subjects of Shahverdi Soltan Ziyadoghlu, baylarbay of Garabagh. The dynasty of the Ziyadoghlu ruled Garabagh for two centuries. It becomes clear from the "Gəncə-Qarabağ əyalətinin müfəssəl dərtəri" (Detailed Journal of the Ganja-Garabagh Province) of 1727 that the biggest malikate by size of population was that of Dizag: 655 non-Muslim and 336 Muslim families. The smallest malikate was that of Gulustan: 181 non-Muslim families.

The malikates called by Armenian authors "princedom" were such dwarf "princedom!"

The territory mentioned as "Aran (Azerbaijan) Garabagh" - but not "Armenian Garabagh" - in the medieval sources was a large region of Azerbaijan.

The 17th century Turkish traveler Evliya Chalabi wrote: "There are three Garabaghs in Azerbaijan, and each of them reminds you of paradise."⁴⁴

One of them is Garabaghlar town in Nakhchivan. According to E.Chalabi, where there were thousands of houses, forty mosques, lots of caravanserais, bath-houses and so on there.

The second one is "Garabagh, one of the small towns of Azerbaijan." According to the same E.Chalabi, it was a "separate sultanate in the province of Tabriz."

The third one is the Garabagh province of Northern Azerbaijan. This Garabagh was called "small Azerbaijan" by E.Chalabi.

It seems that medieval authors named Northern Azerbaijani Garabagh as "Aran Garabagh" in order not to confuse these three Garabaghs with each other.

There is detailed information about Aran in Arabic-language sources. Al-Kufi, a 10th century author, in his "Kitab al-Futuh" (Book of Conquests) talked of Aran, its capital Barda, and mentioned the names of the 8th century Aran rulers. Later the city of Ganja became the capital of Aran. Yagut al-Hamavi (1179-1229) wrote that Aran was a "non-Arabic name of a big province, and it had many cities like Janza (people call it Ganja), Barda, Shamkir, and Beylagan."

The word "Garabagh" is made up of two Azerbaijani words - "qara" and "bagh." In my opinion, the specialists who explain "qara" as "big," but not "black," i.e. in its color meaning, are right. "Garabagh" means a big garden.

Most probably "Garabagh" as the name of the territory was already current by the 13th century. The term "Garabagh" was already the only name in use for this territory in 14th century sources. Since that time the Azerbaijani name of "Garabagh" has been used in the Armenian, Persian, Arabic and other languages, and finally entered all the world languages.

It was well said by Yusif Vazir Chamanzaminli: "There is a nest of history in every word." This may have a direct relation to the word "Garabagh." The Azerbaijani word "Garabagh,"

which has been used by Armenians, Persians, and Russians, in other words, everyone, since ancient times, even this one word is etymological and toponymical evidence for Garabagh being the historical motherland of the Azerbaijanis.

5. Settlement of the Armenians in Nagorno-Karabakh

The widespread opinion of Armenian authors on this issue is as follows: "From the ethnical point of view, only Armenians had resided in Nagorno-Karabakh since ancient times."⁴⁵

Nagorno-Karabakh was a part of Arsakh. Experts have determined that according to "The History of the Albanians" by M.Kalankatuklu, there is no information on the Armenians living in Albania (in the provinces of Arsakh and Uti).⁴⁶ The population of Arsakh consisted of Gargars, Huns, Utis, Khazars, and Basils.

"The History of the Albanians" is, certainly, not the only source. There are such important sources as the 6th century "The Syrian Chronicle", "The 7th century Armenian Geography" and others. "The Syrian Chronicle" informs of the province of Sisakan-Sunik (Zangazur), which was neighboring Arsakh. It reads: "The country of Sisakan has its own language." It means that the population of Sisakan was not ethnically Armenian and its language was not Armenian. Addressing this issue N.Adonts wrote, "*Sisakan was at a certain distance from Armenia, both geographically and ethnically.*" (my italics-T.K.) "The tribal self-identity of Sunik was preserved and renewed by the influx of people from the neighboring mountainous countries." Sisakan "was distinct by its separatist tendencies. Undoubtedly, this feature was first and foremost related to ethnic characteristics of the country." To support his idea, Adonts quoted an Armenian author Sebeos (7th century): In 571 a Sunik prince had separated from the Armenians and requested the Iranian shah Khosrov to move the Sisakan Council from the Armenian capital Dvin to Paytakaran (Beylagan - T.K.), to register it at Atrpatakan (according to experts, the city of Paytakaran was already a part of Albania at that time - T.K.) and not to consider it an Armenian city anymore.⁴⁷ The order was carried out.

Experts think that there is no information on the population or language of Arsakh, which was more distant from Armenia than Sisakan, in either "The Syrian Chronicle" or "The 7th century Armenian Geography."

It seems to indicate that Arsakh was within Albania, so the available information was only about Albania as a whole. It is said in "The Syrian Chronicle" that Arran-Albania "*had its own language.*"⁴⁸ (my italics-T.K.) An Arab author Al-Istakhri (10th century) expressed a more concrete opinion: The population of Dabil and areas around it "*speaks Armenian, while the population of the Barda nahiyas speaks the Aran language.*"⁴⁹

Armenian authors try to prove that the population of Arsakh was Armenian and their language "was the Arsakh dialect of the Armenian language" on the basis of the following:

1."In the era of Strabon the population of Armenia was monolingual, that is its language was Armenian, and this, of course, concerns Arsakh as well."⁵⁰

Such an assumption and "logic" are absolutely unacceptable in science.

2."In the 7th century Arsakh was not only an ethnically Armenian province, but it also had its own Arsakh dialect of the Armenian language, and this... was testified by Stephan Syunetsi."⁵¹

This is a vain claim. The 8th century author Stephan Syunetsi noted that Sunik (Sisakan) and Arsakh had respectively their own Sunik and Arsakh languages.⁵²

3.According to Armenian authors, further evidence is provided by an anonymous Persian geographer of the early decades of the 13th century. He wrote that the population of Arsakh consisted of the "Armenians" ("Armaniand").

The point of this anonymous author concerning the 13th century doesn't seem to be groundless. By the 13th century considerable changes took place in the political, religious and

other fields of life in Albania: the Arabs occupied Albania in the 7th century. As a result of the Arab conquest, the majority of the Albanian Christian population adopted Islam and became Muslim.

The population of the Albanian highlands, Arsakh, remained Christian, gradually Gregorianized, adopted the Armenian language and Armenianized. The Armenian Church played an exceptionally key role in this process. According to a famous scholar and researcher LPetrushevski, "*Garabagh has never belonged to the Armenian cultural centers, and the Armenian Church has always served as an instrument of Armenianization of Albania.*"⁵³ (my italics-T.K.) Let us have a look at one fact: The Armenian Catholicos Ilya wrote to the Arab Caliph: "We (the Armenians - T.K.) and the Albanians are monophysites. The present Albanian Catholicos that sits on the throne in Barda (the political and religious capital of Albania - T.K.) has come to an agreement with the Byzantine Emperor; he commemorates him in his prayers and forces the country to join him in its religious faith." The Caliph was requested to punish the Albanian Catholicos. The Caliph replied that "those Albanians who rose in revolt against our reign" would be punished "in front of you" (Ilya - T.K.) in Barda.

The Armenian Catholicos Ilya "arrives in the capital of Albania, the city of Barda" and the Albanian Catholicos is punished "in front of him." Simeon who replaced the Albanian Catholicos "ordered all the wretched works of the poor Nerses to be put into trunks and thrown into the Tartar River, near his summer residence at the Barda-Kur."⁵⁴

Thus, as written by Petrushevski, the Armenian monophysite catholicos overthrew "the Chalcedonic Albanian Catholicos Nerses (Bakur) with the help of the Arab Caliph" and in Albania "the Chalcedonic movement (Orthodox, Greek-oriented, Georgian-oriented) expressing an attempt by some clergymen and princes to defend the independence of the Albanian Church from the Armenian Church was overturned by the pro-Armenian monophysites."⁵⁵

The process of Gregorianization and Armenianization of the Christian population of Arsakh might have begun from that time on. This process ended in 1836 with the liquidation of the Albanian Catholicosate by order of the Russian tsar through the pressure and repeated appeals of Echmiadzin.

Velichko wrote that Echmiadzin first strongly oppressed the Albanian Patriarchate. Then after Garabagh and Ganja were annexed to Russia, the Albanian Patriarchate was quietly abolished. It became clear that our politicians were even less far-sighted than the Turks who supported the independence of the Sivas and Akhtamar Patriarchates from the "All-Armenian Catholicos."⁵⁶

There is a divergence of opinion concerning the beginning and the end of the process of Gregorianization and Armenianization of the Arsakh population.

The Armenian specialist on Albania, Yeremyan writing about "the Armenianized part of Albania" ("арменизированная часть Албании") stated that by the early 8th century "a great part of the population of the Albanian provinces of Arsakh and Utik had already been assimilated by the Armenians."⁵⁷

Thus Yeremyan confessed that:

- Arsakh was an Albanian, not Armenian province;
- The population of Arsakh was Albanian, not Armenian.

If the population of Arsakh were Armenian, would it be possible to speak about an Armenian "Armenianization" or "assimilation" of another Armenian?

Thus the idea that "only Armenians had resided" in Nagorno-Karabakh since ancient times is groundless.

The idea that the population of Arsakh was "Armenianized" or "assimilated" by the Armenians in the early 8th century is also groundless.

The 13th century writer from Ganja, Kirakos testified that "the majority of their (Albanian - T.K.) leaders knew and spoke Armenian."⁵⁸ It means that not all of the Gregorianized Albanians knew Armenian in the 13th century; only their leaders and even not all leaders but

the "majority" spoke Armenian. According to the epigram of the Ganjasar Monastery built in the 13th century, it was built for the Albanians by the Albanian tsar Hasan Jalal upon the insistence of the Albanian patriarch.

The same Kirakos wrote the following about the city of Ganja: "There are too many Persians (Muslims - T.K.) and only a small number of Christians in this city. The city was a big enemy of the prophet Jesus and his followers; it cursed and abused the cross and church."⁵⁹ This is how the city of Ganja, which the Armenians refer to today as "the ancient Armenian city of Gandzak," was an "Armenian city."

Velichko, a Russian author, wrote the truth: Albania "was inhabited with the peoples of non-Armenian origin."

And: Those inhabitants of Garabagh, *who are mistakenly called the Armenians (with regard to the past), were the Armenian-Gregorians by confession, but originated from the mountainous people and the Turks, and were Armenianized only 3-4 centuries ago.*⁶⁰

V.Velichko said this in the early 20th century. There was no Nagorno-Karabakh problem at that time, and, as far as we know, then no Armenian authors tried to refute what Velichko said!

In order to substantiate the idea that the Armenian nation is a native of Garabagh, the "Memorandum" emphasizes "long years of correspondence" by the Garabaghi "Armenian" maliks "with the Russian palace and some European states since the beginning of the 18th century," introducing it as a "strong" evidence. Here is one of these documents: *"The emergence of the universe began in our country. When Noah's ark approached the Ararat Mountain, he came out and the universe emerged from the ark. The majority of kingdoms came into being from our country. Our state is the most ancient in the world. We possess the keys to all states."*⁶¹ (From "Agvan" - the letter of the Albanian maliks to Peter the Great dated May 27, 1703) (my italics-T.K.)

The letters sent by the "Armenian" maliks of Garabagh to Russian emperors are interesting from another standpoint as well. The letters show that the Garabaghi maliks kept in their historical memory the fact of their Albanian origin. One of the letters addressed to Peter the Great reads: *"We are the Agvans, the Utis by nationality."* (my italics-T.K.)

In one of their letters to the Russian tsar, the maliks presented themselves as being "relative" to the Russians. Then they involved their religion in this venture too.

In this connection, let us consider the report of 1908 by the Police Department of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia. It reads that *"in order to receive mercy for themselves, the Armenians used their religion to cheat everybody and presented themselves as Orthodox.* When the Emperor Paul was titled the Grand Master of the Maltese Order and the protector of the Christians, the Armenians, by sending their representatives, requested him to take the Armenians under his patronage. In 1799, the liturgy drawn up by Joseph Argutinski was even presented to Paul I. The liturgy said that the All-Russian Orthodox Emperor and the August House of His Majesty should be worshipped. After that in Russia the Armenians were considered to be Orthodox brethren. This continued for almost one hundred years. The entire swindle became known in the hearings on the legal case of the Armenian priest Ter-Voskakov in 1891..."⁶²

The correspondence could have "benefited" the UN members in terms of the way the Garabaghi maliks visited palaces. A document of November 1701 concerns their gift to "the Tsar and His successor," which consisted of "a Turkic saddle with a velvet cover, threaded with silver and embroidered in gold" and 11 other various valuable "Turkic" presents, while a document of June 8, 1712 is about 31 types of gift to the tsar, including 5 carpets, 26 horses (probably famous Garabaghi horses), silk from Shamakhy and so on.⁶³

By using such dirty means, the emissaries Israel Ori and Vardapet Minas succeeded in winning the heart of Peter I. In-order to free the Garabaghi Armenians (by confession) "from the Tartar yoke," the Emperor ordered 40 thousand Russian troops to be placed at the disposal of "the swindler and adventurer Israel Ori."⁶⁴ (in the words of Velichko - T.K.)

As is well known, in the summer of 1722, Peter I's military campaign to the provinces along the Caspian Sea began. Under the leadership of Peter I the Russian troops, moving by land from Hashtarkhan, seized Darband on August 23. A key intention of Peter I was to go to Shamakhy personally, and he notified the Georgian tsar Vakhtang VI of this. Armed detachments, formed by the Garabaghi maliks in a hurry, together with the armed forces of Vakhtang VI, were supposed to go to Shamakhy and join the troops of Peter I.

However, soon Peter I had to leave Darband Castle and turn back.

As a result of Peter I's return to Petersburg and his failure to go to Shamakhy, the plan of Vakhtang VI and that of the Garabaghi maliks to join Peter I in Shamakhy failed. Vakhtang was forced to return to Tiflis and the maliks to their lands. The Catholicos of Ganjasar, Isai Hasan Jalal wrote: "We, having been deceived in our hopes, returned to our places and consolidated ourselves in mountains that were hard to pass."⁶⁵

In 1723 the Ottomans seized Tiflis. "Deceived in their hopes," the maliks of Garabagh were completely isolated and immediately took a new course. This is confirmed, among others, by a letter of February 1, 1724 from Ivan Karapet, an agent of the Russian government. It states that the Patriarch Nerses, his brother Sarkis and several yuzbashies (sotnik) wanted the Turks to come (according to Ezov, Nerses competed with the Catholicos of Ganjasar, Isai, and after separating from him, he declared himself an independent patriarch of the Uchoghlan (Three Boys) Monastery). Malik Baghyr, on the other hand, "was a supporter of the Gyzylbashes." There is some terrible information in Karapet's letter: *Malik Baghyr "by tricking 55 Armenian yuzbashies, invited them to a feast at his house and, having beheaded them, sent their heads to the Shah."*⁶⁶ (the Iranian Shah - T.K.) (my italics-T.K.)

The maliks, who completely neglected the Ganja principality during the attack of Peter I on the Caspian provinces, attempted to restore their relations with Ganja. They stated that from now on, if they do anything wrong with the population of Ganja, their life, along with their property, can be dealt with as wished.⁶⁷

However, the maliks of Garabagh were hypocritical: they continued their secret activities against Azerbaijan. As for Peter I, he was encouraging them from Petersburg. The Emperor declared that he would come to look over the Iranian lands annexed to the Russian Empire and that the maliks should prepare their forces by then. Moreover, Peter I summoned an Armenian named Lazar, who knew Iran well, conferred on him the rank of general and ordered 40 thousand troops to be put at his disposal for the "restoration of Garabagh." (it is so in the document - T.K.) Lazar, however, declined the offer. In this case, Peter I declared that he would personally go to save them.⁶⁸

At the end of 1724, the Garabaghi maliks wrote a letter to Peter I, and asked him "to help or, at least, grant them some land somewhere on the shores of the Caspian Sea." If the land were allocated, they asked for troops to be sent in order to provide "their and their nation's safe-leaving the country of Garabagh."

The Emperor immediately reacted to that appeal. On November 10, 1724, Peter I, who was near death, personally received representatives of the maliks, and sent a decree with them to General Kropotov, who was in Darband. He ordered Kropotov to allocate land in the Darband region of the coast of the Caspian Sea for their resettlement.

On the same day Peter I signed a decree for General Matyushkin and Brigadier Levashov in Baku: "It is necessary by all means to call the Armenians and other Christians to move to the Iranian provinces occupied by Russia - Gilan, Mazandaran, Baku, Darband and other favorable places, they should be accepted with kindness, regarded with favor; good lands should be allocated for them, uninhabited houses and facilities in the cities and villages should be given to them. *Those Muslims that express hostility or are suspected of doing so should be driven out* (my italics - T.K.) and replaced by the Christians."⁶⁹ According to research by academician Butkov, the order sent to Matyushkin had been approved by the Board of Foreign Affairs on February 11, 1725 and by the Empress Catherine I on February 22, 1726.⁷⁰

The resettlement of the Armenians to the Muslim countries was a consistent strategy of Peter I and his successors. In the instructions of the tsar's government of November 4, 1722, this strategy was formulated in the following way: "To invite and to resettle the Armenians and other Christians, if there are any, in Gilan and Mazandaran by all means, and *to quietly decrease the number of the Muslims unawares.*" (my italics - T.K.) General Rumyantsev, who was sent to Istanbul on September 1724, was given the following order: "By all possible means, the Armenians should be encouraged to settle in Gilan and those other places of ours. (Iran - T.K.) If their number is high, the Persians will be resettled to other places and the places cleared of Persians will be given to the Armenians."⁷¹

Apparently, Peter I issued an official decree to allocate land in the Darband area for the Christians of Garabagh. The maliks, however, missed this opportunity. On July 25, 1725 (Peter I had already died on January), by sending an official letter to Petersburg, they confirmed receiving the decree on "resettlement to the coast of the Caspian Sea." However, they refused to move away from Garabagh. The excuse given by the maliks for such a refusal was the following: "The places they live now - Ganja, Garabagh, Gaphan, Sisian, etc - are very strong and substantial provinces" and "if they leave their strong places, the enemy Turks and Persians might completely destroy them." That is why "their resettlement in the provinces of Her Majesty the Empress is not possible, although they would be happy to obey Her Majesty's decree with great pleasure and desire."⁷²

Afterwards, Ivan Karapet informed Petersburg by letter that "the request for the allocation of land for the resettlement of the Armenians (by confession - T.K.) did not correspond with the desire of the population."⁷³

An interesting point about the letter of Karapet is that all the requests about a move from Garabagh were made in secret from the population. Preoccupied with everyday concerns, the Christians of Garabagh did not even think of moving anywhere.

The maliks themselves requested the resettlement from Garabagh to Russia, and they themselves refused. Those places being "ancient Armenian territory" wasn't even mentioned. The refusal to move out was based on reasons of "safety" and on the consideration that the places where they lived were "strong and substantial provinces."

In raising the issue of resettlement, the maliks did not have any intention of moving. Their real aim was to draw the attention of Russia, encourage Russia to speed up the occupation of Azerbaijan, and thus obtain political and economic privileges in the region.

In 1727 the maliks again raised the issue of resettlement to the Darband area. In April of the same year, by sending their representatives to Dolgorukov, Commander of the Russian Troops in the Provinces along the Caspian Sea, in Darband, they stated that they "would be subjects of His Majesty the Emperor forever" and requested him to allocate "lands in the provinces belonging to His Majesty the Emperor" for their resettlement. Such an area was presented to them and the maliks expressed their desire to move there. Although Dolgorukov offered a place for the maliks to move, he was skeptical about their intention to move. He wrote, "I don't believe this absolutely because of the Armenians' slippery character."⁷⁴ Dolgorukov was right in his conjectures.

Next year the maliks raised the issue of resettlement from Garabagh again. They were told again, "Please move." At the same time, Rumyantsev informed Petersburg from Darband: "None of the ordinary people will move, only the nobles"; Armenian emissaries themselves say that "ordinary people will not leave their homes as they don't face any danger from the Turks."⁷⁵

Rumyantsev was also right: no Armenian (by confession) left Garabagh this time either. The efforts of the maliks to bring the Russian troops to Garabagh failed this time too.

6. On the Appearance of the Turks in Nagorno-Karabakh

The "Memorandum" claims, "The Turkic tribes had appeared in Nagorno-Karabakh only during the last thirty years of the 18th century."

This claim is absolute nonsense.

The nations of Turkic origin had inhabited Azerbaijan, including Garabagh from ancient times, but since the 2nd millennium an influx of Oghuz Turks had strengthened them. The Turks became an ethno-political and ethno-cultural force in Azerbaijan. The Azerbaijani Turkic language gradually became widespread and a key communication tool in the whole of Transcaucasia and Dagestan.

Barda has for a long time been a main city in Garabagh. In the opinion of V.V. Bartold, famous orientalist, Barda was even "a capital" of Transcaucasia for a certain period, "second to Barda was Darband, third was Tiflis," "Ardabil, the greatest city of Southern Azerbaijan, followed Barda and Darband in size."⁷⁶ Sadulla Bardai, who was born in the 2nd half of the 14th century, included many bayatis (the Turkic poem form) in his "Hadaiq-ud-Daqaiq" (Gardens of Minutes). Gulshan Bardai of Garabagh (1426-1533) wrote a divan (poem collection) in Turkic. His divan included 68 qazels and qasidas.⁷⁷ (genres of lyrical poem)

When discussing the population of Garabagh in the 18th century, Armenian authors often refer to the letters sent by the maliks of Garabagh to Peter I in 1717 and to the Empress Catherine I in 1725. The former letter states that there are nine hundred villages, with one, two, three, four hundred and more families in each of them under the patronage of the Ganjasar Patriarch.⁷⁸ The latter states that in each of *six mahals* (in some sources a "malikate" was called a mahal) of Garabagh there are 30, 40, 50 villages, each village has 600, 500, 400, 200, 100, 50 families. (The 6th malikate called "Talysh" had been formed in Garabagh by this time.)

In reality, what is true? An answer to this question can be found in "Gəncə-Qarabağ əyalətinin müfəssəl dəftəri" of 1727. This is a tax document. That's why it can be considered a relatively reliable source.

Analysis of the Journal shows that in 1727, 166 villages of 6 non-Muslim mahals in Nagorno-Karabakh were populated. Only 4 villages had more than 100 families (one had 143 families and the other three villages had between 104-121).

There were 3.952 families in 6 mahals, including 3.107 non-Muslim and 845 Muslim families.⁷⁹ As for the province of Garabagh as a whole, the Journal contains the names of 11.818 Muslim families (11.068 Azerbaijani and 750 Kurdish families).⁸⁰

Therefore, the information about 900 villages, with each having "100, 200, 300, 400 and more" families in them, is fictitious.

The Armenian claim about the "appearance of the Azerbaijanis in Nagorno-Karabakh only during the last thirty years of the 18th century" is absolutely groundless. In the early 18th century, the Turks already constituted more than 20% of the population in these 6 mahals of Nagorno-Karabakh! It was they and Panahali khan, founder of the khanate of Garabagh, who built a capital for the khanate of Garabagh, the famous city of Shusha, in the 1850s!

It should also be taken into account that the figure 11.818 can not exactly reflect the number of the Garabaghi Muslim families, because many Azerbaijani cattle-breeders who spent most of the year in summer and winter pastures were not included in the Journal. On the other hand, a decrease in the number of Azerbaijanis in Garabagh by the year 1727 has been observed; for instance, during the Ottoman-Safavid conflict in 1588, the baylarbay of Garabagh, Mahammad khan, took thousands of the Azerbaijanis with him to the other side of the River Araz, to Garadagh.⁸¹ After the Safavid state had got Garabagh back from the Ottomans, Mahammad khan returned to Garabagh together with his people in 1605. A great number of Azerbaijanis, however, didn't leave Garadagh.

During the rule of Shah Abbas and Nadir Shah a large number of Azerbaijani families were resettled from Northern Azerbaijan to the Isfahan province of Iran. The very Azerbaijanis

from the Aghdam, Aghdash, Aghsu and Goychay mahals founded villages of the same names in the province of Isfahan. As for Nadir shah, he exiled a great part of the Javanshir tribe of 540 families from Garabagh to Sarakhs (between Iran and Afghanistan). A number of these Garabaghis left for Afghanistan and founded a village named Garabagh near Kabul. Their successors now live in the village of Garabagh. During the rule of Nadir shah, Azerbaijanis from other parts of Azerbaijan had also been resettled to Iran. One example: In 1919 Y.V.Chamanzaminli wrote that Nadir shah "settled the Persians among the Turks and was sending the Turks from the Caucasus to the Persian province. It's amazing that there is no trace of the Persians resettled in the Caucasus, (Azerbaijan - T.K.) all of them are Turkicized. As for the Iranian Turks, they have preserved their language, tradition and rules so far. There is a Turkic village named "Shirvan" in Khorasan (maybe they moved there from the Caucasus). Although it is surrounded by Persian villages on four sides, this village hasn't lost its Turkicness."⁸²

The above-mentioned processes didn't involve the Christian Albanians of Garabagh. On the contrary, *they even benefited from the 1588 events.*

A historian of the Ottoman period, Ibrahim Rahimizada wrote that the non-Muslim maliks of Garabagh expressed their obedience to the Ottomans; in return, they maintained their posts and even obtained new lands.⁸³

Indeed, "the new lands" could only be the lands of the Azerbaijanis of Garabagh, who were forced to leave for Southern Azerbaijan.

At the same time, the resettlement of Armenians from various other provinces to Garabagh was being observed in the 17th century. An Armenian historian of that period, Zakari Kanakertsi, points to such a fact: When the Ottoman Army moved toward Iravan in 1635, the baylarbay of Iravan, Tahmasibgulu khan, resettled the population to the neighbouring provinces. A great number of Armenians migrated to the mahals of Varanda and Khachyn of Garabagh, as well as to Ganja.⁸⁴

7. On the Khanate of Garabagh

Most of the correspondence between "the Armenian maliks of Garabagh" and the Russian palace, talked about in the "Memorandum," was about the khanate of Garabagh. However, the "Memorandum," which talks about the times of Noah, does not even mention the name of the khanate of Garabagh, since this does not respond to the malice of the "Memorandum" authors.

The khanate of Garabagh was established in 1747. Russian historians of the 19th century objectively assessed its establishment. Potto wrote: "Garabagh separated from Iran and in 1747 proclaimed Panah khan its ruler. Thus a small independent state, persistently defending its independence, emerged at the border of a big state."⁸⁵ On the other hand, a 19th century writer of Armenian origin, Lieutenant-General S.Kishmishev wrote: *The son of Panah khan, Ibrahim khan "had accepted neither the authority of Iran nor that of Turkey over himself; he ruled Garabagh independently"*⁸⁶ (my italics-T.K.) I.Zakaryants, priest from Shusha, in his work published in Jerusalem in 1853, wrote that an Iranian shah demanded a tax from Ibrahim khan. As a reply, *the khan wrote to the shah: "My father didn't charge me to pay taxes to anyone, to your state or to any other"*⁸⁷ (my italics-T.K.)

What was a reaction of the maliks of Garabagh to the establishment of the khanate of Garabagh?

They did not react to it uniformly. The malik of Varanda, Shahnazar immediately recognized the authority of Panah khan. However, the malik of Khachyn rose against Panahali khan. Initially Panahali khan called them to discipline with admonition and gentleness, but they did not abandon their obstinacy. Finally, a bloody battle broke out. Panahali khan attacked the trenches of the armed maliks in a place called Ballygaya, and

defeated and crushed them after three days of fighting. As a result, the rest of the maliks were subordinated to the khan of Garabagh.⁸⁸

Even though maliks "put on the ring of obedience and the gown of loyalty," they turned out to be traitors. The majority of them, from the first days of the khanate of Garabagh, initiated provocation against the khanate and opposed Panah khan. It was they who instigated the ruler of Shaki, Chalabi khan, to fight against Panah khan. Mirza Yusuf Garabaghi (Nersesov), Armenian annalist, wrote that the maliks sent a letter with the following content to Chalabi khan, "Panah khan has become the ruler of Garabagh, has begun building a castle (the Castle of Bayat - T.K.) and a trench.... If necessary measures are not taken, it will be difficult to cope with this man."⁸⁹

Chalabi khan yielded to the instigation of the maliks and led his army to the first capital of Garabagh, the Castle of Bayat. He was defeated and returned to Shaki. Nonetheless, the devil had already done his work. The hostility between the two newly-established Azerbaijani khanates was created.

Panah khan gradually strengthened his authority. He built Shusha Castle and moved the capital there. Garabaghi (Nersesov) wrote, "One pleasant day Panah khan laid the foundation of the city of Shusha." Potto also emphasized that it was Panah khan who had built Shusha: "*There is one inscription on the wall of the city mosque; it proves that Panah khan laid the foundation of the city and the castle*"⁹⁰ (my italics-T.K.)

Day by day consolidation of the khanate of Garabagh was gradually increasing the interest of the great powers towards it. The Garabaghi khan Ibrahim and his vizier Molla Panah Vagif realized the existence of the threat from the north. That is why the establishment of diplomatic relations with Russia was given great significance. On March 18, 1783, by addressing Catherine II, Ibrahim khan requested her to take the khanate of Garabagh under her protection. Nevertheless, on April 6, 1783, the favourite and the closest assistant of Catherine II, knyaz (duke) Potyomkin signed the following "order" for General Potyomkin: "*Ibrahim khan must be overthrown and an independent Armenian province must be established in Garabagh.*"⁹¹ (my italics-T.K.)

Thus by the spring of 1783, the attitude of Russia towards the khanate of Garabagh had already been defined and formulated in a very clear, simple and concrete manner: "Ibrahim khan must be overthrown and an independent Armenian province must be established in Garabagh." After a while, Russia decided to "create a powerful Christian state consisting of Garabagh and Armenia." 13 years would pass and Russia would prepare a "top secret" plan on "the consolidation of Georgia with the provinces of Iravan and Ganja."

Russia planned to attack Iran and Azerbaijan in two directions: the Russian troops moving from Kizlyar had to seize Darband, and "if possible, to capture Fatali khan and to send him to Hashtarkhan."⁹² The order issued by knyaz Potyomkin on June 16, 1783 stated the following: "Fatali khan's neighbours must be raised against him."⁹³ After Fatali khan had seized Ardabil, Russia's attitude towards him worsened. Butkov wrote that actions like Fatali khan's seizure of Ardabil "were reinforcing the neighbouring ruler (Fatali khan - T.K.) in Russia's boundaries, and were against our interests."⁹⁴ Then these troops were to occupy the territory up to Anzali, while the Russian forces that would move towards Mozdok-Tiflis were to seize the khanates of Garabagh and Garadagh. This plan was scheduled to implement till the summer of 1784.

The Russian military command strongly believed that this military operation would end successfully. The details were being developed and the establishment of a new control system in the areas to be occupied was being discussed. In November General Potyomkin asked knyaz Potyomkin to clarify the following: "*What kind of control system should be given to the new state consisting of Garabagh and Garadagh? Should the province of Iravan be integrated into this new state?*"⁹⁵ (my italics-T.K.)

The inquiry indicates that the Christian state, to be established, shouldn't consist of "Armenia and Garabagh" as planned before, but of "Garabagh and Garadagh." It was

intended that an Armenian should rule the new state, "other Armenian provinces (Iranian?), by imitating the Garabaghi Armenians (by confession - T.K.), should follow their path, and, finally, a Christian state should be restored in Asia."⁹⁶ (the word "Iranian?" in parentheses belongs to Butkov too)

An unexpected event, however, stopped the military campaign planned for the summer of 1784. The ruler of Isfahan, Alimurad khan, by sending his representative to knyaz Potyomkin, asked Russia to recognize him as an Iranian shah. In return, Alimurad khan promised to give Russia the lands occupied during the campaign of Peter I to the provinces along the Caspian Sea and returned to Iran by the Treaty of Ganja in 1735, as well as "Garabagh, Garadagh, Iravan, and Nakhchivan."⁹⁷

Potyomkin grabbed at the offer and sent his representative to Alimurad khan. However, Alimurad khan was taken out of the game. Potyomkin's plan to easily seize new lands and to establish a Christian state failed.

The khan of Garabagh was aware of Russia's plans. By sending his envoy Musa Sultan to Petersburg with a letter addressed to the tsar (January 1784), the khan confirmed his previous request. At the same time, Russia was asked not to interfere into the administrative rule of the khan.⁹⁸ On May 28, 1784, Catherine II wrote to knyaz Potyomkin: "It seems that the letters of Ibrahim khan are more courteous than the Ottoman or Persian letters sent to me. Please let me know who he is. How did he become a khan? Is he young or old, strong or weak; do the Persians side with him?"⁹⁹

We have no information regarding an answer to this letter. However, we know that the maliks of Garabagh established very close secret relations with the Russian government and that they managed to form a hostile attitude in the Russian government against the khanate of Garabagh.

Ibrahim khan wasn't asleep either. He became aware of the treachery of the maliks. In a letter addressed to Catherine II, the political and religious leader of the Armenians I.Argutinski (01.23.1790) confessed: "*Having been aware of the men sent often by General Potyomkin, of the deeds of the maliks and the Catholicos, the khan of Shusha exposed and punished them*"¹⁰⁰ (my italics-T.K.) By order of Ibrahim khan, the Catholicos and the maliks of Chilaberd, Dizag and Gulustan were arrested. According to Butkov, the Catholicos "died of fear" in Shusha prison.

The maliks Majlum and Abov managed to escape from Shusha prison and went to Georgia. Thus the maliks ran away abandoning their wives, children, property and subjects.¹⁰¹

Ibrahim khan replaced these maliks with new ones. As for the priest of the Uchoghlan Church, Ibrahim khan raised him to the throne of the "Albanian Catholicos" in Ganjasar.

Thus Ibrahim khan very skilfully destroyed the enemies of the khanate of Garabagh. By doing so, he also "foiled the plot prepared against him" and thwarted Russia's plan to send troops to Garabagh. The separatists, who organized a conspiracy against the independence of Garabagh, were not able to resist Ibrahim khan in any way, because they were incapable of doing it on their own. The Garabaghi Christians themselves were tired of the evil deeds committed by the separatists. Therefore, they did not openly object or protest against Ibrahim khan for his crushing of the Catholicos and the maliks.

"The defence of Shusha against Agha Mahammad khan" in 1795 is "one of the most remarkable moments in the military history of this knights' land."¹⁰² (Garabagh - T.K.)

General Kishmishev described the defence of Shusha in detail. He wrote that the walls of Shusha protected the Castle from sudden attacks. The only way to the Castle was up a sharp, arid, slope. The assailant encountered arms and stones before getting close to the gates of the Castle. "The warlike character of the protectors of the Castle was irreproachable. Agha Mahammad khan, who was not able to seize the Castle in this way, wanted to trick Ibrahim khan into leaving the Castle and fighting with him outside. However, the ruler of Garabagh was not one to be tricked easily: he hadn't confined himself only to defending the Castle, but had also taken all measures in order to strike a tangible blow at the enemy. The

khan, who believed that his subjects shared his hatred of the tyrant, declared a popular war... The whole population rose to the call of the beloved khan, and the volunteers organized by the local bays (nobles) soon turned into a dreadful force at the rear of Agha Mahammad khan."¹⁰³

The ruler of Garabagh, Ibrahimkhalil khan *"declared a popular war... The whole population rose to the call of the beloved khan!"* (my italics-T.K.)

Gajar held Shusha under siege for 33 days. Unable to conquer Shusha, Gajar left the siege of Shusha and led his troops to Tiflis.

The maliks, who had escaped from Garabagh, played a vile role in the occupation and looting of Tiflis.

V.L.Velichko wrote: "History had showed to the Georgians that one must not trust those inclined to spying and treachery: the *Armenian maliks* (Armenian by confession -T.K.), Abo and Majmun (Abov and Majlum - T.K.), whom Irakli II was merciful to and hid (further, he offered help with 4 thousand troops - T.K.) from the Persian pursuits (read: Ibrahimkhalil khan - T.K.), *sold themselves to the Persians at a calamitous moment* (my italics-T.K.) and guided the troops of Agha Mahammad khan who looted and blooded Tiflis in 1795. It would be useful to remember this fact at a moment when the Armenian publicists insist that the Armenians are *the Christians*"¹⁰⁴

Long before Velichko, General Kishmishev wrote that the Iranian troops stopped in Aghdam, because they did not know the way from Garabagh to Tiflis. The maliks of Garabagh Abov and Majlum caught up with Gajar's army camp and offered their guidance. Kishmishev later wrote: *"It is difficult to understand what compelled the maliks to betray their motherland.* (my italics-T.K.) Indeed they were hostile to Ibrahim khan for their captivity, but Irakli sympathized with them... Probably without the assistance of the maliks Agha Mahammad khan would not have been able to move so rapidly through unfamiliar places..., the expected support (from Russia - T.K.) would have arrived and Georgia would not have suffered from all the horrors of the Persians' attack."¹⁰⁵

Another fact: According to Potto, the khan of Nakhchivan participated in the military campaign of Gajar to Tiflis. He also took part in the occupation of Mskheti (There is no document about the participation of Kalbali khan in these campaign. It seems one of the princes was there). Potto wrote about the generosity this Turkic man showed to the Christian temple in Mskheti: *"Thanks to the protection of the khan of Nakhchivan, the main Church of Mskheti, which is an ancient monument to the greatness of Georgia, survived. The khan of Nakhchivan told his men: "One should not desecrate holy places and the tombs of rulers. " The temple was not touched."*¹⁰⁶ (my italics-T.K.)

8. On the Ethnic Composition of the Population of Nagorno-Karabakh

The "Memorandum" claims that until 1921 the Turks "had never constituted more than 3-4% of the population of Nagorno-Karabakh."

The letter sent by the Russian officials in Transcaucasia to the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia on June 19, 1811 can be considered the first document containing information on the ethnic composition of the Garabaghi population at the beginning of the 19th century. The letter published in Yerevan in 1972 stated that 12 thousand families resided in Garabagh; 9.500 of them were Muslim families and up to 2.500 were Armenian families.¹⁰⁷

I suppose that these figures generally give an accurate account of the proportion of Garabagh's population; i.e. there were almost 4 times more Azerbaijanis than Armenians. However, the information on the total population figure doesn't even approximately reflect the reality. This can be concluded by comparing these figures with the data calculated by the paper method by the Russian authorities in Garabagh in 1823.

Based on the same paper method, researchers calculated that in 1823 there were 20.095 families in Garabagh, including 15.729 Azerbaijani (78.3%) and 4.366 Armenian families (21.7%).¹⁰⁸

According to the calculations of Armenian authors, the number of the Armenian families was 5.107.¹⁰⁹ Which number concerning the Armenians is more correct - 5.107 or 4.366? One might say that the difference between the two figures is not so high (741 families) and that it does not change the overall view of the number of the Armenians in Garabagh.

What was the relative ratio of the Azerbaijanis and the Armenians in Nagorno-Karabakh at the beginning of the 19th century? It seems there is only one calculation concerning this, and it was made by the authors from Moscow Ter-Sarkisyants, Meltyukhov and Trapeznikov. Based on the paper method of 1823, they calculated that the Armenians constituted 84.6% (30.850) and the Azerbaijanis 14.7% (5.370) of the population (36.490) of the mountainous parts of the Shusha and Javanshir uezds (an administrative unit in the Russian Empire), which approximately corresponded with the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast.

Even this calculation refutes the claims that the Armenians constituted 96-97% of the population of Nagorno-Karabakh at the beginning of the 19th century.

This calculation is, however, imperfect, since every Armenian family was counted as consisting of 10 members on average. Nevertheless, this method was not applied to the Azerbaijanis. Only in Shusha there were 1.111 Azerbaijani families (421 Armenian families). But Shusha was not the only place in Nagorno-Karabakh inhabited by Azerbaijanis. There were many other settlements in Nagorno-Karabakh where Azerbaijanis resided. Even without taking them into account, just the Azerbaijanis living in Shusha would constitute 5.555 if counted as 5 people per family and 11.110 if counted as 10 people per family.

From 1828 the resettlement of Armenians to Transcaucasia, as well as to Azerbaijan increased in size and organization.

PhDs in historical sciences, Ter-Sarkisyants, Meltyukhov and academician of the International Information Academy Trapeznikov wrote that the process of resettlement of the Armenians from Iran to Transcaucasia "had left Nagorno-Karabakh practically untouched. 300 of 700 Armenian families, which had been resettled to Garabagh in 1828, went back and the majority of the others died as a result of a plague epidemic."¹¹⁰ They took this and a number of other ideas from the book called "Нагорный Карабах. Историческая справка" (Nagorno-Karabakh. Historical Information), published in 1988 in Yerevan. Ever since this idea and the figure do not leave the pages of the Moscow press.

It became clear from the facts provided by a 19th century Armenian author M.Barkhudaryants that at least 1.200 Armenian families were settled in the territory of Nagorno-Karabakh.¹¹² "At least" because Barkhudaryants pointed to the resettlement of the Armenians from Iran in a number of other villages, but gave no information concerning their number.

Consequently, the idea that the process of resettlements from Iran "left Nagorno-Karabakh practically untouched" is far from the truth.

It was primarily due to the resettlement of the Armenians from Iran that already in 1832 considerable changes had taken place in the composition of the population of Garabagh. The number of Armenian families in Garabagh in 1823-1832 rose from 4.366 to 6.491, that is an increase of 2.025 families. The number of the Azerbaijani families fell from 15.729 to 13.965, that is a decrease of 1.764 families.

Such an increase in the number of the Armenians in Garabagh was mainly due to the settlers from Iran, *while the decrease in the number of the Azerbaijanis was due to their oppression by the tsarist authorities, as a result of which a large number of the Azerbaijanis were forced to leave Garabagh.*

The number of Armenian families had increased from 421 to 762 within ten years (1823-1832) in Shusha for the same reasons. An inverse process took place in the

composition of the Azerbaijanis: the number of the Azerbaijani families in Shusha decreased from 1.111 to 963.

The materials of the Russian paper method calculation are a significant source on the ethnic composition of the population of Garabagh, as well as that of Shusha at the beginning of the 19th century. However, they do not reflect the real situation. The Russian officials themselves pointed this out.

Let us focus our attention on the letter presented by Captain of the General Staff Prujanovski to Judge-General Newtgardt on March 16, 1845 (the same letter later sent to the Minister of War was reported to the Emperor Nicolas I on April 4).

The letter states, "According to the paper method calculation there are 25.986 families in Garabagh." (The date of the calculation was not indicated; presumably it was at the beginning of the 1840s) There were 73.273 men in these families, including up to 30.600 Armenians (600 "landowners") and 42.000 Azerbaijanis (2.000 "nobles").

Still, Prujanovski had a critical attitude to the paper method calculation. He wrote, "Such a calculation is completely wrong: there are more people in Garabagh; 10.000 families can be added here with certainty."¹¹² In this case, according to him, Garabagh' population would constitute 35.000 families and this would be closer to reality, including the view that the Armenians would constitute a little more than 30.000 (men) and the Azerbaijanis about 62.000 (men).

Later the captain wrote: "The dominant people in Garabagh are Shiites,"¹¹³ i.e. the Azerbaijanis. Despite this fact, the Armenians were appointed to key posts by the occupant power. The same Prujanovski wrote: "The Muslims are dissatisfied by the appointment of Armenians to these posts. Their main concern is that the Armenians damage their welfare by occupying these posts, and, most importantly, the control of the Armenians over local police forces is insulting for the Garabaghi dynasty and bays."

Long before Prujanovski, A.Bakukhanov castigated this situation. Bakukhanov wrote to General Paskevich in 1833 that "some people (he means General Madatov, tyrant in Shusha after he was appointed "Chief of the Muslim Provinces" -T.K.) arouse the hatred of the people (the Azerbaijani people -T.K.) towards the Russians... and the Madatovs try by all means to create turmoil and thus to easily kill the people by invincible Russian arms. The Madatovs want to rule over this country forever."¹¹⁴

Oppression and the trampling of the rights of the Azerbaijanis by the occupant authorities intensified during the following period. Velichko wrote in the early 20th century: "It would be absolutely natural to give equal rights to the Muslims with the Armenians in a country (Azerbaijan - T.K.) *where the Muslims are more indigenous*" the Russians "*must run the state affairs of Russia in Garabagh with the help of the Azerbaijanis themselves.*" (my italics-T.K.)

Let us return to the ethnic composition of the Garabaghi population.

By the end of the 19th century the population of Garabagh had increased considerably. There is a reliable source concerning this change. This source is the first national census of the population of the Russian Empire. According to the census of 1897, 62.808, 52.836, 49.605 and 73.493, i.e. 238.742 Muslims and 74.213, 19.573, 15.769 and 63.246, i.e. 172.801 Armenian-Gregorians resided in the Shusha, Javanshir, Jabrayil and Zangazur uezds of Garabagh respectively. The number of the people living only in Nagorno-Karabakh was not specified yet. However, it is clear as noonday and one could unambiguously say that both in the early and the late 19th century, that is in 1897, the Armenians did not constitute 96-97% of the population of Nagorno-Karabakh, and even if we supposed for a moment that all of the mentioned 172.801 Armenians lived only in Nagorno-Karabakh and the Azerbaijanis in Nagorno-Karabakh lived only in Shusha (10.809 people), in the villages of Malibayli (1.181) and Khojavand (559), in the rural communities of Tugh (242 of the inhabitants), Khanazakh (442 of the inhabitants), and Goki (117 of the inhabitants), we would see again that the Armenians constituted only 92.8% of the region's population (there were tens of other villages

inhabited by Azerbaijanis in Nagorno-Karabakh, but I do not have any information concerning the number of their inhabitants).

According to the calculations of M. Skibitski, a 19th century Russian researcher, 26.038 families used the pastures of Garabagh. "18.919 of them were Azerbaijani families (referred to as the "Aderbayjani Tartars" in the source - T.K.) living in 333 villages of Garabagh and 2 villages of the Ganja plain," 3.510 were Kurdish and 3.408 were Armenian families. In the mountains of Garabagh, Skibitski marked 567 pastures and houses. In the opinion of experts, 560 out of 567 names were of Azerbaijani origin.¹¹⁵

These facts also give an idea of Garabagh and its population.

The Armenian side has specialized in spreading misinformation about Garabagh and the composition of its population; for instance, the document on Nagorno-Karabakh disseminated in the UN by the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Armenia at the UN on September 2, 1997 reads that "in 1918 the number of the Armenians in Nagorno-Karabakh was up to 300.000-330.000." As if in 1918-1920, 20% of the region's population died "as a result of the Turkish-Azerbaijani occupation." Nevertheless, in 1923, somehow 95% of the population of Nagorno-Karabakh were Armenians and only 3% were Azerbaijanis.

According to information in the «Кавказский календарь» (Caucasian Calendar) magazine, for 1917 there were **580.457** people in Garabagh, namely in the uyezds of Shusha, Javanshir, Jabrayil and Zangazur: **321.712** Azerbaijanis and **243.627** Armenians (85.622 and 98.809 in Shusha, 50.798 and 22.008 in Javanshir, 65.587 and 21.755 in Jabrayil, 119.705 and 101.055 in Zangazur uyezds respectively).

However, as Russian author A. Shepotyev wrote in 1919, these figures didn't reflect reality: thousands of Garabaghi Armenian workers settled as far as Rostov were considered to be Armenian inhabitants of Garabagh, though they were not the settled population of Garabagh. On the basis of two important sources «Докладная записка о выкупе надельных земель Закавказья» (Report on the Ransom of Farmsteads of Transcaucasia) (1912) and «Сельско-хозяйственная перепись 1917 г.» (Agricultural Census of 1917), Shepotyev came to the conclusion that for 1917 there were 415.000 Muslims and 170.000 Armenians in Garabagh.¹¹⁶

Yes, these figures are dated not to 1918, but to 1917. Maybe in 1918 there was a "population explosion" in Nagorno-Karabakh or maybe a mass influx of Armenians to Nagorno-Karabakh took place? Certainly not. On the contrary, from 1918 to 1921 the number of Armenians in Nagorno-Karabakh actually decreased. This was due to the strained military-political situation caused by Armenia in Nagorno-Karabakh.

The claim that in 1923 the Azerbaijanis constituted only 3% of the population in Nagorno-Karabakh is completely false just as is the claim that there were 300.000-330.000 Armenians in Nagorno-Karabakh in 1918.

Let us suppose for a moment that the population of the 4 mentioned uyezds consisted of only 243.627 Armenians and 19.121 Shusha Azerbaijanis (this figure was also provided by "Кавказский календарь"). Even in this case too, only the Azerbaijani population of Shusha alone would have constituted 7.3% of the population of those 4 uyezds.

In short, in the two documents distributed by Armenia in the UN there is false information on the size and ethnic composition of the population in Nagorno-Karabakh.

9. On the Status of Nagorno-Karabakh in 1918-1920

The "Memorandum" claims, "Nagorno-Karabakh was not a part of the Azerbaijani Republic in 1918-1920."

At the end of May 1918, the Republics of Azerbaijan, Armenia and Georgia were established.

At this stage Armenia was still waiting for a particular diplomatic tactic concerning Nagorno-Karabakh, and was not openly exposing its intentions. There is a well-known and pertinent fact: On August 1918, the diplomatic representative of Armenia to Tiflis asked the Azerbaijani diplomatic representative therein for permission to send a "special delegation" from Armenia to the center of Garabagh, Shusha. The official answer to this request was as follows: "If the Azerbaijani government is assured that the delegation doesn't work against Azerbaijani interests, laws and rules existing within its borders, and functions under the observation of the Azerbaijani government," a "special delegation" from Armenia will be allowed to visit Shusha.

I am unaware of how the problem of sending a "special delegation" to Shusha was eventually solved. The point meriting attention is that by asking the Azerbaijani government for permission to send a "special delegation" to Shusha, the Armenian government, actually, admitted the status of Nagorno-Karabakh as belonging to Azerbaijan. *If Nagorno-Karabakh belonged to Armenia, why did the Armenian government ask the Azerbaijani government for permission to send its special delegation there? Has there been a case in the history and practice of nations that one state asked another for permission to send a representative to its own city or province?*

By taking such steps the Armenian government was, first of all, trying to achieve for Nagorno-Karabakh the status of "disputed territory." Gradually, Armenia set a goal of forceful separation of Nagorno-Karabakh from Azerbaijan. The armed detachments of General Andranik were brought into Zangazur and Nagorno-Karabakh. On 15th August, the Azerbaijani government, by expressing strong objections to the Armenian government on this problem, asked: "Does Andranik work on your behalf or are these actions his own initiative, and are his detachments subject to the Armenian government or are his actions his personal initiatives and an ordinary uprising?" Armenia did not delay in reply... Two days later, on August 17, Armenia officially stated, "General Andranik, as well as all of his detachments was removed from both the structure and the command list of the Armenian troops by order of the special Armenian corps, and after this they refused to recognize the Armenian government and its officials and to be subject to their command. Therefore, General Andranik and his armed detachments have nothing to do with the Armenian National Army and its authorities, and the Armenian government cannot be charged with the irresponsible activity."¹¹⁸

As was stated in the session of the Azerbaijani parliament on December 20, 1918, the Armenian government had "officially" declared that "we have nothing to do in Garabagh, we do not want it, and we have no relation to Andranik."¹¹⁹

Armenia had not yet openly claimed Zangazur and Nagorno-Karabakh. So far it was concealing its insidious intentions. The Armenian government wanted to gain time, and, by occupying Zangazur and Nagorno-Karabakh via Andranik, who supposedly was "not subject to their command," to present Azerbaijan with a fait accompli.

As said by the Prime Minister of Azerbaijan F.Kh.Khoyski, on July 1918, Andranik "by doing terrible evils in Zangazur destroyed many villages and, finally, by crossing to the Shusha uezd, blocked the road to Asgaran... The Azerbaijani Armed Forces were then focused exclusively on the Baku problem. Therefore, Armenian and Muslim delegations were sent from Ganja only twice. However, they achieved no results." After Baku was liberated on September 15, the Azerbaijani government "sent a small military unit against Andranik. As a result of war, our troops pushed Andranik out of Asgaran and drove him out of the Shusha uezd."¹²⁰

Thomson (Commander of the Allied Forces in Baku), who was supporting the position of the Azerbaijani government, interfered in the problem of Andranik's military aggression against Garabagh. Upon Thomson's insistence Andranik ordered his men "to cease military operations against the Tartars and the Turks."¹²¹

Nevertheless, Andranik spread information in the press that Thomson had invested him with right and power over Garabagh. Concerning this rumour, on December 20, the

Azerbaijani Prime Minister F.Kh.Khoyski stated in the Azerbaijani parliament that *if Thomson did so, "then he would encroach upon the very basis of the Azerbaijani government. This would be an act of aggression against the rights of Azerbaijan. However, we shall defend the rights of Azerbaijan with all our might and we shall not let foreigners commit aggression against the rights of Azerbaijan (Applause).*

The government could not shut its eyes to the fact that somebody would rule Azerbaijan."¹²²

F.Kh.Khoyski required an explanation from General Thomson. Thomson made an official reply that the rumour was a lie and completely groundless. Thomson's refutation was published in the press on December 22.

Although Andranik was disappointed by the official reply of General Thomson, he did not put an end to his military operations against Azerbaijan. Andranik did not immediately leave Azerbaijan and continued to massacre the Muslim villages in Zangazur.

In connection with the situation in Zangazur, in early January 1919, the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Azerbaijani Republic proposed that the government exclude the uezds of Shusha, Javanshir, Jabrayil and Zangazur from the province of Ganja and create a temporary General-Governorship of Garabagh, consisting of those uezds. On January 25, 1919, the Azerbaijani government agreed to the proposal. *The uezds of Shusha, Javanshir, Jabrayil and Zangazur were excluded from the province of Ganja and the General-Governorship of Garabagh, consisting of those uezds, was established with its center in Shusha. Kh.Sultanov, who had been the Minister for War in the first Azerbaijani government, was appointed Governor-General of Garabagh.* The Armenian government expressed a protest to the Azerbaijani government regarding the establishment of the General-Governorship of Garabagh and the appointment of Kh.Sultanov as its Governor-General. The Armenian government, which had considered the military aggression of Andranik against Garabagh as "irresponsible activity," which had declared that "Andranik and his armed detachments have nothing to do with the Armenian National Army and its authorities," and which did not make a claim on Garabagh, this time, as it were, showed its cards and claimed that "most of these areas belonged to Armenia."

The Azerbaijani government immediately replied (on January 31) to the note of Armenia. The note stated that the districts of Shusha, Jabrayil, Javanshir and Zangazur were "undoubtedly integral parts of Azerbaijan" and the objection of Armenia to the establishment of the General-Governorship of Garabagh was "a plot against the sovereignty of Azerbaijan, an attempt to interfere in our internal affairs."¹²³

Faced with such an unequivocal and principled position of the Azerbaijani government, the Armenian government resorted to all means to pressurize Azerbaijan. In February, Armenia, addressing General Walker, Commander of the British Armed Forces in Caucasia, "protested against the appointment of Dr.Sultanov the Governor-General" and "declared the authority of the Governor-General void."

Walker did not reply to the note of Armenia on the problem of Garabagh.

On March 11, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Armenia appealed to Thomson.

This, however, was not also enough for the Armenian government.

Bekzedyan, diplomatic representative of Armenia to Azerbaijan, and Shahnazarov, Chairman of the Armenian National Council of Garabagh, made an effort to prevent the establishment of the General-Governorship of Garabagh with the help of Thomson's staff. Meeting with the British Colonel Shatelwart, Shahnazarov said, "Azerbaijan is not even capable of establishing internal order. Its nation is uncivilized in comparison with us, and you cannot subordinate the civilized to the uncivilized."

The colonel replied: "I do not agree. The Armenians and the Muslims are on the same cultural level. Doesn't your nation want peace, and if the General-Governorship is established, will it choose a way of breaking order?"¹²⁴

Shahnazarov resorted to blackmail: "We cannot propagandize our nation to obey, (to obey Azerbaijan - T.K.) it would be treachery."

*Shatelwart answered sharply: "I warn you that any sort of excess against Azerbaijan and its General-Governorship is a challenge against England. We... can compel you to obey."*¹²⁵ (my italics-T.K.)

However, this also didn't affect Shahnazarov. He claimed that if Kh.Sultanov was sent to Garabagh, the National Council would resign.

Interrupting him Shatelwart said: "You must go with the major and work there to restore order."¹²⁶

Thus the protest of the Armenian government and its attempt to gain General Thomson's favour brought no results.

Thomson's representative Shatelwart left Baku for Shusha on April 1919 and demanded that the Armenian community accept the rule of the Azerbaijani Republic, or as general A.I.Denikin wrote, to recognize "the legitimate power of Sultanov."

On 5th May, F.Kh.Khoyski, having met with Thomson, stated that "the Armenians in Garabagh... held inadmissible intelligence against the recognition of our power, which, in turn, created difficult conditions for our administrative rule."

As a reply, Thomson declared that he "had already ordered the exile of harmful persons like Chalmazyan. Colonel Shatelwart will soon visit Gorus and will bring to heel those who do not comply with Azerbaijani rule."¹²⁷

Finally, on 5th June, the representative of the British Command accompanied by an Azerbaijani official exiled the aggressive members of the Armenian National Council from Shusha to Tiflis. The next day, the Azerbaijani battalion was barracked in the Armenian part of Shusha.¹²⁸

These measures shocked the separatists. Peace was restored in Shusha.

On June 5, Bishop Malik Shahnazarov and other Armenian representatives met with Kh.Sultanov. The next day, Kh.Sultanov visited the Armenian part of the city. A few hundred Armenians, having gathered at the mass meeting, declared their recognition of the Azerbaijani government.¹²⁹

Prime Minister N.Yusifbayov's visit to Shusha played a significant role in easing the tension and gaining mutual understanding.

Prime Minister N.Yusifbayov and Minister for War S.Mehmandarov accompanied by the Governor of Ganja Kh.Rafibayov visited Shusha on July 30th and were met with bread and salt. The bishop greeted them in Azerbaijani. The Prime Minister reviewed a parade of the garrison of the Azerbaijani National Army in Khankandi.¹³⁰

The quarterage of the Governor of Garabagh in Shusha, his confident rule of the province, his curbing the Armenian separatists, the deployment of the Azerbaijani National Army units in the Armenian part of Shusha, the visit of the Azerbaijani Prime Minister to Shusha and Khankandi, his review of the parade of the garrison of the Azerbaijani National Army, etc. serve as unquestionable proof that Nagorno-Karabakh belonged to Azerbaijan and that only Azerbaijani laws worked there.

10. On the "Provisional Agreement"

The "Memorandum" claims, "In the agreement signed between the National Council of Nagorno-Karabakh and the Azerbaijani government, the Parties agreed to solve the Nagorno-Karabakh problem at the Paris Peace Conference."

Here is the story of that agreement:

The Azerbaijani government, along with "the representatives" of Nagorno-Karabakh, took "the initiative in directly resolving a number of problems." On July 17, Prime Minister N.Yusifbayov stated in the Azerbaijani parliament that "the representatives" from Nagorno-

Karabakh "have arrived and are holding discussions with the government. Not much is left to do. Things are being resolved peacefully... If not all Armenians, but three quarters of them... by feeling and realizing that they are in Azerbaijan have decided to declare themselves subjects of Azerbaijan."¹³¹

Following that, at the beginning of August, the attorneys of the Congress of Armenian Peasants of Garabagh, as well as Armenian religious figures, met with Khosrovbay Sultanov, Governor-General of Garabagh, in Shusha. During the two-day negotiations, a draft "Provisional Agreement" between the Armenians of Nagorno-Karabakh and the Azerbaijani government was prepared. On August 15, 1919, the Congress of Armenian Peasants of Garabagh almost unanimously approved the "Provisional Agreement." The agreement would remain in force until the issue was resolved at the Paris Peace Conference.

The agreement stated: *"The mountainous part of Garabagh, namely the districts of Dizag, Varanda, Khachyn and Chilaberd, populated by the Armenians, temporarily proclaims itself to be within the territory of the Republic of Azerbaijan."*¹³² (my italics-T.K.)

That is exactly what the principle decision was about! The "Memorandum" did not even mention this provision, which was the essence of the agreement. By doing so, the "Memorandum" openly tried to mislead the UN on the issue of the political-territorial status of Nagorno-Karabakh at that time.

The population welcomed the "Provisional Agreement" warmly and hopefully. Celebrations were held in Shusha in honor of the agreement that brought peace and order to Garabagh. The delegation of Armenians of Garabagh, meeting with Prime Minister N.Yusifbayov during its visit to Baku, expressed deep gratitude to the Azerbaijani government for "the peaceful resolution of the Garabagh problem."

The adoption of this agreement meant the failure of the policy of Armenia to declare Nagorno-Karabakh the "territory of Armenia."

The High Commissioner of the Allied Powers in Transcaucasia, Colonel Haskell (USA), supported the position of Azerbaijan on the Garabagh problem. In late August, he openly declared to Prime Minister N.Yusifbayov in Baku that he *"considers it to be necessary for Garabagh, including Zangazur to be conclusively Azerbaijani territories."*¹³³ (my italics-T.K.)

The Azerbaijani Republic, for the first time in Transcaucasia, set in practice an example of a peaceful and civil solution to the problem of minority groups - a guarantee of rights for the Armenians of Nagorno-Karabakh. This was appreciated at that time. «Борьба» (Struggle), a Tiflis newspaper wrote: "There was at least an initiative to stop the animosity between two nations in this agreement... Life gave rise to the agreement in Garabagh, the agreement is the first serious experience of settling the controversy between Armenians and Muslims not by massacre, but by mutual pact."¹³⁴

*Scotland-Liddel, a British journalist, wrote to London from Shusha, "Peace came to Garabagh. The Armenians agreed to obey the Azerbaijani government... The Armenians tell me that there has never been such order and peace in Shusha and Garabagh before"*¹³⁵ (my italics-T.K.) (There were many other interesting observations by the British journalist; for example, he wrote: "I believe that if several political intriguers, spies and instigators are isolated, the Armenian arbitrariness and confrontation will be stopped.")

However, Armenia did not give up its claim on Nagorno-Karabakh and intensified the provocation there.

The Armenian government in one secret document declared the issue of "declaring an Armenian administrative system in the parts of Garabagh populated mainly by Armenians" a key one.¹³⁶ For this purpose, it intended to send "emissaries, and as many funds as possible" from Iravan to Nagorno-Karabakh. The emissaries had to do their job "silently," "without even mentioning the name" of Armenia. The provocation in Nagorno-Karabakh had to be carried out in maximum secrecy; the impression had to be created that Armenia didn't have any involvement in the events in Nagorno-Karabakh, and that all processes taking place there were the initiatives and internal affairs of the local population of Garabagh.

Such tactics were repeatedly being applied in Nagorno-Karabakh. As Tevodros wrote in 1922, in late 1919 the Armenian government funded 19 million manats "in order to liberate" Nagorno-Karabakh. When the emissaries came with money from Iravan to Nagorno-Karabakh, the turmoil of "liberation" started and the emissaries began to involve the Garabaghi peasants in their adventure.¹³⁷

On the night of Novruz Bayramy (Spring Holiday) -March 22-23, 1920, a large-scale armed uprising against the Azerbaijani government was organized in Nagorno-Karabakh with the direct instigation and participation of Armenia. National Army units of Azerbaijan were simultaneously and suddenly attacked in Shusha, Khankandi and a number of other places. According to Professor L.Khurshudyan (1989), "*Dro from Iravan and Njde from Gafan soon came with their units to help the rebels.*"¹³⁸ (my italics-T.K.)

The insurgents, however, met with serious resistance from the Azerbaijani soldiers. The day after the uprising, the Azerbaijani soldiers in Shusha cleared the town of the armed bands. An attack on an army unit in Khankandi was repulsed as well. The Armenian rebels retreated with heavy casualties. Yet, the enemy was victorious in Asgaran. The troops of Dali Gazar, consisting of 4.000 people, seized Asgaran. The road to Shusha was blocked.

The perfidious violation by the Armenian separatists of the agreement signed on August 15, 1919 which accepted the mountainous part of Garabagh itself as part of Azerbaijan, their organization of an uprising and Armenia's initiation of a military intervention by sending troops from Iravan to Garabagh, caused the whole Azerbaijani people to rise in defence of the Motherland. Numerous armed volunteers from all parts of Azerbaijan began flowing into Garabagh. It should be noted that during those days a group of volunteers consisting of 200 people was organized on the initiative of the imam of Zagatala, Nurulla Efendi, and sent to the front.¹³⁹

After going through the necessary preparatory measures, the Azerbaijani army units launched an offensive towards Asgaran. On April 2, Asgaran was liberated. The army of the enemy was completely destroyed. Dali Gazar was killed.

The next day our army units entered Khankandi without any fighting, and Shusha on 8th April.

On the same day General Habib Salimov sent the following telegram from Shusha to the Defence Minister Samadagha Mehmandarov: "*The valiant troops,*" which you found, "*fought with the courage characteristic of old established units.*"¹⁴⁰ On April 27, he also sent another telegram from Shusha to Bakı: "*I do not know whether I should keep on moving towards Zangazur...*"¹⁴¹ (my italics-T.K.)

Those were the last days of the Azerbaijani Republic. As a result of military intervention by Soviet Russia, the Azerbaijani Republic was overthrown and Soviet Republic was proclaimed in Azerbaijan on April 28. In those days, in the village of Tagavard in Nagorno-Karabakh "The Ninth Congress of Working Peasants of Nagorno-Karabakh" was held. The Congress decided:

"1.Following the organized attacks of Azerbaijani troops on the Armenian civilians of Garabagh and their massacre of people in Shusha and the villages, the agreement signed with the Azerbaijani government on behalf of the Seventh Congress of Garabagh shall be considered to be violated by the Azerbaijani government.

2.The annexation of Nagorno-Karabakh to the Republic of Armenia as an integral part shall be declared."¹⁴²

(As a reminder: In the agreement signed in August 1919, Nagorno-Karabakh "considered itself to be temporarily within the borders of the Azerbaijani Republic." The Armenian side, not the Azerbaijani one, violated the agreement.)

Referring to the agreement L.Khurshudyan comes to the following conclusion: "Thus we see that Nagorno-Karabakh was not a part of Musavat Azerbaijan. Nagorno-Karabakh was independent from late May 1918 to April 1920, i.e. until the establishment of Soviet rule in Azerbaijan."¹⁴³ K.Mikaelyan has the same view too: Nagorno-Karabakh "was independent

from late May 1918 to April 1920." Apparently, Mikaelyan grabbed this idea from Khurshudyan.

Another author (V.Evoyan) came to the following conclusion: With that agreement "in April 1920, that is on the eve of the establishment of Soviet rule in Azerbaijan, Arsakh was reunified with Armenia.

The opinion of «Армянский вестник» (Armenian Herald) is as follows: "Nagorno-Karabakh has been a part of the Republic of Armenia."

Evidently, Armenian authors had various, sometimes even contradictory views on the status of Nagorno-Karabakh. All of these ideas are groundless, frivolous, and fictional.

Until August 15, 1919, Nagorno-Karabakh was *de facto* a part of the Azerbaijani Republic. The "Provisional Agreement" signed between the Armenian Congress of Nagorno-Karabakh and the Azerbaijani government on 15th August *de-jure* confirmed Nagorno-Karabakh's *de facto* being a part of the Azerbaijani Republic.

No changes took place in the status of Nagorno-Karabakh after the Armenian Congress had made a decision on "reunification" of Nagorno-Karabakh with Armenia on April 29, 1920. Documents prove that Nagorno-Karabakh hasn't in any way been "re-unified" with Armenia. Nagorno-Karabakh continued to be a part of Azerbaijan from the political, economic, legal and administrative points of view. Not for a single day has Nagorno-Karabakh been within the boundaries of Armenia, and not for a single day has Iravan administered Nagorno-Karabakh. The Armenian government and the Armenian parliament have not even expressed an official attitude to this decision. The decision has just remained on paper.

Thus the claims that Nagorno-Karabakh was not a part of Azerbaijan in 1918-1920, or that it was independent, or that it was a part of the Republic of Armenia are nonsense. The claim that Azerbaijan didn't have sovereignty over Nagorno-Karabakh and that "Arsakh was reunified with Armenia" on the eve of the establishment of Soviet rule in Azerbaijan are fictional as well.

Armenia's efforts to separate Nagorno-Karabakh from Azerbaijan, as well as Armenia's territorial claims against Azerbaijan were such an evident reality that most authors in the former Soviet Union, including Armenian ones admitted it; for instance, «Большая Советская Энциклопедия» (Great Soviet Encyclopedia) published in 1926 wrote: "Dashnaks... stated to have claims on the Akhalkalaki and Borchaly regions of Georgia, and Garabagh, the Nakhchivan region, and the southern part of the large Yelizavetpol province, which were parts of Azerbaijan. The efforts to forcefully annex those areas caused a war with Georgia (December 1918) and a long, bloody confrontation with Azerbaijan. As a result, the population of the disputed territories decreased 10-30% and a number of settlements were, in a literal sense, razed to the ground. There were especially severe fights in Garabagh, where the Dashnak guerrillas had strong positions..."

Maybe, at that time or later, some, even the Armenian historians themselves have denied the view of Encyclopaedia that exactly reflected objective, historical reality? Certainly not! On the contrary, Armenian historians have themselves confirmed and reiterated that view. According to an encyclopaedia «Гражданская война и военная интервенция в СССР» (Civil War and Military Intervention in the USSR), published in Moscow in 1983, "Dashnaks made claims on the Akhalkalaki and Borchaly regions of the bourgeois republic of Georgia, and on Garabagh, Nakhchivan, and the southern part of the province of Yelizavetpol, which were parts of the bourgeois republic of Azerbaijan."

The historical reality as to who made claims on Nagorno-Karabakh is in these entries in the encyclopedias.

The confession of the last Prime Minister of Armenia, Vrasyan, contains an important reality: "We turned Armenia into a battlefield of endless conflicts with our neighbours."

The letter of April 1920 from Shusha by R.Shahnazarov, inspector of the Armenian educational establishments of Garabagh, to Bagrat, Armenian bishop in Baku, also reveals the reality: "The happiness of Garabagh was ruined by the deeds of the spies of Ararat. The

Dashnak government is fully responsible for the misfortune of the Armenians of upper Garabagh. The treacherous and villainous attack of the Dashnaki bands on military barracks and guard posts in Shusha, Khankandi and, some even say, all along the line took place simultaneously.

Your Holiness the Bishop, it is your duty to notify all our fellow countrymen of this. All we did to prevent the misfortune were ruined by the villainy and political idiocy of the Dashnaks. The Armenian people should know those who destroyed our peaceful life. Garabagh should and might have stayed outside the circle of bloody events; if not for the ventures of the Dashnaks, it certainly would have stayed outside.

Do everything in your power together with all honest workers, the Armenians and the Muslims, to prevent this misfortune. God damn the enemies of the Armenian nation, the Dashnaks, who destroyed the beautiful and peaceful Garabagh."¹⁴⁵

11. The Soviets and Nagorno-Karabakh

Armenia claims, "The Nagorno-Karabakh region has never been a part of Azerbaijan. Nagorno-Karabakh was forcefully turned into a part of Azerbaijan in 1921."

We have already given evidence above for this claim being groundless.

In this section we'll try to describe the situation after the establishment of Soviet rule.

Roughly violating international norms, declaring no war, Soviet Russia brought the 11th Red Army units into Azerbaijan and occupied Azerbaijan again. The Azerbaijani Republic, the independence of which had already been recognised by the Supreme Council of the Paris Peace Conference and a number of other countries, was overthrown. The Azerbaijani Soviet Socialist Republic was proclaimed on 28th April.

The Azerbaijani Soviet government immediately expressed its principal position on the Nagorno-Karabakh issue. On April 30, the Azerbaijani Soviet government sent a note to the Armenian government. The Armenian government was ordered to clear the territories of Garabagh and Zangazur of Armenian troops, to return to its borders and to stop the international massacre; otherwise Azerbaijan would consider itself to be in a war situation with Armenia. The note had to be answered within 3 days. At the same time, the 11th Red Army Command ordered the Armenian government "to immediately stop hostilities in Soviet Azerbaijan and to withdraw its troops from the borders of Azerbaijan." This demand had to be fulfilled within 24 hours after the telegram was received.

The Armenian government couldn't but take these strict warnings. The troops of Dro, "who had been called a robber" by one Armenian newspaper («Nor Khosk»), were forced to leave Nagorno-Karabakh.

Soviet rule was also proclaimed in Garabagh a few days after the Azerbaijani Soviet Republic had been established. With regard to the new situation in Nagorno-Karabakh, one of the local Dashnak leaders informed Yerevan that "the Armenian peasants refused to recognize our (Dashnak - T.K.) rule." Visiting Garabagh in mid-June, Orjonikidze, Head of the Caucasian Bureau of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist (Bolshevik) Party (CCRC(B)P), became acquainted with the political mood of the local people, both Azerbaijanis and Armenians. Under that impression he wrote in his telegram to Chicherin, People's Foreign Affairs Commissioner of the RSFSR, on 19th June that Garabagh and Zangazur "considered themselves to be part of the Azerbaijani Soviet Republic."¹⁴⁶

Preparations for the conclusion of a treaty between Russia and Armenia were under way at that time.

Orjonikidze met with the Armenian delegation going to Moscow when he was in Rostov in late June. The Nagorno-Karabakh and Nakhchivan problems were discussed. The delegation told Orjonikidze: "...if Azerbaijan renounces Sharur-Daralayaz uezd and

Nakhchivan district (in favour of Armenia - T.K.), the Armenian delegation will agree to the immediate annexation of Garabagh and Zangazur to Azerbaijan. "147 (my italics-T.K.)

Orjonikidze notified Lenin, Stalin and Chicherin of this by telegram from Rostov. He also expressed his opinion that Garabagh and Zangazur had to be annexed to Azerbaijan; "...we can declare autonomy there... a different way of solving this problem will undermine our position in Azerbaijan and doesn't gain anything in Armenia."148 (my italics-T.K.)

Orjonikidze went on writing: "I understand well that we may need Armenia in a certain political situation. Solve it as you consider to be necessary. We shall fulfil every instruction given, but let me note that *such an attitude towards Azerbaijan will stain us in the eyes of the broad masses of the Azerbaijani population.*"149(my italics-T.K.)

It seems a different plan had been worked out in Moscow on Nagorno-Karabakh. Its details haven't been cleared up yet. What did "such an attitude towards Azerbaijan" mean? Orjonikidze didn't make it clear, but another telegram sent by Orjonikidze to Chicherin from Rostov gives us reason to say that Moscow intended to declare Garabagh and Zangazur as "disputed territories." The telegram reads: "I have received your telegrams about the disputed regions between Armenia and Azerbaijan only this night... If these places (Garabagh, Zangazur and Nakhchivan - T.K.) remain disputed, the Turks will occupy them without negotiations."

Then Orjonikidze repeated his position about the Nagorno-Karabakh problem: "My opinion is that Garabagh and Zangazur have to be immediately annexed to Azerbaijan. I can compel Azerbaijan to grant autonomy to these regions. ("I can compel!" - T.K.) But the initiative has to be made by Azerbaijan, and this should by no means be mentioned in a treaty." (RSFSR-Armenia Treaty - T.K.)

Orjonikidze called Narimanov, Chairman of the People's Commissioners' Soviet of the Azerbaijani Soviet Socialist Republic, to Baku: "I have just talked with Chicherin about Garabagh and Zangazur. *I propose immediate and unconditional annexation of these regions to Azerbaijan,* (my italics-T.K.) you renounce your claims on other regions (Nakhchivan - T.K.) and grant autonomy to Nagorno-Karabakh and Zangazur, and granting autonomy should by no means be mentioned in a peace treaty, (RSFSR-Armenia Treaty - T.K.) the initiative must be made only by you."150

Narimanov along with Mdivani, Member of the Caucasian Bureau, Mikoyan, Member of the Central Committee of the Azerbaijani Communist Party (CAzCP) and Nurijanyan, Member of the Central Committee of the Armenian Communist Party (CArCP) sent a telegram to Chicherin and Orjonikidze, who was in Vladikavkaz.

The telegram reads:

"We decisively declare that allegedly disputed Zangazur and Garabagh, which are already part of Soviet Azerbaijan, indisputably belong to Azerbaijan and have to be within Azerbaijan from now on. " (my italics-T.K.)

"The districts of Julfa and Nakhchivan are places populated entirely by Muslims, and for more than a year they have been defending themselves against the Dashnak government by their own strength. ...these places have to be taken over by our forces and annexed to Azerbaijan."151

It means Narimanov rejected the main demand of Orjonikidze - renouncing Nakhchivan, and insisted on the annexation of Nakhchivan to Azerbaijan.

It also becomes clear that the idea of granting autonomy to Nagorno-Karabakh within Azerbaijan belongs to Orjonikidze. Following the development of events, including the letter sent by Chicherin to Lenin on 29th June shows that Chicherin didn't take the position of the Azerbaijani leadership on the issue of so-called "disputed territories" into consideration. Chicherin, who had a high opinion of Armenia, must have been indifferent to the proposal of Orjonikidze for the "immediate and unconditional annexation" of Nagorno-Karabakh and Zangazur to Azerbaijan on condition Azerbaijan gave up Nakhchivan. Tense personal relations between Narimanov and Chicherin, as well as the influence of Garakhan

(Garakhanyan), Deputy People's Foreign Affairs Commissioner of the RSFSR, on his commissioner Chicherin may have shaped a negative attitude towards Azerbaijan.

The Bureau of the CCAzC(B)P discussed a report by A.Garagozov (Garagozyan), Secretary of the Nagorno-Karabakh Party Committee, on Garabagh in 10th July. It was mentioned in the report that "Dro fled to Zangazur from Garabagh with his detachments... First of all, it's necessary to settle the refugee problem, because the Armenian refugees don't want to return to Armenia."

On the same day Narimanov, Mdivani, Member of the Caucasian Bureau, Mikoyan and Naneyshvili, Members of the CCAzCP, and Vesnik, Levandovski and Mikhailov, Members of the Military Revolutionary Council of the 11th Red Army, expressed "common opinion on the Zangazur and Garabagh issues" to the CCRC(B)P:

1. *"Garabagh was wholly a part of Azerbaijan during the rule of the Musavat government."* (my italics-T.K.) It was recalled that Nagorno-Karabakh had been considered to be within the boundaries of Azerbaijan by the Armenian Peasant Congress of Garabagh even at that time - in August 1919.

2. "Garabagh and its mountainous part... gradually become a backstone of the Soviet system."

3. *"The neutralization of Zangazur and Garabagh or giving them to Dashnaks... will be considered a betrayal..."* ("betrayal!" - T.K.) *Any sudden return to the past and inability of the Soviet power to ensure Azerbaijan' previous boundaries will be considered by the Muslim masses to be treason, a pro-Armenian position or weakness of the Soviet power.* " (my italics-T.K.)

4. "To ensure that Azerbaijan is not turned into a mongrel under Red Army patronage and distributed among the Armenians and the Georgians, we call upon the Centre to avoid hesitation on the issues of Garabagh and Zangazur."¹⁵²

In any case, Orjonikidze may have been aware of this "common opinion." But he didn't take this into account and sent the following telegram from Baku to Chicherin on 14th July along with the representative of the RSFSR in Armenia, Legran (along with Legran! - T.K.): "We consider it to be necessary to solve this issue in a way which may partly satisfy Azerbaijan: Garabagh is fully and unconditionally annexed to Azerbaijan. Zangazur is declared a disputed region. The rest of the regions... (Nakhchivan - T.K.) remain in Armenia."¹⁵³

On 15th July, the Bureau of the CCAzC(B)P discussed an "issue on peace with Armenia" with the participation of Orjonikidze and Legran. Stenographic records of this meeting don't exist, so it's impossible to say anything concrete on bringing up the question for discussion, the final positions of the meeting participants, exchange of opinions, and the struggle there. We shall confine our explanations only to the decision adopted in this Bureau.

The full text of the decision is as follows:

"1. Garabagh and Zangazur should be annexed to Azerbaijan, (my italics-T.K.)

2. To propose the giving up of Nakhchivan and other regions, and the occupation (of those places) by Russian troops.

3. To propose to Legran that peace shouldn't be concluded until detailed information is received about the situation in Armenia.

*4. To propose to Armenia to stop all hostilities during negotiations."*¹⁵⁴

It can be supposed that Orjonikidze in the meeting insisted on declaring Zangazur a disputed region, but the demand was rejected.

It can be supposed that Orjonikidze was an author of the proposal to give up Nakhchivan and that with his pressure this capitulatory item was adopted.

It can also be supposed that it was Narimanov who insisted on the occupation of Nakhchivan by the Soviet troops.

Under the leadership of Chicherin, a draft treaty with Armenia was prepared in haste. This draft treaty was an attack on the integrity of Azerbaijan, as Nakhchivan and Zangazur were to be given to Armenia.

Narimanov became aware of this anti-Azerbaijan bargain.

On 4th November, a meeting of the Political Bureau of the CCAzC(B)P with the participation of Stalin and Orjonikidze, probably with the efforts and insistence of Narimanov, decided: "The article proposed on the inclusion of Nakhchivan and Zangazur into Armenia (an article in the draft RSFSR-Armenia Treaty - T.K.) isn't acceptable from either a political or a strategic point of view."¹⁵⁵

Thus the decision of the CCAzC(B)P of July 15 on the renunciation of Nakhchivan was, in fact, annulled. It could be expected that with this decision adopted with the participation of Stalin, taking into account the stand of the Azerbaijani leadership and Stalin on Nakhchivan and Zangazur, the principal position of Moscow was fully shaped. But on November 9, answering a question on Nakhchivan in Baku, Stalin said: "On the position of Zangazur and Nakhchivan we have to say that we can't give them to the present Armenian government; it may be possible only if Soviet rule is established there."¹⁵⁶

This double position shows how provisional and lax the attitude of Stalin was on a problem of vital importance. It also denies the claim about the allegedly "toughest pressure" by Stalin for an anti-Armenian solution to the Nakhchivan issue.

Most of all, such an answer by Stalin gave a reason to Orjonikidze and others to raise the question of the inclusion of Nakhchivan and Zangazur into Armenia again when Soviet rule was established there.

That was the case. The CCAzC(B)P adopted a decision on the occasion of the declaration of Soviet rule in Armenia on 30th November. In defiance of the decision adopted on 4th November, it was decided to give Zangazur to Armenia.

The decision of November 30 didn't touch upon Nakhchivan. Still, in the declaration of December 1 by Narimanov, made on the basis of that decision, along with Zangazur, "the territory of the Nakhchivan uezd" was declared to be an "integral part of Soviet Armenia."

This was absolutely contrary to the position and line pursued by Narimanov on Nakhchivan. A mistake may have been made when the declaration of Narimanov was published in a newspaper on 2nd December. In this case, Narimanov would have refuted this mistake. Maybe Orjonikidze and others compelled Narimanov to make this step by adopting an additional decision? I don't rule this out. Maybe someone from Moscow, for example, Stalin told Narimanov to declare Nakhchivan a part of Armenia for the sake of internationalism, and then tomorrow Armenia would declare Nakhchivan a part of Azerbaijan for the sake of proletarian internationalism.

In any case, there is one interesting fact. On the 27th day after that declaration, i.e. on 27th December, the Revolutionary Committee of Armenia issued a decree: "Soviet Azerbaijan eliminated the disputes between Azerbaijan and Armenia with solemn act (the declaration of December 1 - T.K.)... and declared Nakhchivan to be an integral part of Soviet Armenia. But the Soviet power of Armenia... sees its strength only in the openly expressed will of the people, including that of the Nakhchivani workers." The Armenian Revolutionary Committee offers the population of Nakhchivan the opportunity to choose its own way and to state its clearly expressed common opinion concerning the desirable mutual relations between Armenia and the working people of Nakhchivan.

There is no document at our disposal on the reasons for this unexpected step by Armenia. But it is not difficult to understand that if there hadn't been an understanding, or there hadn't been strong pressure against Armenia, it would never have given such a statement on Nakhchivan by its own free will.

A referendum was held in Nakhchivan in early 1921. More than 90% of the population voted for Nakhchivan to stay part of Azerbaijan.

It means that the issue of keeping Nakhchivan part of Azerbaijan was settled with the permission of the Armenian government and the will of the Nakhchivani population. The Treaty between the RSFSR and Turkey signed in Moscow on March 16, 1921 approved the fact that had already taken place. It was reflected in this treaty by Russia and Turkey that Nakhchivan would have autonomy under the Azerbaijani protectorate.

The status of Nakhchivan was affirmed in the Kars Treaty of October 13, 1921 signed by Russia, Turkey, Azerbaijan, Georgia, and Armenia.

The 5th Article of the Treaty reads that the government of Turkey and the governments of Soviet Azerbaijan and Armenia agree that the Nakhchivan province is an autonomous territory under the patronage of Azerbaijan.

12. On the Issue of Azerbaijan's "Renunciation of ALL Claims" on Nagorno-Karabakh in 1920

The "Memorandum" states, "A day after Soviet rule was established in Armenia, twice - on November 30 and December 1, 1920, Azerbaijan officially renounced all claims on all disputed areas, including claims on Nagorno-Karabakh. On July 4, 1921, in the plenum of the Caucasian Bureau of the CCRC(B)P, the proposal of Azerbaijan to include Nagorno-Karabakh in Azerbaijan was rejected... However, on July 5, 1921, the plenum of the Caucasian Bureau of the CCRC(B)P, under pressure by Stalin, and without discussion and voting, made a decision on the inclusion of Nagorno-Karabakh in Azerbaijan."

All four matters mentioned here are misrepresented and falsified.

1) The decision of the CCAzC(B)P of November 30 on Nagorno-Karabakh states the following: "The mountainous part of Garabagh is given the right to self-determination."¹⁵⁷

Therefore, the claim about Azerbaijan's renunciation of Nagorno-Karabakh on November 30 is absolutely fictitious.

2) Resting upon that decision, Nariman Narimanov made a government declaration on December 1. The principal provision of the decision of November 30 on Nagorno-Karabakh was revealed there: "The working peasants of Nagorno-Karabakh are given the full right to self-determination."¹⁵⁸

Thus the Armenian side has fabricated the declaration of December 1 as well.

The declaration was published in «Коммунист» (Communist) newspaper on December 2 in Baku, i.e. a day after the declaration was made, and in «Бакинский рабочий» (Baku worker) newspaper on December 3. The declaration was also included in the collection of documents entitled "The Great October Socialist Revolution and the Victory of the Soviet Power in Armenia" published in Yerevan in 1957. It is important to note that the declaration was published in Yerevan without abridgement and ellipsis, with a reference to the copy of the declaration held in the Armenian State Archive and with a note that it was published for the first time on December 2, 1920 in «Коммунист» newspaper in Russian in Baku. The text of the declaration published in Yerevan also clearly states: "The working peasants of Nagorno-Karabakh are given the full right to self-determination."

In short, the "Memorandum" completely fabricated the similar provisions on Nagorno-Karabakh of both the decision of November 30 and the declaration of December 1, and thus provided the UN with false information.

3) In the opinion of Armenian authors, "the Azerbaijani leadership raised a question before the Caucasian Bureau of the CCRC(B)P on changing its decision about considering Nagorno-Karabakh an integral part of Soviet Armenia."

As mentioned above, Nagorno-Karabakh wasn't declared an integral part of Armenia in the declaration of December 1 by the Azerbaijani government. Neither the Azerbaijani government nor the CCAzC(B)P made any separate decision about this, so the Azerbaijani leadership couldn't have raised and didn't raise a question before the Caucasian Bureau on a

decision which didn't exist. Nagorno-Karabakh was a part of Azerbaijan, and Azerbaijani law was in force there. The government and party organisations of Nagorno-Karabakh were subordinate to Baku and were being ruled from Baku. Why would Azerbaijan raise a question about the territorial status of Nagorno-Karabakh? Thus the claim that the Azerbaijani leadership raised a question on "changing its decision" is nothing but false.

A brief history of the return to the issue of Nagorno-Karabakh in the Caucasian Bureau is as follows:

When the Caucasian Bureau discussed a border issue between Azerbaijan and Armenia, the Armenian government raised a question on the territorial status of Nagorno-Karabakh. Not the Azerbaijani, but the Armenian government raised this issue!

Armenia launched a new large-scale fight to gain Nagorno-Karabakh.

On June 3, 1921, the Caucasian Bureau decided:

"5.To mention Nagorno-Karabakh as belonging to Armenia in a statement of the Armenian government..." This decision has not been published in Azerbaijan. The Armenians published it in the above-mentioned form. What was a full text of the decision, how was it adopted, did the Azerbaijani representatives attend the discussion, what was their reaction to the decision? I don't have any information about these events.

In the opinion of academician J.Guliyev, on 3rd June, the Caucasian Bureau adopted a decision on the liquidation of the Dashnak detachments in Zangazur very quickly. In that decision the Caucasian Bureau, "as if taking into account tactical considerations," considered it to be necessary to mention in the statement of the Armenian government Nagorno-Karabakh as belonging to Armenia.

This "evidence" of the Caucasian Bureau was, of course, false evidence, the inattentiveness of decision-makers, a political game reminiscent of a child's game.

Let's recall that the autonomy of Nakhchivan under the Azerbaijani protectorate was recognised in the RSFSR-Turkey Treaty of March 16, 1921. This meant failure for the attempts made by Orjonikidze over a long period to give Nakhchivan to Armenia, and at the same time, it was a victory for the policy pursued by Narimanov to keep Nakhchivan within Azerbaijan. Orjonikidze with the decision of June 3 on Nagorno-Karabakh may have been wreaking vengeance on Narimanov and Azerbaijan for the clear failure of his own policy on Nakhchivan. Maybe.

In any case, the Caucasian Bureau decision of June 3 played its cursed role. The Armenian government immediately made use of the "tactical considerations" of the Caucasian Bureau. The Armenian government's Decree "On Re-unification ("воссоединение") of Nagorno-Karabakh with Armenia" was published in Yerevan on June 19. The decree read: "On the basis of the declaration of the Azerbaijani Soviet Socialist Republic Revolutionary Committee and intergovernmental agreement between the Armenian and Azerbaijani Soviet Socialist Republics, it is declared that Nagorno-Karabakh is an integral part of Soviet Armenia from now on." A few days after the decree, the Armenian government appointed Mravyan extraordinary representative of Armenia to Nagorno-Karabakh and sent him to Nagorno-Karabakh.

There is an important acknowledgment in the decree.

As is seen from the decree, the matter is about the "re-unification" of Nagorno-Karabakh with Armenia. It means that the Armenian government admits that until the decree was adopted, Nagorno-Karabakh wasn't a part of Armenia. Of course, Nagorno-Karabakh wasn't in outer space; it was a part of Azerbaijan. From the day of its adoption, let's say again, from the same day, Nagorno-Karabakh is "re-unified" with Armenia and considered to be an "integral part" of Armenia. But when, in what year or century was it separated from Armenia and annexed to Azerbaijan? Armenian authors haven't answered this question and can't answer it even now too.

There are two lies in this decree: one of them supposes that the declaration of December 1 by Azerbaijan declared Nagorno-Karabakh as an "integral part" of Armenia,

while the declaration gave only the right to self-determination and only to the working peasants of Nagorno-Karabakh. The second lie is the suggestion that there was an agreement or understanding between the Armenian and Azerbaijani governments on the annexation of Nagorno-Karabakh to Armenia and on declaring it a part of Armenia.

On June 25-27, a Conference on the Delimitation of the Borders of the Transcaucasian Republics was held in Tiflis. However, the border issues were left unresolved. On June 26, Orjonikidze and Kirov, representative of the RSFSR in Georgia, sent Narimanov a telegram requesting that the Political Bureau of the CCAzC(B)P and the People's Commissioners' Soviet urgently consider the Garabagh issue. At the same time, the following directive was given to Narimanov: *"No Armenian village should be annexed to Azerbaijan and no Muslim village should be annexed to Armenia"* (my italics-T.K.)

On June 27, a meeting of the Political and Organisational Bureaus of the CCAzC(B)P was held. Having discussed the "issue on borders between Armenia and Azerbaijan according to the work of the commission in Tiflis," the meeting adopted the following decision:

"1. Taking into account the indisputable economic inclination of Nagorno-Karabakh towards Azerbaijan, the Political and Organisational Bureaus consider the statement of the question on Nagorno-Karabakh by Bekzadyan to be unacceptable. The issue should be settled in the same context, (my italics-T.K.)

2. Therefore, the proposal on the division of places with Armenian and Turkic populations between Armenia and Azerbaijan respectively can not be accepted from the point of view of either administrative or economic expediency, (my italics-T.K.)

3. The only solution to the issue can be the involvement of the Armenian and Muslim masses in the Soviet building process (as is clear from Comrade Narimanov' declaration).

4. Any subsequent course and discussion of the issue remain open until information is received from Tiflis.

5. Comrade Narimanov is charged with delivering the opinion of the Political and Organisational Bureaus to Tiflis."

As is seen, the "no Armenian village should be annexed to Azerbaijan" directive by Orjonikidze and Kirov was rejected. This decision was also a reaction to the decree of the Armenian government on Nagorno-Karabakh. The same day, the decision' full text was delivered by phone to M.D.Huseynov, People's Foreign Affairs Commissioner of the Azerbaijani Soviet Socialist Republic, who was in Tiflis. A.G.Shirvani, who delivered the text of the decision to M.D.Huseynov, as Narimanov was in a meeting of the People's Commissioners' Soviet, said to him: "Comrade Narimanov asked me to tell you that the issue should be settled only in this way, (as in the decision - T.K.) otherwise the People's Commissioners' Soviet would disclaim responsibility."

Answering the phone at that time, Narimanov said to Huseynov: "Tell him that this is the opinion of the Political and Organisational Bureaus. If they refer to my declaration, (declaration of December 1 - T.K.) it was stated there: the right to free self-determination is given to Nagorno-Karabakh."

Narimanov informed Huseynov of the following as well: "I talked with Comrade Sergo yesterday, he openly said that the Garabagh issue was an issue of honour for all Soviet Republics and it should be solved once and for all, i.e. as I said to you yesterday." It becomes clear that Narimanov had already delivered his final opinion on Nagorno-Karabakh to Huseynov the day before, i.e. on June 26.

The following words said to Narimanov by Huseynov are of special interest: "On the one hand, the Armenian People's Commissioners' Soviet makes one declaration and sends its extraordinary commissioner to Garabagh without informing us, although the Armenian comrades claim that all this is done with our consent and we are aware of them. On the other hand, we send them telegrams almost annulling their decisions."

Thus it appears that neither Narimanov nor Huseynov had given consent to the Armenian decree about Nagorno-Karabakh, they were simply unaware of it. The Azerbaijani leadership hadn't made any decision about it.

On June 27, Narimanov sent a special telegram to Orjonikidze and Myasnikov, Chairman of the Armenian People's Commissioners' Soviet. A reaction to the Armenian decree on Nagorno-Karabakh was reflected in the telegram. It said: "The issue of Nagorno-Karabakh has been resolved only by the Armenian Revolutionary Committee; the issue hasn't been considered by the People's Commissioners' Soviet (the Azerbaijani PCS - T.K.) yet and isn't being considered." (hasn't been considered yet and isn't being considered!-T.K.) Just this citation proves that the claim about having the consent of the Azerbaijani government for the Armenian decree is nonsense.

The telegram goes on to say that the Azerbaijani People's Commissioners' Soviet "unanimously considers the appearance of Comrade Mravyan as an extraordinary representative of Armenia to Nagorno-Karabakh to be a great political and tactical mistake. The Azerbaijani People's Commissioners' Soviet requests that Comrade Mravyan is immediately sent back." This demand was immediately carried out.

Thus the Azerbaijani leadership prevented the next trick of the Armenian leadership on Nagorno-Karabakh.

On June 27, the Caucasian Bureau considered the "issue of the conversation of Comrade Huseynov with Comrade Narimanov on Nagorno-Karabakh." Huseynov informed Narimanov of this: "After my latest statements it was decided to leave the issue (Nagorno-Karabakh issue - T.K.) open in any case." Along with this decision a decision in the nature of ultimatum was adopted. It was suggested that Narimanov and Myasnikov "come to an extraordinary plenum of the Caucasian Bureau as soon as they receive" the telegram. It was said that 6 members of the Caucasian Bureau were in Tiflis. If they don't come, the decision of those 6 members "will be considered to be binding. Therefore, we insist on your immediate arrival."

On July 4, a meeting of the Caucasian Bureau was held with the participation of Stalin. The "Garabagh issue" was discussed. It seems a stenogram of the meeting doesn't exist, so it's impossible to talk about the details of discussion, speakers and their speeches. What we know from the minutes of the meeting is that 4 issues were put forward for discussion:

a)to retain Garabagh as part of Azerbaijan; ("to retain!" -T.K.)

b)to hold a referendum with the participation of all the Armenian and Muslim population in the whole of Garabagh;

c)to include the mountainous part of Garabagh in Armenia; ("to include!" - T.K.)

d)to hold a referendum only in Nagorno-Karabakh, i.e. among the Armenians."

Narimanov, Makharadze and Nazaretyan voted in favour of retaining Garabagh within the boundaries of Azerbaijan (voting against - Orjonikidze, Kirov, Myasnikov and Figatner). Thus Orjonikidze betrayed the line he had pursued consistently for a long period of time, i.e. immediate and unconditional annexation of Nagorno-Karabakh to Azerbaijan, granting autonomy to Nagorno-Karabakh.

Orjonikidze, Myasnikov, Figatner and Kirov voted in favour of the inclusion of Nagorno-Karabakh in Armenia.

Thus the Caucasian Bureau decided: "Nagorno-Karabakh shall be included in the Soviet Socialist Republic of Armenia ("included!" - T.K.) and a referendum shall be held only in Nagorno-Karabakh."

The majority of Armenian authors make a "slight" alteration in this decision: they replace "to include" with "to retain."

What political goals were pursued by this falsification? To create an impression that Nagorno-Karabakh was a part of Armenia when the decision was passed. Consequently, to create an impression that the Caucasian Bureau adopted a decision to "retain" Nagorno-Karabakh within Armenia.

Armenian authors ignore the way that the question was presented as "to include the mountainous part of Garabagh in Armenia" at the meeting of the Caucasian Bureau.

4)The Caucasian Bureau didn't adopt any decision about the "retaining" of Nagorno-Karabakh within Armenia. The decision was as follows: "Nagorno-Karabakh shall be included in the Soviet Socialist Republic of Armenia..." It wasn't otherwise, but like this!

N.Narimanov strongly objected to this decision. The text of the minutes is as follows: "The statement of Comrade N.Narimanov: Taking into consideration the importance of the Garabagh question for Azerbaijan, I deem it crucial to submit the case for the final decision of the CCRCP." A relevant decision was adopted concerning N.Narimanov's statement: "Due to the principal divergence of opinions on the Garabagh issue, the Caucasian Bureau of the CCRCP considers it to be necessary to submit the question for the final decision of the CCRCP."¹⁵⁹

There is no information on the co-ordination or the way of co-ordination of the question with the CCRCP. It is known that the next day, on July 5, the Caucasian Bureau discussed the following question: "Orjonikidze and Nazaretyan raise the question of reconsideration of the decision on Garabagh, which was adopted in the previous plenum." Orjonikidze himself, who voted in favour of the inclusion of Nagorno-Karabakh in Armenia!

The following was decided on the question: "Taking into consideration the necessity of national peace between the Muslims and the Armenians, the importance of the economic relations between Upper and Lower Garabagh and the permanent relations of Upper Garabagh with Azerbaijan, *Nagorno-Karabakh shall be retained within the boundaries of the Soviet Socialist Republic of Azerbaijan* ("retained!" - T.K.) and broad autonomy shall be given to Nagorno-Karabakh with Shusha city as an administrative center."¹⁶⁰ (my italics-T.K.)

The "Memorandum" stated that the decision was passed "without being put to the vote." The decision was put to the vote. 4 people voted in favor of the decision while 3 people abstained from voting. However, their names were not indicated in the minutes.¹⁶¹

Thus by annulling its previous decision on the inclusion of Nagorno-Karabakh in Armenia, the Caucasian Bureau adopted the decision to retain Nagorno-Karabakh within Azerbaijan. The efforts to separate Nagorno-Karabakh from Azerbaijan and include it in Armenia failed.

According to the authors of the "Memorandum," the Caucasian Bureau adopted this decision under pressure from Stalin. This did not take place at Stalin's insistence. On the whole, no information was found on what Stalin said, declared or on his role in the adoption of both decisions at the meetings of the Caucasian Bureau on July 4 and 5.

It was at the urgent request of N.Narimanov that the question was reconsidered. It was at N.Narimanov's insistence that the decision to put forward the Nagorno-Karabakh issue for "the urgent decision" of the Centre was decided on July 4.

Armenian authors present the decision of the Caucasian Bureau of July 5 ("Nagorno-Karabakh shall be retained within the boundaries of the Soviet Socialist Republic of Azerbaijan") as a decision "on Nagorno-Karabakh' being automatically seceded from Armenia and included in Azerbaijan."

The historical reality is that, with the decision of July 5, the attempt of the Armenian government to separate Nagorno-Karabakh from Azerbaijan and annex it to Armenia was rejected, the position of Nagorno-Karabakh within Azerbaijan was confirmed, and the issue of retaining Nagorno-Karabakh within Azerbaijan and granting it autonomy within Azerbaijan was resolved.

13. On the "Policy of Discrimination"

The "Memorandum" claims, "The Azerbaijani government pursued a policy of discrimination during the whole period Nagorno-Karabakh was within Azerbaijan. This

discriminatory policy was intensified especially after Heydar Aliyev came to power... 85 Armenian villages (30%) disappeared in Nagorno-Karabakh between 1926-1980."

This aspersion about the pursuit of a discriminatory policy in Nagorno-Karabakh by the Azerbaijani leadership has been spread since 1988. Armenian "politicians" convinced Gorbachov, then the USSR leader, of this aspersion too. Those who convinced him were Balayan, Kaputikyan and perhaps, first of all, Gorbachev's assistant Shahnazarov (Shahnazaryan).

As is well known, when the events in Nagorno-Karabakh began, Gorbachov, with the participation of his assistant Shahnazarov, received Balayan and Kaputikyan in Kremlin.

The reception of representatives of the Armenian public by the Secretary General of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was in itself a necessary step. Of course, it would have been rational for Gorbachov to listen not to the "...famous" aggressive separatists and instigators, but to someone who lived and worked in Nagorno-Karabakh. Gorbachov was satisfied with this, however. As leader of the USSR, he, according to logic, had to invite the representatives of the Azerbaijani public and learn their opinion. Nevertheless, he didn't. I explain this by Gorbachov's biased attitude towards Azerbaijan, and his unilateral and frivolous approach to a problem of state importance.

One result of Gorbachov's meeting with Balayan and Kaputikyan was that he became a hostage to misinformation spread by unmasked separatists. His book «Жизнь и реформы» (Life and Reforms) shows that he is still a hostage and still continues the utilization of this misinformation and provocation by the Balayans.

Gorbachov wrote that "one of my guests" (either Balayan or Kaputikyan, who knows, maybe Shahnazaryan - T.K.) characterized the activity of the Azerbaijani leadership in Nagorno-Karabakh as a "continuation of an attack by Islam against Christianity"¹⁶² (my italics-T.K.)

Gorbachov's book «Жизнь и реформы» clearly shows that he didn't state any attitude to this provocation and thus he actually shared it.

Gorbachov's malevolence towards Azerbaijan and Heydar Aliyev was so strong that he completely lost a sense of objectivity concerning a key cause of the Nagorno-Karabakh events. He wrote that if the decision of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Council of Ministers of the USSR "On Measures of Accelerating the Socio-Economic Development of NKAO" (March 24, 1988) had been adopted "ten years ago" and "if Aliyev had pursued a correct international policy, it would have been possible to prevent the tragedy."¹⁶³

This is quite a simple judgement and simple conclusion. A key cause of the events in Nagorno-Karabakh was not a lag in socio-economic development (we'll give factual evidence below), but the open interference of a foreign force - Armenia -into the domestic affairs of the Azerbaijani Republic and its attempts to separate Nagorno-Karabakh from Azerbaijan.

Armenia had been working in this direction for a long time. Let us reiterate that Armenia had already attempted to seize Nagorno-Karabakh in the 1918-1920s. However, the political, diplomatic and military efforts of Armenia weren't successful.

In 1921, the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic attempted to separate Nagorno-Karabakh from Azerbaijan again and annex it to Armenia through the Caucasian Bureau of the CCRC(B)P and its head Orjonikidze. However, this attempt didn't work either.

In 1945, the leadership of Armenia once again raised the question of Nagorno-Karabakh. The Central Committee of the Armenian Communist Bolshevik Party officially appealed to I.V.Stalin with a proposal to annex Nagorno-Karabakh to Armenia. The proposal was rejected categorically.

In early 1964, the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, A.I.Mikoyan took an initiative to separate Nagorno-Karabakh from Azerbaijan. This was the same Mikoyan who, along with a group of statesmen from Azerbaijan, had written to Moscow in 1920 that *Garabagh is indisputably Azerbaijani territory and should further be within the*

Azerbaijani boundaries. He suggested that N.S.Khrushchov consider the successful transfer of Crimea to Ukraine and annex Nagorno-Karabakh to Armenia. *Khrushchov* replied: "I am ready to provide 12 thousand military trucks for the resettlement of the Armenians of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast to Armenia within a day."¹⁶⁴ (my italics-T.K.) By such a sharp and resolute reply, the Armenian statesmen were again forced to keep silent.

The year of 1985 came. Gorbachov, whose goals and ideals have not been completely clarified yet, came to power. Until then the Armenian Diaspora was stating that "our territorial claims were against Turkey only." On December 1985, the Dashnak Party and the Armenian National Committee in the US declared the establishment of a "United Armenia" and the annexation of Garabagh and Nakhchivan, as well as the region of Akhalkalaki of Georgia, to Armenia to be their strategic goal.

This actually signalled the beginning of the "Garabagh movement." The aggressive separatists began "bombarding" Moscow with various applications and appeals. According to Gorbachov, in three years the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union received 500 letters from Nagorno-Karabakh. When checking one of the applications sent to Moscow with 216 signatures in the spring of 1986, it became clear that only 21 of the 216 people resided in NKAO. While there were only 3 houses in the Arpagadik village of the Hadrut district, 25 inhabitants of that village "signed" the appeal!¹⁶⁵ Apparently, other letters were fake as well!

Two events took place in November 1987, on the eve of the beginning of events in Nagorno-Karabakh (February 1988): one in the US and another in France.

The spouse of the Secretary General of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union met with the representatives of the Armenian Diaspora and the Dashnak Party in the United States. It remains a mystery to me whether any request concerning Nagorno-Karabakh was made there or not and why R.Gorbachova met with the Armenian Diaspora instead of the Russian Diaspora of almost 1 million people. What we all know is that the Dashnaks gave valuable presents to R.Gorbachova - 62-carat black diamond necklace with "Arsakh" written on it, an earring, etc....

The USSR leader was, anyway, under the strong influence of the Armenian lobby. This time the Dashnaks could also pin their hopes on the support of the first lady of the USSR.

A close friend and adviser of Gorbachov, academician Aganbekyan stated in Paris that he wished Nagorno-Karabakh to be given to Armenia. He openly said: "I have made a proposal concerning this issue. I believe this problem will find its solution in terms of perestroika and democracy."

Here is how Aganbekyan "based" his argument: "As an economist, I think that Garabagh is tied up with Armenia more than it is with Azerbaijan."

It became unequivocally evident from the statement of Aganbekyan that the territorial and state integrity of Azerbaijan was already in danger.

Nevertheless, the leadership of Azerbaijan wasn't able to set an alarm and did not take any preventive measures in the existing circumstances. Gorbachov expressed no clear or principle attitude either to his adviser Aganbekyan's official proposal concerning Nagorno-Karabakh or to his statement in Paris, or to his boastful confidence in the solution to the Nagorno-Karabakh problem.

This, in fact, indicated support for the position of Aganbekyan concerning Nagorno-Karabakh.

What the Armenian leadership needed to do next was – test the efficiency and power of the Soviet leadership. To do just this the Armenian leadership organized an open anti-Azerbaijan movement in Nagorno-Karabakh in February 1988.

There is no doubt that Armenia directed the events in Nagorno-Karabakh. The Armenian leadership, so to speak, was not only the ideas man behind these events, but also their scenario writer, director, conductor, and the leading actor. Even Russian First Deputy Foreign Minister and pro-Armenian Shelov-Kovedyayev confessed that "*the Nagorno-Karabakh*

conflict was a well-planned, pre-arranged move. The communist leadership of Armenia succeeded in carrying out this move... By over-exaggerating the right of nations to self-determination, the leaders of the "Garabagh movement" took this principle to extremes of separatism."¹⁶⁶

Indeed, Shelov-Kovedyayev told the truth. It was "the communist leadership of Armenia" that he correctly identified to be the force behind separatism in Nagorno-Karabakh.

However, neither the "Memorandum" nor Gorbachov revealed this truth. The "Memorandum" talked about the "policy of discrimination" followed by the Azerbaijani leadership in Nagorno-Karabakh, while Gorbachov maintained that the Azerbaijani leadership "sometimes exercised simply inhumane treatment" of the population of Nagorno-Karabakh.¹⁶⁷

In order to put a mask of truth on its claim, the "Memorandum" brings up the disappearance of 85 Armenian villages in Nagorno-Karabakh in 1926-1980 as an example.

Does this figure correctly reflect the reality? I have not had an opportunity to verify it. If it is true, then some aspects have to be clarified.

Were those villages the victims of the "policy of discrimination" or of objective reasons? Aren't the traditional tendencies of the Armenians towards migration, their flow to cities and the campaign of expansion of collective farms the main causes of the decrease in the number of villages in Nagorno-Karabakh? Maybe some of those villages consisted of 3-5 houses, just like the Arpagadik village of the Hadrut district, and the concentration of these families into another village with wider opportunities was a necessity of the time?

The decrease in the number of villages was not a process peculiar only to Nagorno-Karabakh. This appeared in various forms in the Soviet Union, as well as in a number of districts of Azerbaijan. Here is a fact concerning just one of the districts of Azerbaijan: 32 of 66 villages of the Khyzy district near Baku were depopulated. Almost half of the district's population moved to the cities Baku and Sumgayit, with higher living standards and more jobs.

If this is a result of the "policy of discrimination" of the Azerbaijani leadership, the decrease in the number of villages in Nagorno-Karabakh is undoubtedly a result of this policy!

Perhaps every unbiased person would agree with me that if especially Heydar Aliyev was to be blamed for the intensification of the "policy of discrimination" in Nagorno-Karabakh and if the disappearance of 85 Armenian villages in 1926-1980 was claimed to be a result of this policy, then, at least the number of the villages which "disappeared" during Heydar Aliyev's leadership and the number of the families who lived in those villages should have been mentioned.

This wasn't done. Apparently, it seems that there weren't any facts about the "disappearance" of Armenian villages during the rule of Heydar Aliyev.

Now about Gorbachov's accusations.

Let us, first of all, mention that there were numerous cases of disagreements between political figures of the same administration, even of animosity of one to another, one's calumny and aspersion on another throughout history. However, cases such as Gorbachov's aspersion against the Azerbaijani leadership and Heydar Aliyev are very rare in occurrence.

As for the issue of allegedly "sometimes simply inhumane treatment" of the Armenian population of Nagorno-Karabakh by the Azerbaijani leadership, I would say that:

-This is a malicious aspersion cast not only on the Azerbaijani leadership but on all of the Azerbaijani people;

-This is a provocation aimed at slandering the Azerbaijani people, as well as intensifying the conflict between them and the Armenian people more and more;

-This is an example of a biased attitude to the events in Nagorno-Karabakh.

According to Gorbachov, Heydar Aliyev did not pursue a "correct international policy" in Nagorno-Karabakh. In what way did this appear? Maybe there were distortions in personnel policy; i.e. H.Aliyev appointed Azerbaijanis to senior positions in the autonomous oblast, as well as its in towns, districts, party, Soviet and law enforcement bodies? Maybe Heydar Aliyev

oppressed the Armenian language in the autonomous oblast or restricted the education of the Armenians in their mother tongue?

Neither M.S.Gorbachov nor anyone else has pointed to facts concerning these issues, because they don't exist.

Maybe Heydar Aliyev did not care for the socio-economic development of Nagorno-Karabakh and that's why Nagorno-Karabakh was supposedly a backward region of Azerbaijan in its level of development?

It can be noted without any exaggeration that Heydar Aliyev pursued a consistent "international policy" in relation to the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. The years of 1969-1982, when Heydar Aliyev was leader of Azerbaijan, were the period of most rapid development in all spheres for Nagorno-Karabakh. It was the same period during which the socio-economic development of Nagorno-Karabakh was growing faster than that of most other regions of Azerbaijan.

In March 1988, a "round table" discussion on the socio-economic situation in NKAO was held in Baku. Scholars from Moscow also took part in this discussion (including economist and academician T.Khachaturov). Let us pay attention to a number of facts mentioned there:

- "The indices of the region in the early 1970s were higher than those of the Republic and the Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic of Nakhchivan. The level of development of the region in this direction is much higher than in other regions" (Z.Samadzada, Head, Economic Department, Central Committee of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan);

- "From 1971 to 1985, 483 million rubles was invested in the development of the region, which was 2.8 times more than in the previous fifteen years" (L.Davidyan, Deputy Director, Construction and Municipal Economy Department, Central Committee of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan);

- "During the last 16 years the region has surpassed the average level of the Republic in the rate of increase in industrial production" (S.Huseynov, Economist);

- "Transport and communication facilities in the region have developed dynamically over the last years. In the city of Stepanakert a railway with all kinds of facilities was put into operation" (A.Pogosova, Deputy Head, State Planning Committee of the Azerbaijani SSR);

- "Over the last 17 years the production power of the factory (The Stepanakert Furniture Factory - T.K.) has increased by 5 times" (A.Ayriyan, Minister, Ministry of Forest and Wood-Working Industry of the Azerbaijani SSR);

- Personal services constituted 41 rubles per person in the region, which is much more than those in the Republic overall.... This index for the Soviet Union is... 38 rubles (B.Aleksenko, Minister, Ministry of Personal Services of the Azerbaijani SSR);

- "About 25% of production of the Republic's sericulture industry falls to the share of NKAO" (J.Avetisov, Deputy Minister, Ministry of Light Industry), etc, etc, etc.

The documents of the "round table" discussions were then published in the press. A correspondent of «Известия» (Times) newspaper asked B.Lakhtin, Deputy Chairman, Bureau of the Council of Ministers of the USSR on Social Development, to express his views on the information and ideas concerning NKAO. Lakhtin stated that the ideas expressed during the "round table" discussions on Nagorno-Karabakh's being one of the most developed regions of Azerbaijan "were based on precise facts." He gave the following example: "NKAO exceeds the average figures of Azerbaijan on dwelling provision by 1.4 times. There are many other spheres in the region where the situation is better than that is in both countries."¹⁶⁸ (Azerbaijan and Armenia - T.K.)

In other words, NKAO was one of the most developed regions of Azerbaijan. This development was more rapid during the years of the leadership of Heydar Aliyev in Azerbaijan between 1969-1982.

Even if someone was not aware of those irrefutable facts and the statement of Lakhtin in «Известия» concerning the socio-economic situation in NKAO, Gorbachov, as a leader, should have been. And he was, of course, aware! Nonetheless, because of his biased attitude

towards Azerbaijan, he keeps hypocritically stating that if the decision on measures of accelerating the socio-economic development of NKAO had been adopted "ten years ago" and "if Aliyev had pursued a correct international policy, it would have been possible to prevent the tragedy," or that the Azerbaijani leadership "sometimes exercised simply inhumane treatment" of the population of Nagorno-Karabakh.

As for the key cause of the Nagorno-Karabakh events, Gorbachov passed over in silence. The key cause, however, was obvious. It was the territorial claim of Armenia against Azerbaijan with its aim of separating Nagorno-Karabakh from Azerbaijan by all means, that directly fed and maintained the events in Nagorno-Karabakh.

On November 28, 1989, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR adopted a decision "On Measures of Normalizing the Situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast." Though it was not openly announced, a number of principle mistakes made by the Center concerning the Nagorno-Karabakh issue were corrected by this:

-The Special Administrative Committee of NKAO, supervised by Moscow, was disbanded;

-The Azerbaijani Organizational Committee on Nagorno-Karabakh was established.

The leadership of Armenia ignored and rejected the decision of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. The ink on this decision, one might say, had hardly dried, when the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR adopted decisions "On Reunification of the Armenian SSR and Nagorno-Karabakh" in December 1 of the same year and "On Inclusion of the Socio-Economic Development Plan of NKAO into the State Plan of the Armenian SSR for the year 1990" in January 9, 1990, which contradicted the Constitution of the USSR.

The Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR assessed the above-mentioned decision of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR as a "forcible return of Nagorno-Karabakh to the rule of the Azerbaijani SSR and forcible holding of the region within the Republic, a new act of annexation!"

From the political point of view, this was an open challenge to the leadership of the Union and the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. This was a turning-point in the campaign against Azerbaijan as well; this meant a declaration of war against Azerbaijan.

Nevertheless, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, whose decision was openly rejected in front of the whole world, kept silent. So did Gorbachov. He became silent at a moment when it was necessary to take firm measures, and he shut his eyes to this extraordinary event. Only 40 days later, on January 10, 1990, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR adopted an ineffective decision on the "incompatibility" of the acts of Armenia "with the Constitution of the USSR."

The decision didn't contain any sharp criticism of the outrageous rejection of the decision of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR of November 28, 1989 by Armenia. The decision of Armenia on the annexation of Nagorno-Karabakh to Armenia was not only not annulled but the annulment of that decision was not even resolutely demanded.

As expected, this decision of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR remained on paper in Armenia. It was one of the numerous cases when the leadership of the Soviet Union tolerated the disrespect of Armenia when the decision concerned the Nagorno-Karabakh issue. It was one of those cases when the leadership showed weak political will, inability and hesitation regarding the implementation of its decision!

This was the bitter truth and the Azerbaijani people couldn't but learn a lesson from this. A key lesson was that the body and the leadership of the Soviet Union did not fulfil - maybe did not even want to fulfil - their constitutional duties concerning a problem of vital importance for Azerbaijan - the protection of the sovereignty, state and territorial integrity of Azerbaijan. This shattered the trust and confidence of the Azerbaijani people in the Union and its leadership.

The leadership of the Soviet Union, and personally Gorbachov, did not want to see the shattering danger hidden behind the Nagorno-Karabakh phenomenon, the destructive

dynamite in the decision of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR "on re-unification" of Nagorno-Karabakh with Armenia. Never before had the Soviet leadership been so helpless in the settlement of any problem and showed such a weak political will.

The unconstitutional decision of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR on the annexation of Nagorno-Karabakh on December 1, 1989, the characterization of the decision of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR three days earlier as a "forcible return of Nagorno-Karabakh to the rule of the Azerbaijani SSR and forcible holding of the region within the Republic, a new act of annexation" and the subsequent rejection of the above-mentioned decision of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR of January 10 by the Armenian leadership demonstrated a failure of Gorbachov's Nagorno-Karabakh policy. A leader who had a sense of self-respect, who valued highly human dignity and personal honor would probably have resigned in a similar case. However, Gorbachov was not such a person.

One might expect that, at least several years after Armenia's obvious unconstitutional acts, Gorbachov would soberly examine and evaluate everything that happened, would admit his lack of political will, decisiveness and responsibility in the settlement of the Nagorno-Karabakh problem.

However, Gorbachov "remained the same person he was in the past." In 1995 he wrote: "At one time or another it became obvious that it was possible to resolve the Nagorno-Karabakh problem: just as was done with Nakhchivan, Nagorno-Karabakh could also be given the status of autonomous republic while remaining within Azerbaijan. There was a moment when this proposal could have been implemented immediately. However, the Supreme Soviet in Yerevan then adopted a decision on the inclusion of NKAO in Armenia and everything was ruined. It happened due to an internal struggle, since the Armenian national movement established on the basis of the "Garabagh" Committee strived for a change in the ruling elite."¹⁶⁹

It was clear as noonday, and the decisions of the Supreme Soviet of Armenia on December 1 and January 9 once again confirmed that the events of Nagorno-Karabakh were planned by Armenia; these events are not rooted in any socio-economic problem of the region, but rather in the territorial claims of Armenia against Azerbaijan and in the plans to separate Nagorno-Karabakh from Azerbaijan; and peace and order will never come to Nagorno-Karabakh until Armenia gives up its evil intentions in the region or until these evil intentions are eradicated on the basis of international law.

Although Gorbachov mentions that "everything was ruined" because of the decision of the Supreme Soviet of Armenia "on the inclusion of NKAO in Armenia," he does not express any principled attitude to this decision; moreover, he does not even point to the contradiction between this decision and the Constitution of the USSR and does not admit his failure to annul this decision.

Let us recall that in a letter to Abulfaz Elchibay, President of Azerbaijan, John Major, British Prime Minister, wrote: "*The British government declares that the issue of the official status of Nagorno-Karabakh cannot be a subject for discussion -Nagorno-Karabakh is the territory of Azerbaijan*" (my italics— T.K.)

Gorbachov's biased attitude towards Azerbaijan did not allow him to overcome his hesitation about Nagorno-Karabakh in a situation caused by the unconstitutional decision of Armenia, nor could he make a resolute and unambiguous statement similar to that of Great Britain and suppress the unmasked aggressor by taking emergency measures within the framework of law.

It is known that Ilyukhin, Deputy Prosecutor General of the USSR, brought a criminal case against Gorbachov on November 1991. On events in NK Ilyukhin came to the conclusion that "Gorbachov had not only failed to prevent the territorial claims but he had, in fact, even encouraged the separatists. One of the leaders of the Garabagh movement G.Pogosyan, First Secretary of the Oblast Party Committee of NKAO, was retired with a 400 manat pension (this was big money at that time) and was offered an apartment in Moscow by

Gorbachov. The reason for this was that Pogosyan was an initiator of the adoption of the anti-charter decision to take the Nagorno-Karabakh Oblast Party Committee out of the Azerbaijani Communist Party. The decision was openly provocative in character and undoubtedly played an inflammatory role."

In the opinion of Ilyukhin, Levon Ter-Petrosyan and other nationalist leaders "skilfully used such a delicate, painful national issue in their fight for political and personal power." Gorbachov's unfortunate actions encouraged Armenian separatists and made the situation even worse, and "turned the artificially created Garabagh conflict into an insoluble question." This conflict spilled the blood of tens of thousands of people, and brought disaster upon the Azerbaijani and Armenian peoples. Ilyukhin was right: "The pain called "Gorbachov pain" in Faros is incomparable with the sorrow and pain of the peoples living in Transcaucasia," "those who helped give birth to and headed the Garabagh movement (Ter-Petrosyan and others - T.K.) continue to live as they lived before. Not a hair left their heads; they have their homes, families, a good table and a soft bed."¹⁷⁰ Hundreds of thousands of refugees and internally displaced persons were deprived of all these and their native land.

But this injustice will not continue! We believe that one day the UN will make its presence felt concerning the organizers of the Garabagh tragedy and will have the final word about their protectors. If the UN can't, the court of History, the court of the People will pass judgement!

14. On Legal Aspects of the Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict

The "Memorandum" claims, "The arguments of Azerbaijan that Nagorno-Karabakh belongs to Azerbaijan are legally less convincing," since "when the international community recognized the Azerbaijan Republic in 1992, Nagorno-Karabakh was not a part of Azerbaijan; the people of Nagorno-Karabakh voted for its independence in the referendum of December 10, 1991; on August 30, 1991, the Supreme Soviet of Azerbaijan declared the restoration of the state independence of the Republic of Azerbaijan of 1918-1920. Nagorno-Karabakh was not a part of Azerbaijan during 1918-1920 and the League of Nations confirmed this; it was the Soviet power that gave Nagorno-Karabakh to Azerbaijan. However, by adopting the Constitutional Act on the State Independence of the Republic of Azerbaijan on August 18, 1991 (this act was adopted on October 18, 1991 - T.K.), Baku officially declared the Soviet power illegitimate and renounced the Soviet legal and political legacy. By doing so, Baku in fact considered the forcible holding of Nagorno-Karabakh for 70 years within the Azerbaijani SSR illegal."

The historical reality and truth are as follows: even according to the version of Armenian authors, Nagorno-Karabakh has been within Albania-Azerbaijan since 428 A.D. Likewise, in 1918-1920, Nagorno-Karabakh was a part of the first Azerbaijani Republic, both de facto and de jure. We have given broad information above concerning this.

The "Memorandum" claims that the League of Nations by taking into consideration the "Provisional Agreement" of August 15, 1919 supposedly put the issue of Nagorno-Karabakh on the agenda of the Paris Peace Conference and that the League of Nations supposedly confirmed that Nagorno-Karabakh wasn't a part of the Azerbaijan Republic.

The Charter of the League of Nations was adopted at the Paris Peace Conference. If the League of Nations didn't exist until the Conference, could it have defined the agenda of the Paris Peace Conference?

Let us suppose that the Paris Peace Conference put "the issue of Nagorno-Karabakh" on the agenda, either on its own initiative or upon the proposal of Armenia which made claims on the large territories of Turkey and Transcaucasia, including Garabagh in its demands presented to the Conference, or upon the proposal of the Azerbaijani government which disseminated the Agreement of August 15, 1919 in the Conference.

If the Conference put it on the agenda then, did it consider it? If it considered the issue then, did it adopt any decision? There wasn't any decision. No decision!

Maybe after the establishment of the League of Nations, by discussing "the issue of Nagorno-Karabakh," it adopted a decision that "Nagorno-Karabakh wasn't a part of the Azerbaijan Republic?" No, there was no such decision.

On December 1, 1920, the 5th Committee of the League of Nations considered the application of November 1 by A.Topchubashov, Head of the Azerbaijani Delegation at the Paris Peace Conference, for the admission of the Azerbaijan Republic to the League of Nations.

The 5th Committee decided that the admission of Azerbaijan into the League of Nations was impossible under existing circumstances.

The Armenian officials say that "the League of Nations rejected the recognition of Azerbaijan because of its claims on the territories of the Eastern Transcaucasia populated by the Armenians, i.e. Nagorno-Karabakh."

Spoken in vain. The League of Nations decision was based on two key factors in the issue of membership of the Azerbaijani Republic:

1."The territory of Azerbaijan having been originally part of the Empire of Russia, the question arises whether the declaration of the Republic in May 1918 and the recognition accorded by the Allied Powers in January 1920 suffice to constitute Azerbaijan *de jure* a "full self-governing State."¹⁷¹ (According to the Charter of the League of Nations, "any fully self-governing state" may become a member of the League.)

2."Should the Assembly consider that the international status of Azerbaijan as a "fully self-governing State" is established, the further question will arise whether the Delegation by whom the present application is made is held to have the necessary authority to represent the legitimate government of the country for the purpose of making the application."¹⁷²

Thus, when the League of Nations considered the issue of Azerbaijan's membership, it, first of all, took into consideration the political reality - that the national government represented by A.Topchubashov had already been overthrown at the end of April as a result of the Russian occupation and the declaration of the Azerbaijan Soviet Republic. There was no place for a Soviet republic in the League of Nations at that time.

So, why did the Armenian side resort to such deception? Certainly, in order to build a new lie based on the previous one! In order to maintain that supposedly Nagorno-Karabakh was not a part of Azerbaijan and that the League of Nations had supposedly confirmed this, and supposedly "it was the Soviet power that gave Nagorno-Karabakh to Azerbaijan."

Indeed, this is an absolutely false argument. As is obvious from the "Provisional Agreement" of August 15, 1919 mentioned in the "Memorandum," Nagorno-Karabakh was within the Azerbaijan Republic. On April 29, 1920, after the fall of the Republic of Azerbaijan, the Congress of the Armenians of Nagorno-Karabakh adopted a decision on the secession of Nagorno-Karabakh from Azerbaijan, which remained on paper.

On the geographical map presented by Azerbaijan to the Paris Peace Conference, Nagorno-Karabakh was also mentioned as a territory of Azerbaijan. In November 1919, during the Paris Peace Conference, the delegations of Azerbaijan and Iran signed an important agreement. The agreement stated the following:

I. "...Caucasian Azerbaijan within the boundaries shown in the maps and claims ("maps and claims!" - T.K.) presented by the Azerbaijani delegation to the Peace Conference resolutely and once and for all separates from Russia.

II. "The Republic of Azerbaijan existing within the shown boundaries" ("shown boundaries!" - T.K.) of Caucasian Azerbaijan "from May 28, 1918 is recognized as an independent, sovereign and democratic republic."¹⁷³

Apparently, this document also emphasized the recognition of the Republic of Azerbaijan within the territorial boundaries shown on the map that Azerbaijan had presented to the Conference.

It was the same map that served as a basis when the Paris Peace Conference de facto recognized the independence of Azerbaijan on January 11, 1920.

There is no evidence as to whether the Paris Peace Conference, the League of Nations, the governments of the United States of America, Great Britain, France, Italy or any other state expressed any official attitude to the Nagorno-Karabakh issue.

It is evident that an American Colonel Haskell, High Commissioner of the Allied Powers in Transcaucasia, considered Azerbaijan's position to be fair and considered it "to be necessary for Garabagh, including Zangazur to be conclusively Azerbaijani territories."

It is evident that the Commander of the Allied Forces in Baku, British General Thomson and his representatives opposed the separatism in Nagorno-Karabakh and helped establish Azerbaijani rule in the region.

It is also evident that General Milton, Commander-in-Chief of the British Forces in the Balkans and Caucasus, made a statement on January 22, 1919: "The British government recognizes the Azerbaijani government as the only legitimate government within the territory of Azerbaijan."

Certainly, the statements by Haskell, Thomson or Milton, and their attitude to the Nagorno-Karabakh issue could not but reflect the position of the Allied Powers in every way.

The government of Azerbaijan appreciated highly the fair position of the Allied Powers concerning the issue of Nagorno-Karabakh. For instance, A.Topchubashov's note to the British Foreign Secretary Lord Balfour stated (September 10, 1919): "The British Command gained the sincere gratitude of our people by its participation in the resolution of the conflicts with our neighbours, particularly on the Garabagh issue,"¹⁷⁴ (my italics -T.K.)

It is not a matter of coincidence that in June 1919, Andranik, while meeting with the President of France, Poincare, expressed his discontent concerning the position of the Allies on the issue of Nagorno-Karabakh.¹⁷⁵

The statement that "it was the Soviet power that gave Nagorno-Karabakh to Azerbaijan" is also complete nonsense. As we have already noted, it was Nagorno-Karabakh within Azerbaijan that the Soviet power retained within the boundaries of Azerbaijan and created a Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast therein. The idea that Azerbaijan "in fact considered the forcible holding of Nagorno-Karabakh for 70 years within the Azerbaijani SSR illegal" is beyond any fact and logic.

As for the issue that when the UN "recognized the Azerbaijan Republic in 1992, Nagorno-Karabakh was not a part of Azerbaijan," let Armenia make an inquiry to the UN as to whether the UN admitted Azerbaijan to its membership without Nagorno-Karabakh in 1992.

Finally, let us address the issue of referendum. The Azerbaijanis, constituting a quarter of the "Nagorno-Karabakh people" of 189.000, boycotted the referendum held in contradiction of the Constitution of Azerbaijan. Neither Azerbaijan nor the international community has recognized that referendum.

Thus almost every sentence of the "Memorandum" presented by the Republic of Armenia to the UN emits lies, aspersion, deception, diplomatic provocation and scientific ignorance.

Let us hope that in order to serve as an example to all, the United Nations will condemn those who deceive the UN, cast aspersions, and spread tall-stories.

End Notes

- ¹Übeyd ibn Şəriyyə əl-Cürhuminin əxbəri. - Azərbaycan tarixi üzrə qaynaqlar. Bakı, 1989, səh.56-57; Ziya Bünyadov. Azərbaycan VII-IX əsrlərdə. Bakı, 1989, səh.174. ²Ziya Bünyadov. The work referred to above, p. 174. ³Ibid, p. 136.
- ⁴Cahangir Zeynalöglü. Müxtəsər Azərbaycan tarixi. Bakı, 1992, səh.10. ⁵See: Ziya Bünyadov. The work referred to above, p. 137; Nailə Vəlixanlı. Ərəb Xəlifəti və Azərbaycan. Bakı, 1993, səh.77. ⁶Ziya Bünyadov. The work referred to above, p.136. ⁷Cahangir Zeynalöglü. The work referred to above, p.10. ⁸Ibid.
- ⁹Jan Şarden. Səyahətnamə. Bakı, 1994, səh.68.
- ¹⁰Ф.М.Алиев. Антииранские выступления и борьба против турецкой оккупации в Азербайджане в первой половине XVII века. Баку, 1975, с. 132. ¹¹Ibid, p.135. ¹²Ibid, p.137.
- ¹³Описание областей Азербайджанских в Персии и их политического состояния, сделанное полковником и кавалером Бурнашевым в Тифлисе в 1786 г. Курск, 1793, с.5. ¹⁴Акты Кавказской Археографической Комиссии /АКАК/. Том II, док.1216, с.610. ¹⁵Ibid, p.592. ¹⁶Ibid, p.594.
- ¹⁷Присоединение Восточной Армении к России. Сб. док. Том I, Ереван, 1972, с.448. ¹⁸Газета «Славянин», 1827, №7, с. 117-118. - Хаджи Мурат Ибрагимбейли. Россия и Азербайджан в первой трети XIX века. Москва, 1969, с.61. ¹⁹Журнал «Армянский вестник» (Москва), 1998, №2, с.9; «Независимая газета», 22.07.1998. ²⁰Əli bəy Hüseynzadə. Türklər kimdir və kimlərdən ibarətdir. Bakı, 1997, səh.34. ²¹Yusif Vəzir Cəmənəzaminli. Xarici siyasətimiz. Bakı, 1993, səh.7. ²²Əli bəy Hüseynzadə. The work referred to above, pp.36-37, 186, 213. ²³Məhəmməd Əmin Rəsulzadə. Əsərləri. II cild, 1909-1914. Bakı, 2001, səh.485. ²⁴V.L.Velicko. Kavkaz. СПб., 1904, с. 154-155. ²⁵Ibid, p.67. ²⁶Ibid, p.66.
- ²⁷Н.Адонц. Армения в эпоху Юстиниана. Ереван, 1972, с.398.
- ²⁸See: Играр Алиев. Лжеистория - попытка оправдать агрессию. Баку, 1998, с.3.
- ²⁹N.Adants. The work referred to above, p.393.
- ³⁰Б.Ишханян. Народности Кавказа. СПб., 1916, с.18.
- ³¹See: С.А.Мамедов. Азербайджан по источникам XV - первой половины XVIII вв. Баку, 1993, с.41. ³²Ibid, p.46.
- ³³«7 gün» gəzəti, 19.12.1992.
- ³⁴See: И.Шопен. Исторический памятник состояния Армянской области в эпоху ее присоединения к Российской империи. СПб., 1852, с.635-638. ³⁵Ibid, pp.706-707.
- ³⁶See: Н.И.Шавров. Новая угроза русскому делу в Закавказье. СПб., 1911, с.64. ³⁷See: Azərbaycan tarixi üzrə qaynaqlar. Bakı, 1989, səh.16.
- ³⁸See: Фарида Мамедова. Политическая история и историческая география Кавказской Албании. Баку, 1986, с. 127. ³⁹Моисей Каганкатваци. История агван. СПб., 1861, с. 146. ⁴⁰Нагорный Карабах. Историческая справка. Ереван, 1988, с. 10. ⁴¹See: Fəridə Məmmədova. The work referred to above, p.241.
- ⁴²See: Журнал «Азербайджан и азербайджанцы», 2001, №7-8, с.22. ⁴³V.L.Velicko. The work referred to above, p.75. ⁴⁴Evliya Çələbi. Səyahətnamə. Bakı, 1997, səh.15.
- ⁴⁵Журнал «Армянский вестник», 1998, №2, с.31. ⁴⁶Fəridə Məmmədova. The work referred to above, p.78. ⁴⁷N.A.Adants. The work referred to above, pp.221, 423,421, 220-221. ⁴⁸Ziya Bünyadov. The work referred to above, p.92. ⁴⁹See: Azərbaycan tarixi üzrə qaynaqlar. Bakı, 1989, səh.114.
- ⁵⁰Нагорный Карабах. Историческая справка. Ереван, 1988, с. 16. ⁵¹Ibid.
- ⁵²See: Fəridə Məmmədova. The work referred to above, p. 106.
- ⁵³И.П.Петрушевский. О дохристианских верованиях крестьян Нагорного Карабаха, Баку, 1930, с.13,8.
- ⁵⁴Moisey Kagankatvatsi. The work referred to above, pp.239-241. ⁵⁵See: И.П.Петрушевский. The work referred to above, p.8. ⁵⁶See: V.L.Velicko. The work referred to above, p.80.
- ⁵⁷С.Т.Еремян. Идеология и культура Албании III-VII вв. - Очерки истории СССР III-IX вв. М, 1958, с.328-329. ⁵⁸Киракос Гандзакети. История. Баку, 1946, с.99. ⁵⁹Ibid, p.119.
- ⁶⁰V.L.Velicko. The work referred to above, pp.66, 154.
- ⁶¹Г.А.Эзов. Сношения Петра Великого с армянским народом. Документы. СПб., 1898, с.161. ⁶²Дашнаки (из материалов департамента полиции). Баку, 1990, с.7.
- ⁶³Q.A.Ezov. The work referred to above, pp.99, 295-296.
- ⁶⁴V.L.Velicko. The work referred to above, pp.70,77; Собрание актов, относящихся к обозрению истории армянского народа. II часть. М., 1832, с.53-54. ⁶⁵Есаи Хасан Джалалян. Краткая история страны Албанской (1702-1722). Баку, 1989, с.36.
- ⁶⁶Q.A.Ezov. The work referred to above, pp.365-366.
- ⁶⁷Ф.М.Алиев. Азербайджано-русские отношения (XV-XIX вв.). Баку, 1985, с.122. ⁶⁸Собрание актов, относящихся к обозрению истории армянского народа. II часть. М., 1832, с. 54.
- ⁶⁹П.Г.Бутков. Материалы для новой истории Кавказа. I часть. СПб., 1869, с.68. ⁷⁰See: Ibid. ⁷¹Ibid, p.67.
- ⁷²Q.A.Ezov. The work referred to above, pp.423-424. ⁷³Ibid, p.424. ⁷⁴Ibid, p.438. ⁷⁵Ibid, p.441.
- ⁷⁶V.Bartold. Müsəlman dünyası tarixində Xəzərbayat bölgələrinin yeri. Bakı, 1999, səh.39. ⁷⁷See: Aləm Nuriyev, Əlibabə Babayev. Bərdə şəhərinin tarixi-arxeoloji oçerki (Antik və orta əsrlərdə). Bakı, 2001, səh.118-119. ⁷⁸See: Q.A.Ezov. The work referred to above, p.324. ⁷⁹See: Gəncə-Qarabağ əyalətinin müfəssəl dəftəri. Bakı, 2000, səh. 171-180. ⁸⁰See: ibid, p. 13. ⁸¹See:ibid, p. 15.
- ⁸²Yusif Vəzir Cəmənəzaminli. Xarici siyasətimiz. Bakı, 1993, səh.7. ⁸³See: Gəncə-Qarabağ əyalətinin müfəssəl dəftəri. Bakı, 2000, səh. 15. ⁸⁴See: ibid, p. 17.
- ⁸⁵Б.А.Потто. Кавказская война. Том II, Ставрополь, 1993, с.603.
- ⁸⁶С.О.Кишмишев. Походы Надир шаха в Герат, Кандагар, Индию и события в Персии после его смерти. Тифлис, 1889, с. 131. ⁸⁷Яков Захарянц. История Арцаха. - Tarix institutunun elmi arxivı, inv.№924.
- ⁸⁸Qarabağnamələr. İkinci kitab. Bakı, 1991, səh.III-III. ⁸⁹Ibid, p. 15.
- ⁹⁰В.А.Потто. The work referred to above, p.169.
- ⁹¹P.Q.Butkov. The work referred to above, part III, p. 169.
- ⁹²Ibid, p. 193.
- ⁹³Ibid, p. 171.
- ⁹⁴Ibid, part II, p. 141.
- ⁹⁵Ibid, part III, p. 176.
- ⁹⁶Ibid, part II, p. 142.
- ⁹⁷Ibid, part III, p. 179.
- ⁹⁸See: ibid, p. 178.
- ⁹⁹В.И.Левинатов. Очерки по истории Азербайджана в XVIII веке. Баку, 1978, с.147. ¹⁰⁰Собрание актов, относящихся к обозрению истории армянского народа. II часть. М., 1832, с.60.
- ¹⁰¹P.Q.Butkov. The work referred to above, part II, p. 195. ¹⁰²В.А.Потто. The work referred to above, p.233. ¹⁰³S.O.Kismisev. The work referred to above, pp.255-256.
- ¹⁰⁴V.L.Velicko. The work referred to above, p.36. ¹⁰⁵S.O.Kismisev. The work referred to above, p.257. ¹⁰⁶В.А.Потто. The work referred to above, volume I, p.262.
- ¹⁰⁷Присоединение Восточной Армении к России. Сб. док. Том I, Ереван, 1972, с.395. ¹⁰⁸See: X.D.Xəlilov. Qarabağın elat dünyası. Bakı, 1992, səh. 17. ¹⁰⁹Нагорный Карабах. Историческая справка. Ереван, 1988, с. 19. ¹¹⁰See: «Независимая газета», 22.07.1998.
- ¹¹¹М.Бархударянц. Арцах. Баку, 1895. - Tarix institutunun elmi arxivı, inv. №1622.
- ¹¹²Колониальная политика Российского царизма в Азербайджане в 20-60-х гг. XIX в. Часть II. М.-Л., 1937, с. 19. ¹¹³Ibid, p.22.
- ¹¹⁴А.А.Бакыханов. Сочинения. Статьи. Письма. Баку, 1983, с.145-147. ¹¹⁵See: Tofiq Kocərlı. Qarabağ. Bakı, 2002, səh.254-255. ¹¹⁶ADTA, f.970, s.10, i.227, v.23-24.
- ¹¹⁷Fətəli xan Xoyski. Nəyat və fəaliyyəti (Sənəd və materiallar). Bakı, 1998, səh.119. ¹¹⁸Ibid.
- ¹¹⁹Azərbaycan Xalq Cümhuriyyəti (1918-1920). Parlament. I cild. Bakı, 1998, səh.56.

- ¹²⁰Fətəli xan Xoyski. Həyat və fəaliyyəti (Sənəd və materiallar). Bakı, 1998, səh. 121.
- ¹²¹Azərbaycan tarixi sənədlər və nəşrlər üzrə. Bakı, 1990, səh.238.
- ¹²²Fətəli xan Xoyski. Həyat və fəaliyyəti (Sənəd və materiallar). Bakı, 1998, səh. 121.
- ¹²³Azərbaycan tarixi sənədlər və nəşrlər üzrə. Bab, 1990, sah.227.
- ¹²⁴И.Шахдин. Дашнакцугюн на службе русской белогвардейщины и английского командования на Кавказе. Тифлис, 1931, с.28. ¹²⁵Ibid. ¹²⁶Ibid.
- ¹²⁷Fətəli xan Xoyski. Həyat və fəaliyyəti (Sənəd və materiallar). Bakı, 1998, səh. 55. ¹²⁸See: Газета «Азербайджан», 17.06.1919. ¹²⁹See: ibid. ¹³⁰See: ibid, 03.08.1919.
- ¹³¹Azərbaycan Xalq Cümhuriyyəti (1918-1920). Parlament. I cild. Bakı, 1998, səh.870. ¹³²Газета «Знамя труда», 26.08.1919. ¹³³Газета «Борьба», 05.09.1919. ¹³⁴Ibid.
- ¹³⁵Azərbaycan tarixi sənədlər və nəşrlər üzrə. Bakı, 1990, səh.244.
- ¹³⁶Бахтияр Наджафов. Лицо врага. История армянского национализма в Закавказье в конце XIX-начале XX вв. II часть. Баку, 1994, с. 154. ¹³⁷See: Газета «Бакинский рабочий», 05.12.1922.
- ¹³⁸Л.Хуршудян. Истина - единственный критерий исторической науки. Ереван, 1989, с. 17-18. ¹³⁹See: Азербайджанская Демократическая Республика (1918-1920). Армия. Баку, 1998, с.295.
- ¹⁴⁰Ibid, p.303.
- ¹⁴¹Ibid, p.325.
- ¹⁴²L.Xurşudyan. The work referred to above, p. 18. ¹⁴³Ibid.
- ¹⁴⁴Газета «Коммунист» (Ереван), 13.07.1989. ¹⁴⁵See: Tofiq Köçərlı. Qarabağ. Bakı, 2002, səh.367.
- ¹⁴⁶See: К истории образования Нагорно-Карабахской Автономной Области Азербайджанской ССР. Документы и материалы. Баку, 1989, с.49. ¹⁴⁷Ibid, p.32. ¹⁴⁸Ibid,p.33. ¹⁴⁹Ibid.
- ¹⁵⁰Ibid, pp.33-34. ¹⁵¹Ibid, p.35. ¹⁵²Ibid, pp.54-56. ¹⁵³Ibid. ¹⁵⁴Ibid, p.57.
- ¹⁵⁵Tofiq Kocerli. Qarabag. Bala, 2002, sah.370. ¹⁵⁶Ibid.
- ¹⁵⁷К истории образования Нагорно-Карабахской Автономной области Азербайджанской ССР. Документы и материалы. Баку, 1989, с.64. ¹⁵⁸Ibid, p.65. ¹⁵⁹Ibid,p.91. ¹⁶⁰Ibid, p.92. ¹⁶¹See: ibid.
- ¹⁶²М.С.Горбачев. Жизнь и реформы. Книга I. М., 1995, с.503. ¹⁶³Ibid, p.504.
- ¹⁶⁴Юрий Помпеев. Кровавый омут Карабаха. СПб., 1992, с.16-17.
- ¹⁶⁵See: Ziyad Səmədzadə. Dağlıq Qarabağ: Naməlum həqiqətlər. Bakı, 1995, səh.II.
- ¹⁶⁶Yuriy Pompeyev. The work referred to above, pp.4-5.
- ¹⁶⁷M.S.Qorbaçov. The work referred to above, p.506.
- ¹⁶⁸Газета «Известия», 25.03.1988.
- ¹⁶⁹M.S.Qorbaçov. The work referred to above, p.509.
- ¹⁷⁰See: Юрий Помпеев. Юдальные дни. Санкт-Петербург. 1993, с.49-50.
- ¹⁷¹Assembly Document 20/48/108, p.4.
- ¹⁷²Ibid.
- ¹⁷³See: Tofiq Köçərlı. Qarabağ. Bakı, 2002, səh.272.
- ¹⁷⁴Азербайджанская Демократическая Республика (1918-1920). Внешняя политика. (Документы и материалы). Баку, 1998, с.335. ¹⁷⁵See: Səmil Nəsonov. Azərbaycan beynəlxalq münasibətlər sistemində. 1918-1920. Bakı, 1993, səh.231.