

**ORGANIZATION OF LIBERATION OF
GARABAGH**

**"GARABAGH
YESTERDAY, TODAY AND TOMORROW"**

**PROCEEDINGS
OF SCIENTIFIC-PRACTICAL
CONFERENCE**

Editorial board: Ali Abasov, doctorate in philosophy; Gasym Hajiyev, doctorate in historical sciences; Kerim Shukurov, doctorate in historical sciences; Firdovsiyye Ahmedova, candidate of historical sciences; Panah Huseyn, Mehman Aliyev, Novruz Novruzbeyli, Shamil Mehdi Editorial board: AH Abasov, doctorate in philosophy; Gasym Hajiyev, doctorate in historical sciences; Kerim Shukurov, doctorate in historical sciences; Firdovsiyye Ahmedova, candidate of historical sciences; Panah Huseyn, Mehman Aliyev, Novruz Novruzbeyli, Shamil Mehdi

Translators: Heyran Muradova, Gulnar Mammedli

OLG (Organization of Liberation of Garabagh).

Proceedings of the conferences held under the topic "Garabagh yesterday, today and tomorrow". Second volume. Baku, 2009, 240 pages.

The book expounds proceedings of the conferences held in 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008 under the topic "Garabagh yesterday, today and tomorrow" and devoted to problems of Azerbaijan-Armenia war.

The book is translated and published by financial support of Committee for State Support to non-governmental organizations attached to President of Azerbaijan Republic.

From Editorial Board: This book embraces papers presented at the conferences held in 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008 under the topic "Garabagh yesterday, today and tomorrow". Presented papers are devoted to various aspects of Azerbaijan -Armenia war caused by territorial claims and aggression of Armenia against Azerbaijan. These conferences initiated by Organization of Liberation of Garabagh are targeting to inform international community about causes, roots and perspectives of resolution of Azerbaijan-Armenia war and to derive a common, fair position, which corresponds to reality, in this vital problem.

Adalat Mustafayev

ARMENIAN SEPARATISM AND ITS SUPPORTERS

Political processes, which took place in western regions of Azerbaijan since 80-ies of the XX century were based on events of the XIX century when Russian empire invaded South Caucasus and initiated move of Armenians here. This problem became even more deeper with conveying of Zangezur to Armenia by Soviet empire and creation of autonomy for Armenians on the territory of Azerbaijan (DGAR, 1923).

During the period of Soviet rule Armenians repeatedly expressed ridiculous ideas about economic and political "links" of Nagorno Karabakh to Armenia and claimed giving Autonomous Republic to Armenia. In 1965 when the claim of Armenia for Nagorno Karabakh was voiced, Khrushov held a fair position and defended rights of Azerbaijan (Boran Aziz. Khodjaly genocide: causes, methods of implementation and results. Baku, 2008, p.42). Those who made this demand clearly understood that in fact there were no economic or political ties of Nagorno Karabakh and Armenia. But Armenians never refused from their groundless claims and strengthened anti-Azerbaijan propaganda by all means. They also widely applied financial sources both across the former Union and in many foreign countries for implementation of their dirty plans against Azerbaijan. In 1989 Armenian organizations of the USA held a conference on Nagorno Karabakh at the Columbia University, which was attended by Tadeush Svyatokhovskiy, who attempted to say truth and informed participants of the conference that Armenians are not the indigenous population. Professor then informed about crude behavior of Armenians towards him: "They said to me: "What a scientist you are, how can you say that you are an American scientist?" ("Elm" newspaper, July 29, 1989). The only thing is in mind of Armenians: whoever you are, you have to say "Amen" to lies and falsifications of Armenians. Anti-Azerbaijan propaganda of Armenians is confessed even by authoritative representatives of Russia. Ex vice-speaker of Russia S.Baburin while his meeting with lecturers and students of Baku State University said that "Armenians spend a lot of money for publication of anti-Azerbaijan propagandistic materials in mass media of Russia" (A.N.Abbasbeyli, P.Q.Darabadi, A.G.Ibrahimov. Conflictology. Textbook. Baku, 2006, p.269).

Unable to objectively evaluate the essence and perspectives of political processes in former USSR, dutiful rule of K.Bagirov, A.Vezirov and A.Mutallibov seriously complicated situation in the Republic. (Musa I.M. International relations and Azerbaijan. Baku, 2005, p.478). When tragic process of withdrawal of over 200 thousand Azerbaijani from Armenia had started, Armenians of Nagorno Karabakh were afraid of the similar actions against them. Unfortunately, Azerbaijan government failed to correctly evaluate situation and did not create conditions favorable for location of Azerbaijani refugees in Nagorno Karabakh. At the same time, Armenians under

the control of USSR were equipped by arms and received required support from abroad. Through the period when empire moved towards collapse there emerged hurdles for a united strong resistance of our nation to enemy and the gap between authorities and people became even deeper. That is why, the enemy by use of all possible means succeeded to change the situation for its favor.

It must be noted, that despite tense political situation through that period, Azerbaijan government speeded up construction of some buildings in Daglyg Garabagh, while Armenians at the same period were equipped by arms by Armenia and powerful supporters. In order to prevent all arguments of Armenians the government of Azerbaijan sent supplies to all regions of Autonomous Region and undertook any effort to improve social situation in the region. Events were not correctly evaluated, Azerbaijan mostly did not held firm position and regarded actions of Armenians as desire to impede reforms in the country. Azerbaijan authorities evaluated actions of Armenians as "storm of emotions" ("Baku" newspaper, July 14, 1989).

With collapse of USSR the South Caucasus turned into the arena of ethnic conflicts. On the background of fight between forces attempted to preserve the Union and their opponents the hostility between nations became even deeper. Armenian nationalists played the role of catalyst of national hostility. Instability in South Caucasus, various attitudes of great powers to these processes and absence of farsighted leader able to preserve the unity in the country led to unwanted results for Azerbaijan. M.Gorbachev coming to power in 1985 held pro-Armenian position and did not refrain from expressing preconceived opinion about Azerbaijan. M.Gorbachev said about Garabagh problem that "Garabagh problem" exists and its roots are deep. The problem deepened because at a certain stage the attitude of Azerbaijan government to population was ...inhuman" (Armenian terrorism and crimes: in Azerbaijan, Turkey and around the world. Baku, 1994, p. 16). Preconceived opinion of a head of state was the evidence of Russian chauvinism. Gorbachev was aware that social-economic situation in Garabagh was exceptionally well. He just assisted to activity of Armenian nationalists.

On January 12 of 1989 due to resolution of Supreme Soviet of USSR under leadership of Gorbachev the Special Governing Committee (SGC) was created in Daglyg Garabagh Autonomous Republic (DGAR). A.Volski, who headed a special committee created for the first time through the history of Union under the leadership of Gorbachev, was pro-Armenian chauvinist. He was one of those who created condition favorable for blossoming of Armenian nationalism and separatism in Garabagh. Major activity of a body created by USSR authorities in Garabagh served for strengthening of positions of Armenians. At the same time, SGC attempted to create conditions for gradual convey of Garabagh under subordination of Russian Federation. They tried first of all to convey control over enterprises to Russia or other dependent countries. All these were planned before

creation of SGC and Volski was closely involved in this. Newspaper "Baku" noted that "A.Volski as a representative of Central Committee of Soviet CP and Supreme Soviet of USSR" took part at the meetings held by authorities of Azerbaijan and Armenia in DGAR on October 11, 1988. (Newspaper "Baku", October 12, 1988). From the activity of A.Volski it is clear who he is. Armenians were delighted when SGC was created in DGAR under supervision of A.Volski and ignoring decisions of Azerbaijan government intensified separatism and atrocities. However in the press the SGC activity evaluated as "positive". "Special Governing Committee, juridical and internal affairs bodies do everything possible in order to prevent ethnic clashes and killing of civilians" ("Baku" newspaper, July 12, 1989). It was the result of policy implement by this committee that nature of information sent to Moscow had changed, creating negative opinion about Azerbaijani, and evaluated terrorist groups of Armenians as their attempt for self-determination. Higher activity of Armenian lobby was clearly observed. Instead of restoration of order in the region the Special Governing Committee made the situation favorable for withdrawal of Azerbaijani from here.

From the start of the conflict various groups and officials successively visited Garabagh openly or hidden. To clarify situation in DGAR and regulate activity of security forces the group of officials including USSR's Deputy Internal Affairs Ministry -S.Lusauskas, Head of Regular troops Colonel-General I.Shatalin and other officials visited Khankendi (Stepanakert). But this visit deteriorated situation and increased cases of killings and looting of Azerbaijani.

At first, Azerbaijani believed SGC, which was created in Autonomous Region, then they started to understand the essence of activity of this "committee" and its being just a deceptive body for easy breakaway of Daglyg Garabagh from Azerbaijan. Despite that secret plans for quiet convey of enterprises to Russia or other countries were carefully prepared during the period of activity of Special Governing Committee the population gradually became informed about the true essence of events. One of committee members created in DGAR was Vagif Jafarov, the First Secretary of Communist Party Committee of Shusha region. When he was asked about cease of subordination of Daglyg Garabagh enterprises and organizations to Azerbaijan, his answer was: "...I would like to inform about the opinion of Committee: no one, no labor group will be forced to change subordination. The issue is different: the issue is about regional economy, economic independence, equal partnership and beneficial cooperation, whether it will be with Baku, Moscow or other center." ("Communist" newspaper, April 9, 1989). It can be seen that the center did not allow to inform population about real processes in Daglyg Garabagh and unmask true essence of the committee, made people believe in possibility of positive resolution, even prevented description of some issues in press and correctly inform population. As one of journalists said "In order to convince us-journalists they say: It is no need to write about DG, this only

fuels emotions. And we thought, may be indeed there is no need to write." ("Baku", newspaper, December 23, 1989).

During events in Daglyg Garabagh there were issues which rose disputes. Sometimes Armenians also resisted Special Governing Committee and demanded its liquidation. "One of the former leaders of dismissed Krunk B.Dadmyan, director of Automobile Transport Association in Stepanakert said in his televised address on May 3 that the aim of strike participants is to liquidate special governing committee and restore activity of regional party committee and regional executive committee" ("Communist" newspaper, May 6, 1989). It is clear that Armenian lobby was maneuvering and tried to hide major activity of SGC. In respect of SGC activity on May 19, 1989 at the meeting devoted to activity of International Relations Committee, held in Moscow and chaired by N.Ryjkov it was emphasized: "Special Governing Committee at initial stage of its existence strengthened rights of Autonomous Republic, assisted to deepening of its independence and use of principles of regional economy, and made organizational and juridical decisions in order to stimulate DGAR's Armenian population ties with Armenia in spheres of culture and education, while also taking into account interests of Azerbaijani population." ("Communist" newspaper, May 20 1989). These ideas allow to understand true designation of Special Governing Committee.

Akif Naghi

FACTOR OF FORCE FOR RESOLUTION OF THE CONFLICTS

The world is forced to exist under conditions of international and internal conflicts, as well as racial, ethnic, religious and government - opposition conflicts. In some cases there are attempts to resolve and get rid of these conflicts, while in other cases reconciling with situation, the existence of the conflict is accepted. Actually, being tied of struggle, it agrees to live with keeping status-quo and without changing the existed situation. In such case conflict is accepted as a norm. The situation of conflict becomes ordinary. However this case takes place when one or several parties of the conflict distance themselves from struggle and accept their destiny as a must. But this is not frequent.

In most cases parties attempt to resolve the conflict by seeking various ways of regulation. Without taking into account intermediate colors, there are two major paths or methods existed for thousands of years, starting from primitive society era up to now:

- a)** peaceful way of negotiations, gradual, progressive, reconciliation, mediating, compromise, mutual concessions, etc.
- b)** use of violence and force, military interference, radical, intolerant, maximalistic, refusal of compromises and half-steps, irreconcilability, etc.

Until today both ways have their supporters and followers. There is an

acute discussion and confrontation between them.

I am the supporter of the second path. I am of opinion that the first path is a trick of stronger party, which wishes to keep status-quo and suppresses the will of weaker party and forces it to reconcile with its own destiny, or it is the trick of party, which wishes to keep the situation unchanged. There is no serious fact evidencing regulation of the conflict within any country or international conflicts by peaceful means and negotiations. Examples, which are shown in some cases do not correctly reflect the reality and mostly have propagandistic nature. The process implemented by peaceful means leads toward accepting by one of the conflict parties of its own destiny and surrender. This path brings to zero the ability of one party to mobilize, bring together its own forces and resist. This path leads to the triumph of stronger, winner party. This path means oppression of the rights of the weaker, minor and defeated party. In this case, it would be expedient to remind to those talking about democracy, that democratic principles are violated.

One of arguments, which necessitate use of force consists of idea that any conflict starts from use of force by one of the parties. Azerbaijan-Armenian conflict is related to use of force and invasion of Armenia. All conflicts, including English-Ireland, Jewish-Palestinian, Spanish-Basques, newly sprouting Turkmen-Kurds conflicts have started with use of force by one of the parties. Thus, the essence of any conflict is explained by use of force and violence of one of the conflict parties. If so, i.e. if confrontation starts from use of force, is it possible to solve the problem by other peaceful ways? It is impossible! This does not correspond to rules of nature and society. Impact is equal to reverse impact. On the contrary, the world would collapsed a long time ago. The world itself is emerged after the first push, i.e. after the first application of force. Any novelty opens way for itself by use of force. The world stands over the rule of unity, confrontation and struggle of opposites. Struggling and fighting world lives, strengthens and develops. That is why, it must be feared not of conflicts in the world, but on the contrary, it must be feared of absence of conflicts or their resolution by ways other than struggle and fighting. Conflicts proceed from the essence of the world, nature and society. Conflicts are indicators of ability of the world to live and strengthen. Conflicts show that internal reserves of the world are not exhausted. In fact, people have to prolong existence of the world by solving problems in open fields by use of force. If you will live until the passive times without conflicts and struggle, be sure that this is the end of the world, i.e. as Fukuyama said it is "the end of history".

Supporters of peaceful path frequently mention movements of M.Gandhi in India or Martin Luther King in the USA. I would like to remind in-brief history of these movements. Movement of Mahatma Gandhi had started from 1919 and gave its results after 30 years. This movement used non-violent methods. Gandhi named these methods as "satiyagrakha" - persistence to truth. M.L.King refuses from active resistance and calls not to use violence in response of violence and

prefers to use various methods of boycott (for example, to boycott the company, which does not allow use of bus by white and black people jointly, etc.).

a) I would like to draw attention of supporters of this movement to the following: India has gained independence after a long period of time and with possession of inferiority complex. Even now it has been unable to get rid of consequences. For comparison, its neighbors (Pakistan and China) gained independence by a rapid leap and violence. Today it is even no sense to compare their development level and that of India.

b) Those involved in Gandhi movement comprehended that it is quite difficult to achieve any result by non-violent methods. That is why they characterized their movement as "persistence to truth". That is why sometimes they used violence or enriched their non-violent methods by elements of violence. It is not accidental, that sometimes 25-30 thousand their members were in jail.

c) It is due to Gandhi movement that India's society did not complete the process of self-assertion. Leaders of the country in India, which gives preference to non-violent methods, including also M.Gandhi, were removed from the office by use of violence, i.e. killing them. Paradox, which shows inferiority complex of the society!

It is the result of M.L.King movement that black people in the USA still in the process of self-assertion, find it difficult to define their position in society and feel themselves in role of rabble of society. Those who have a knowledge of American society to any extent know that black people behave badly everywhere, demonstratively violate rules and deliberately play role of "bad boy". This proves continuation of self-assertion process. Assignment of black people to various positions and even high government positions serves to artificially remove that imbalance. For comparison, it can be displayed that in South African Republic, which chosen path of radical struggle, black people have higher achievements than in other places. Here the government of black people, the country of black people has more complete and higher form than in the countries where almost all of population is black. Another example is Algeria. No one believed that it will become an Arab country some time. But Algerian people, who led a struggle by violent methods, have gained results in a short period of time.

Only violence may give positive results in fight against the violence. As, it was noted earlier the conflict arises when one of the parties uses force. And the party which used force will not refuse from its position by negotiations. If it had the intention to refuse it would not use the force. If Palestinians would not use violence against violence of Israel, the problem of Palestine would not be actual today and most probably, Palestinians were forgotten long time ago. Nobody has taken into account Palestinians until Y.Arafat. For a long period of time most of the countries did not want to have any deal with Y.Arafat regarding him as a terrorist. But later, all countries recognized him and took into account his opinion.

If today the world listens to Palestinians, it is largely due to phenomena of Y.Arafat.

Azerbaijan-Armenian conflict is frozen for a long period of time. Negotiations are underway, but there are no visible results. Azerbaijan used the force for the first time in 1992-1993. There were immediate results. Four resolutions on Garabagh adopted by Security Council of UN and signing by Armenian government of document about withdrawal from Kelbadjar in June of 1993 are the results of use of force by Azerbaijan. In some cases, by use of force it is possible to achieve more quick and concrete results. Peaceful means and negotiations, used while regulation of any conflict, have frequently lead to involvement of a lot of new elements and new shades. This changes the essence of the problem, draws away the attention from initial position and causes distortions. Time never assists to fair resolution of the conflict. In the course of time the stronger party becomes even stronger and attracts allies and interested parties. At the same time, in the course of time such categories as social interest, international opinion and actuality move to a back plane.

England immediately reacted to the event with Falkland islands, used force and had a result in a very short time. If there was not such rapid reaction, some European-American mediator mission similar to the Minsk group of OSCE has been making roundtrips between England and Argentina. Some media representatives and diplomats in England do not appreciate this action. But, in my point of view those members of a country which defended its territory from occupation, are far from sincerity. Turkey in a single day mobilized ail its forces against Greece, which attempted to occupy Turkey's islands. Croatia has liberated its territories from invasion of Serbia in four days period by use of force. No doubt, international organizations imposed sanctions on them for this. But they succeeded in more important issue. The USA, which tried to change Iraqi regime by negotiations and peaceful means for along 30 years could not achieve any results and in the end had to use force.

Famous Chinese military theorists Sun Tszi (VI-V centuries B.C.) wrote that the army wins by its stability and the country wins by its integrity. According to his opinion, use of force is the most important and basic problem of any country. Existence of a country depends on its force and ability to use force. Azerbaijan, which territorial integrity has been broken, faces a dilemma: reconcile to reality and continue its way to destruction or choose the war for liberation of its territories. But according to military theorist K.Klauzevitsin "war is the continuation of policy by other means". That is why today in Azerbaijan the policy, which leads to war must be implemented. Azerbaijan has everything to fulfill such policy and start the war and win. Without consideration of other factors I would like to underline financial possibilities. At present, annual state budget of Armenia is US \$ 800 million. Military budget of this country for the year 2005 is scheduled

as US \$ 84 millions. Armenia spends for keeping of military forces in occupied territories US \$ 12 millions. Of 25 thousand servicemen of armed forces deployed in occupied territories of Azerbaijan 3200 servicemen are foreign mercenaries and 7 thousand are Armenian military servants. According to expert evaluations if war starts, one day of military operations will cost to conflict parties US \$ 25 millions. Here I add also the human factor of both countries. As we can see, war demands huge financial expenses and a lot of human reserves. However, everyone understands that potential of Azerbaijan and Armenia even can not be compared.

R.Nibur, F.Shuman, H.Kissinger, E.Karr, KMorgenthau, P.Aron and others known as supporters of "theory of force" consider it is important as "force" category. According to this theory, international policy is based first of all on the force. Consequently, efforts of any country to accumulate the force constitute the major factor, which directly impacts international relations development. The system of "power balance" between power centers provides stability and development of international relations. H.Morgenthau in his book "Political relations of nations. Struggle for power" shows that country implements its position in two ways: military strategy and diplomacy. And diplomacy gives real results if it is based on force. Diplomacy is efficient when it uses available elements of power. In international relations the position of any country is defined by criteria of national force. National force unites such forces as political, economic, military, demographic, geographic, scientific-technical, social-psychological and cultural forces.

Major principles of international law are described in Bylaws of UN, in Resolution (1970) of General Assembly of UN, in Final Act (1975) of Helsinki Conference and other documents. One of those principles is the principle of not applying the force and not to threat by use of force. According to this principle, all countries refuse to use force against territorial integrity and political sovereignty of other country and refuse to threat to use force. Armenia, which has broken territorial integrity of Azerbaijan, has already violated this principle. According to international law, if there will be armed attack or invasion into any country, that country may use armed force to defend itself and liberate its territories. It can be seen that international law envisages use of force in certain cases.

Thus, in regulation of any type of conflict use of force and violence, radical methods must be used as more efficient, rapid and fair way.

Ali Abasov
**STAGES OF DAGLYG GARABAGH CONFLICT: THROUGH
LOCAL TO INTERNATIONAL LEVELS. IS THE WAY BACK
POSSIBLE?**

For long years of confrontation the following phrase repeatedly emerged and then temporarily vanished: "negotiation process over Daglyg Garabagh conflict came to deadlock". In other words, hopes and expectations had sporadic nature while scepticism in this issue turned into political long-lived issue. May be today it is the right time to suppose that this process never went out from deadlock. Certainly, there are a number of reasons. Not always everything depends on conflict parties, but if one will attempt to understand the logic of position of Azerbaijan, then it will be possible to formulate some interesting conclusions.

First of all, it must be noted that the conflict passed through several stages of development and each of them seriously changed its character, and consequently the strategy of regulation. In the meantime, no serious researches or special technologies based on real process of confrontation were proposed by authorities or intellectual circles for conflict resolution. On the contrary, through these long years Azerbaijan hold position of waiting "offended" party, which fair demands sooner or later will be recognized by international community and centers of political influence, which are capable to restore status-quo of Soviet era. Namely this dependent position caused such prolonged nature of conflict, when decisions are made by too large number of parties, which political interests distinctly contradict each other.

Dynamics of Daglyg Garabagh conflict may be distinctly divided into several levels, transitions to which significantly changed character of confrontation and paths of conflict regulation. In chronologically intersected succession the following stages may be observed.

At the first, local stage, the conflict had a nature of ethnic confrontation between citizens of one state, which was relatively new for Soviet Republics, but known as tens or even hundreds of cases around the globe. It is also not the exception, when behind separatism it is possible to see annexation interests of third parties, which have territories in the region of the conflict. This is similar to our case. Major requirement in such case consists in timely prevention of local conflict transformation into the regional conflict, accompanied by continuous unmasking of annexation policy. Hidden implementation of this policy by any country is considered by international law as interference into internal affairs of other states, however open implementation is interpreted as violation of peace and announcement of war through territorial claims. In this case, it is important to timely fix the aggression fact and clearly indicate the party, which violates peace. It is usual for us to justify failures of that period by underlining impossibility of

such measures due to centralization of Soviet state, which means that the policy was implemented from a single center. Supporters of this position forget that under the same circumstances the Parliament of soviet Armenia adopted resolution about annexation of DGAR, repeating de-jure (de-facto by their successors) anschluss by Germany of part of Czekoslovakia. Allowing the conflict to move to regional level, Azerbaijan under these circumstances was unable to strengthen its positions and did not undertake measures assisting to creation consolidated platform of Georgia and Azerbaijan since they are subject of threats to annex their territories by separatism and ethnic cleansing. Attempts to create such platform within the framework of the last summit of GUUAM in Kishinev demonstrate comprehension of incorrectness of policy implemented earlier, as well as dependant mood, which both in Georgia and Azerbaijan brought to transformation of regional conflicts of South Caucasus into overe-gional. Thus, despite that Armenia from the very start was an active party of the conflict, widening of its authority was due to fault of Azerbaijan, which always underlined instigation activity of this country, but did not achieve legal evaluation of Armenia's territorial claims. At this stage Azerbaijan could not use opportunity of bilateral negotiations with Armenian community of Garabagh, which would allow the conflict to stay as local conflict.

Position of the Center used to focus in its hands tk^ authority to make decision, also impeded preserving the conflict at local level. It is commonly known how the center used this authority bringing conflicts in the South Caucasus to the deadlock. There is no significant distinction between policy implemented by capital of totalitarian USSR and the capital of democratic Russia in respect of conflicts in South Caucasus. Geopolitical disturbances compressed radius of direct influence of this country to limits of "nearby foreign countries" as it called by Moscow. Support to interests of Russia here is implemented only due to "frozen" conflicts. Thus, the false policy of "dalliance" with Moscow was sentenced for failure from its start. Even today the part of political elite continues to state that "keys of the conflict are in Moscow". If this statement were true then Moscow would resolve the conflict a long time ago avoiding its transfer into international level, which devoid Russia of opportunity single-handedly define destiny of South Caucasian nations.

Conflicts never pass away without leaving any traces in political systems of countries involved in military confrontation. On the contrary., they turn into the major tool of unavoidable swamping of country into authoritarian regime, which is justified by "realities of war-time". No one of South Caucasian countries could avoid this bitter experience and post-revolutionary events in Georgia displayed that for countries of the region it will be a l,ng way to liberation from this hard heritage. Obviously, currently the ways o^f overcoming the conflicts in South Caucasus will be defined by rate of development of civil societies and institutions, strengthening of democracy, creation of independent unions and structures, which implement consolidation of democratic processes in these three republics and generation of

new intellectual and political elite of South Caucasus countries. For the time being, political instability in Azerbaijan and Armenia, instability, which is caused by distinctly displayed necessity to change ruling elites, makes it difficult to comprehend that only peaceful negotiations may ultimately bring conflicting parties to peace and development of system of mutual protection guarantees, stability and cooperation in the region.

A fragile ceasefire in the region established since May 1994 is frequently broken by conflicting parties while deterioration of internal situation, which as a rule coincide with periods of parliamentary and presidential elections in Azerbaijan and Armenia. These deteriorations are also evidence of use by ruling elites of these two countries of methods, which were popular during former USSR era but absolutely useless for further strengthening of authoritarian regime. No doubt, if the region would be under distinguishing geopolitical conditions and Azerbaijan would not possess strategic oil reserves, the conflict most probably had been resolved up to now. The problem is that several large countries and superpower as USA have their own "vitaly important, strategic" interests, tied in a knot of contradictions and not always openly stated. Thus, internationalization of the conflict has brought to situation then its resolution involves such countries as USA, Russia, leading states of Western Europe (separately and together within the structures of EC and EU), Turkey, Iran. Is it possible to reach a resolution at such broad range of political interests of these countries?! Russia attempts to gain back influence possessed by former USSR in the region. Iran, seriously concerned by possible arrival of NATO and USA into the region, opposes these plans by all possible means. Western Europe is embarrassed by interpretation of essence of "nearby neighboring" policy towards south Caucasus. Turkey, evidently a bit tired of unilaterally defending position of Azerbaijan due to conditions stipulated to this country for entering into EU. Under these circumstances such cataclysms as displacement of President and shooting in parliament of Armenia must be considered from viewpoint of continuous struggle of geopolitical interests, which are far from planning of immediate regulation of conflicts in South Caucasus. Interested countries prescribe various roles to three Republics of South Caucasus, however, it is clear that full-scaled implementation of someone's ambitions is possible only under condition of entering of these republics into a single geopolitical domain.

So, it should be admitted that Gärabagh issue has turned into complex knot of diverse problem, which resolution can be hardly reached unilaterally in modern world. Attempts of Armenians to convince everyone that the problem is resolved by military operations, means in fact that Yerevan appeals to result of war, but in this case refute the similar right of opposite side. Nobody takes into account this aspect, however it must be taken into consideration. Both sides explain their positions in war terms and simultaneously refuse of them. The last resolution of Parliamentary Assembly of Council of Europe (PACE) made clear this issue:

"Assembly confirms that separation of the region from the state and its sovereignty may be reached as a result of peaceful and legal process, based on democratic support of population of the region, but not through armed conflict, which leads to ethnic withdrawal and de-facto annexation of this territory by other state. Parliamentary Assembly repeats that occupation of foreign territory by a country-member of CE is the serious violation of obligations of this state as member of Council of Europe and confirms the right of people displaced from conflict zone to return to their homes". However, international community does not display its readiness to satisfy pretensions of Azerbaijan, which until now only indistinctly describes peace and situation in the conflict region after reaching an agreement and signing of peace treaty. Moreover, Azerbaijan frequently and thoughtlessly applies war rhetoric while forgetting a simple truth that a country, which decided to restore the justice by war, implements own plans without announcing its aims.

The interesting issue is discussion on dilemma whether military or peaceful way of conflict regulation must be applied. In fact, there is no dilemma at all due to obligations undertaken by Azerbaijan before entering into CE ("Assembly reminds that Armenia and Azerbaijan while entering into Council of Europe in January of 2001 undertook to use only peaceful paths for regulation of Daglyg Garabagh conflict. Thus, Assembly calls for governments of both countries to refrain from use of armed forces against each other, as well as from war propaganda"), as well as due to unjustified passive position of Azerbaijan's diplomacy, which has lost all its advantages in the course of peace process and impossibility to fulfill claims stipulating the signing of peace agreement. The program inevitably leading to strengthening of positions of Azerbaijan, support of its fair conditions proposed for peace by international community, is related to development of legal state, civil society and reinforcement of democracy, which are major arguments for emerging of such positions around the globe.

Only through joint efforts of Azerbaijani society directed to democratic resolution of Garabagh issue and adoption of realistic program of joint actions it is possible to demand attention of international community and expect changes in attitude of leading powers of the world. However, there are some obstacles related to positions of ruling authoritarian elites in two countries regarded continuation of the conflict as guarantee of stability of their regimes, which must be preserved by any means, including even violation of ceasefire regime observed now. Hopes for presidential elections in both countries were not justified and in both countries it is observed the throw back from democratic achievements, decrease of power legitimacy, their low international rating and as a result, weakness of power while easily predicted protests of opposition and community. Possible revolutions and power changes in Republics may create additional stimulus for negotiation process. However, serious politicians should not foster hopes for these hypothetic processes and need initiatives, which constitute purposeful policy and do not depend on

political situation in the country.

Initiative of Azerbaijan has to mean adoption of the concept that Armenians of Daglyg Garabagh are citizens of Azerbaijan Republic, temporarily gone out of its jurisdiction under the influence of external forces and internal separatists. It is obvious, that authorities must strengthen legality and guarantee safety of Armenian population of Azerbaijan and work in direction to make them citizens of the Republic. Any attempts of external influence and separatist activity must be condemned and known to international community. Azerbaijan have to use all available resources in order to force aggressive forces of political elite of Armenia to sit behind negotiations table and restore state border between two countries. At the same time it is necessary to make statement about separating negotiation processes with Daglyg Garabagh and Armenia. The former is the internal affair of Azerbaijan, which may attract to negotiations any party, except for aggressor country. Negotiations with Armenia may be devoted only to relations between two states and problems of removing aggression.

Let us consider rarely discussed fact that at the last (international) level, the conflict, transforming into the problem of relations between Azerbaijan and Armenia, has gone to the second plane. However, in this second plane the conflict continued to play an important role and moreover deteriorated position of Azerbaijan in negotiation process. In any case, attempts to solve the conflict by increasing a number of involved parties and level of their involvement do not give positive results. In this respect, it is required to consider the reverse version of decreasing the negotiations process to local, i.e. to initial level. This concept is also proposed in the last international document - presentation of Atkinson based on which PACE: "appeals to Government of Azerbaijan to establish contacts with political representatives of both communities of Daglyg Garabagh in order to work out future status of the region". The recommendation also contains mechanism for initiation of such negotiation process, in which also elected representatives of both communities will take part. Prior to start of this negotiation process Azerbaijan may undertake a commitment not to restart armed operations against Armenians of Daglyg Garabagh with guarantee of international forces and their observers. Analysis of present situation even if Azerbaijan may start the war, it will be war against Armenia, which fulfilled aggression and aims to eternalize this.

Insisting on "direct dialog", co-chairs of Minsk Group and international structures and even Armenia hypocritically stating that it "will agree with any decision of Armenians of Daglyg Garabagh" assist Azerbaijan to return the conflict into the phase of locality and this will cut away most aggressive participants of negotiations. The issue is which political forces are able to implement this initiative and whether they may turn into such force during parliamentary elections in Azerbaijan.

ArazAslanly
OCCUPIED AZERBAIJAN AND
THE RIGHT FOR NECESSARY DEFENSE

Among juridical documents on use of force the most harsh and serious is Bylaws of UN. After World War II in 1945 the goal in adoption of UN Bylaws was to provide peace and security for countries and nations. This is because approximately during half-century the world evidenced two world wars, which negatively influenced almost all countries of the world. Until adoption of UN Bylaws the existed international documents could not prevent World W; r 17. That is why, it was necessary to adopt juridical documents in order to provide peace and security.

All the- e are also reflected in introduction in Bylaws of UN. In Articles 1 and 2 the UN goals and principles are reflected, the 3rd clause of the second article indicates that all members will resolve international conflicts without damaging principles of ivernational peace, security and justice and by use of peaceful means. 4th clause of the second article devoted to bases of use of force prohibits to all members to threaten with use of force and direct use of force against territorial integrity and political independence of other countries and in a way incompatible with goals of UN. These clauses of UN Bylaws, especially 4* clause of article 2 openly prohibits to member countries application of force in international relations. But there are various disputes with limits and framework of this prohibition. According to some researchers, the main goal of UN consists in "Preserving international peace and security and in this aim, prevent dangers for peace, remove existed danger, impede actions directed to violation of peace by armed attacks or other means; resolve international conflicts which may cause break of peace by peaceful methods, according to bases and principles of justice of international law" and due to this prohibition of use of force is absolute prohibition and there may be no exceptions.

According to other group of researchers this explanation being within limited framework may force countries to tolerate for indefinite time period the existed injustice and actions contradicting to law. According to UN Bylaws in cases of violation of principles of respect to international law, justice, prohibition to change borders by use of force and other principles, await tolerance from country, which rights are violated mean questioning existence of these principles and ultimately existence of UN Bylaws.

In UN Agreement the sentences devoted to use of force and necessary defense is expounded in Article 51.

From this Article it can be seen that UN Bylaws prohibits use of force in general, however, within the framework of Bylaws there are cases of exception.

According to UN Agreement there are four exceptions in prohibited use of

force (according to most researchers):

1. Exceptions made until establishment of Security Council;
2. Measures, which will be undertaken against countries regarded as enemy in World War II;
3. Necessary defense;
4. Obligatory measures fulfilled according to resolution of Security Council; (some researchers regard these measures not as exceptions, but as a normal right of Security Council).

Of these initial two exceptions were never applied and there is no probability that they will be used in the future. Obligatory measures such as necessary defense and measures according to resolution of Security Council were applied (even just in few cases) and are exceptions which are in use today.

The right for necessary defense was the right which never was forbidden through the history and this is indicated in UN Agreement. However, legal limits and conditions under which this right can be applied were defined. In general, conditions of right for necessary defense are the following:

- to be the subject of armed attack; inform Security Council and after its adoption of a certain actions plan to stop use of the right for necessary defense;
- relativity;
- time period;

To be the subject of armed attack: Necessary defense must be implemented against the force which undertook attack previously. According to Article 51 of UN Bylaws this right can be used if any country is the subject of armed attack. However, no provision of UN Bylaws describes what must be understood under armed attack. Even in Resolution N3314 dated from December 14, 1974 on Definition of Essence of Attack there is no clear explanation for this. In this resolution there is no definition of direct armed attack, but definition of attack in general. At the same time, the implementation of armed attack gives the country or countries the right for necessary defense. In this case, the country which the first uses force is aggressor and this fact gives the other party the right for necessary slefense. In this respect there are also some uncertainties. It is not easy to define which party was the first to use force. However, in contradictory cases the decisions can be made according to investigations of appropriate international organizations. A number of such contradictory cases were researched by International Justice Court (IJC).

Let us consider the use of armed attack and the right for necessary defense in case of Azerbaijan-Armenia conflict within the framework of theory and practice of international law.

Despite the fact is reflected in international documents the authorities in Armenia in most cases reject this and claim that there is no aggression in the region and as if "Armenians of former DGAR struggle for independence". But sometimes

Armenian authorities use phrases evidencing their aggression. For example on 17 May, 2001 at the meeting of Armenia's parliament Ministry of defense Serj Sarkisyan said: "There are territories we have occupied. It is nothing to shame. We occupied these areas in order to provide our security. We said this in 1992 and earlier, and we say it now. May be I do not speak in a diplomatic way, but this is the truth."

While meeting of Heydar Aliyev, President of Azerbaijan, and Robert Kocharyan, the President of Armenia in August of 2002 in Sadarak, the Armenian Defense Ministry S.Sarkisyan officially recognized presence of Armenia's soldiers on occupied territory and added that it is normal. In the same speech Sarkisyan emphasized that they never regard DGAR as Azerbaijani territories.

Armenia violated 4th clause of Article 2 of UN Bylaws. In resolutions of Security Council of UN, Armenia does not openly named as aggressor and the reason of this is the vital importance of political opinions of countries- members of Council. Let us remind that Armenian Parliament keeps in force resolution adopted on December 1, 1989 on annexation to Republic of Armenia of former DGAR, which is the territory of Azerbaijan Republic.

Another fact which may bring the clarity to the subject emerged during the presidential elections in Armenia. President of Armenia claimed that nomination of R.Kocharyan is not correct from juridical viewpoint. Opponents claimed that for nomination Kocharyan must have "become the citizen of Armenia of at least ten years ago". In a response, Internal Affairs Ministry of Armenia taking as a basis resolution adopted by Armenian Parliament on December 1, 1989 issued documents regarding citizenship of Kocharyan. Thus, Internal Ministry of Armenia outspokenly admitted occupation of Azerbaijan's territories.

All these facts confirm aggressor activity of Armenia towards Azerbaijan.

If Armenia admits "we have done this", then it forces Azerbaijan to use its right for necessary defense. For example, Armenia repeatedly admitted that it behaved according to the 3^r Article of resolution number 3314 of Supreme Council of UN. Despite that Armenia does not admit that it undertook actions shown in clauses a) and b), it always admits actions indicated in clause g). Special representative of OSCE chairman, Ancy Kaspshevik while his visit to the region said: "in occupied territories of Azerbaijan there are armed forces related to Armenia's Defense Ministry and this is admitted by S.Sarkisyan, the Armenia's Defense Ministry". This action, by Nicaragua resolution of International Crime Court dated from 1986 was evaluated as armed attack and gave the other party the right for necessary defense.

Since the aggression is expanded and Azerbaijan solely could not resist it, Azerbaijan was forced to sign ceasefire (not peace agreement) agreement (in this respect there may be various opinions, but we will not consider here details of internal political approaches). However, through these years Azerbaijani officials

underlined that they will not leave forever the territories under the occupation of Armenia and will use all means, including military operations, for liberation of territories. When Armenia started aggression, Azerbaijan was devoid of necessary forces to defend the country and due to this, was forced to sign a ceasefire agreement. Azerbaijan never agreed with occupation of its territories and always made it clear that it will use all means, including use of force, to liberate its territories.

Simultaneously, Armenia's officials at various levels emphasized that they will never recognize territorial integrity of Azerbaijan, will never allow annexation of occupied territories of Azerbaijan (they mean territory of former DGAR as "Daglyg Garabagh") to Azerbaijan. Thus, contemporary world justifies necessary defense against attacks on existence and integrity and gives Azerbaijan the right for necessary defense.

It must be noted, that international law allows Azerbaijan to use armed forces for liberation of territories occupied by Armenia and in such case to inform Security Council of UN. Undoubtedly, we note this not to propagandize war or use of armed forces. We are also supporters of peaceful resolution of disputes between countries, i.e. without use of force. That is because we know that use of force may result in situations dangerous for humanity and culture. However, it must be always kept in mind that playing blind to the fact of aggression may be more dangerous for international peace and security, and ultimately for humanity and culture.

Taking this into account, territorial integrity of Azerbaijan and normal life of all citizens of Azerbaijan, suffered from occupation of Azerbaijan territories by Armenia, irrespective of their ethnic origin, must be restored. For this Azerbaijan may demand from Armenia to withdraw from occupied territories and stipulate time period as six months or a year. In this case, similar to the event of Iraqi invasion into Kuwait in 1990-1991 the Security Council of UN may define time period and develop appropriate programs. In this case Azerbaijan will have to wait for the end of defined period and results of implementation of developed programs. However, if such program would not be implemented for six months or one year period starting from now, or, if developed program will not gain required result for the indicated time period, Azerbaijan have to use its right for necessary defense according to the Article 51 of UN Bylaws. This is the obligation of our country not only to own nation, but to international law and international community.

Arif Yunusov

STATISTICS OF LOSSES IN ARMENIAN-AZERBAIJAN WAR

1. In Azerbaijan in 1988 before Garabagh conflict 390 thousand Armenians lived (approximately 6% of Republic's population). Of these 180 thousand lived in Baku and 145 thousand lived in Dag-lyg Garabagh Autonomic Region (DGAR). According to population census in 1989 in Armenia 85 thousand Azerbaijani lived (about 3 % of population). In fact, the figure was higher because in January of 1990 in Azerbaijan 208 thousand former Armenian citizens fled to Azerbaijan were recorded: 186 thousand of Azerbaijani, 18 thousand of Kurds and about 4 thousand Russians.

2. First refugees in USSR at the end of XX century were Azerbaijani, which were forced to flee Armenia in November of 1987. One month prior official date of start of Garabagh conflict there were up to 4 thousand Azerbaijani refugees from Armenia.

3. First victims of Garabagh conflict also were Azerbaijani: On February 22, 1988 near Askeran settlement the dwellers of city Agdam - Ali Hajiyevev and Bakhtiyar Guliyev were killed. All documentation about this case were later transferred to Moscow and investigation stopped.

4. Losses of both "ides through 1988 to 1994 were:

During the conflict and battles 11 thousand Azerbaijani died, of these up to 2 thousand were women of various age. Most victims were during Armenians attack on Khodjaly in 1992 - 613 people. Through this period up to 30 thousand people were wounded, of these more than 7 thousand became disabled forever. According to official data of Azerbaijan government about 5 thousand people were recorded as lost, including 320 women, 71 children and 358 elderly people. Of these, location of 783 people in Armenia is known (18 children, 43 women and 56 elderly). Through the period from 1992 to 2000 about 1086 Azerbaijani were freed from Armenian prison, including 67 children, 243 women and 246 elderly. Depth of 176 citizens of Azerbaijan in Armenian prisons officially was confirmed by International Committee of Red Cross. Through the same period 6 thousand Armenians were killed and up to 20 thousand people were wounded. According to Armenian sources over 500 Armenians are in prison in Azerbaijan or lost.

5. Ceasefire is constantly broken from both sides by use of firearms and gun-machines. Heavy artillery and artillery with aviation are not used. The exact figure of killed after 1994 is unknown. According to unofficial data through that period 2500 military Azerbaijani servicemen were killed and 3000 wounded.

6. according to State Statistics Committee of Azerbaijan by the end of 2001 there were registered 219 thousand refugees (from Armenia and Akhiska Turks fled in 1989 from Uzbekistan) and 575 thousand internally displaced people from Daglyg Garabagh. In total, there were 794 thousand people or approximately

10% of the Republic's population. According to official data of Armenian government as a result of conflict 310 thousand refugees and displaced people (8% of population) are registered in the Republic.

7. Indirect losses of both countries: in comparison to 1989 the childbirth sharply decreased and child death increased. In Azerbaijan through 1989-1999 a number of orphans increased almost by 3 times and in Armenia by 2 times. In both Republics a highest number of orphans are among refugees and IDPs. As a result of conflict and followed social-economic crisis through period of 1994-2000 up to 2.5 millions of Azerbaijani (over 30% of population) and up to 1 million Armenians (26% of population) left their countries in aim to find better life. Most of them are men between 20-40 years of age. Such flow of masculine population negatively influenced demographic structure of population in Azerbaijan and Armenia: decreased number of marriages, birth rate decrease, decrease of number of family members and all these resulted in decrease of population.

Aydm Aslanov
TO 200th ANNIVERSARY OF KUREKCHAY
TREATY ONCE MORE ABOUT GARABAGH MELIKHS

During the period of rule of Sefevids dynasty all territory of Azerbaijan was divided into four regions: Shirvan, Garabagh (or Gandja), Chukhursaad (of Irevan), Azerbaijanian (or Tebriz). Heads of these regions - beylerbeyliks were governor-generals assigned by Shakhs and called beylerbeks.

The first beylerbek of Garabagh was Shakhverdi-sultan from Ziyad-ogly clan of Azerbaijani (Kyzylbash) tribe of Kadjar. He was assigned as governor-general in 40-ies of the XVI century by shakh Takhmasib I. Nobility of this tribe possessed by pastures and lands in Garabagh. Descendants of Shakhverdi-sultan were beylerbeks of Garabagh until 1736, when Nadir-shakh took away Garabagh from Ziyad-ogly, leaving them only Gandja with district, which they possessed until 1804.

After the death of Nadir-shakh, who was killed in 1747, Azerbaijan became divided into feudal state units: khanates and sultanates. In area between Kur and Araz rivers there was established Garabagh khanate, which was one of the strongest in Azerbaijan. The founder of this khanate was Panah Ali-bek Jevanshir from Sa-rydjaly clan of Jevanshir tribe, which "stands in a row with most important statesmen of Azerbaijan in XVIII century ". In mountain part of Garabagh khanate there were small feudal units - meli-kates: Khachen, Varand, Gulistan, Dizak and Jeraberd. Since there were five melikates they jointly called Khamse.

From indicated melicates only one - Khachen had its historic roots in land of Garabagh. In XIII century Khasan Jalal, the representative of noble clan -

Mikhranids restored power of Artsakh-Khachen principality in part of ancient territory of Albania.

As Armenian historian P.Arutyunyan wrote: "Sovereigns of Khachensk district were representatives of large feudal family Khasan-Jalalyan. Building in 1240 the Gandzasar monastery, they hold in their hands secular and religious power over this district, holding both until XIX century".

Being direct descendants of Caucasian Albans, the head of Khachen principality Khasan Jalal was regarded as "Autocratic knyaz of knyazes, sovereign of Khachen ", "knyaz of Khachen and Aran " as well as "great sovereign of Albania " and "tsar of Albania".

Khachen meliks being of Alban roots evidence the fact that there is no source about population of Khachen with indications about Armenians. So called "Khachen Armenians " in historic documents name themselves as "agvans" (i.e. albans). For example, in their letter to Peter I in 1722 they named themselves as "agvans", which is a synonym of the word "Alban", This is also evidenced in the book titled "Brief history of Agvan country" authored by Katalikos of Gandzasar monastery - Esai Khasan-Jalalyan, which called territory where his ancestors lived as "Agvan".

Of four indicated earlier melikates three (Varand, Gulistan and Jeraberd) emerged on the territory of Garabagh during various periods of XVII century and Dizak even at the beginning of XVQI century.

Referring to historic sources P.Arutyunyan noted: "meliks of Varand districts were from clan of Melik-Shakhnazaryan". One of Melik-Shakhanazarov brothers - Mirza-bey in 1603 moved from Ge-garkuni to Garabagh, where he put the ground of Varand melikate.

In this respect Azerbaijani historian of XIX century Mirza Adi-gezel-bey wrote that sovereign of Varand were "Melik-Shakhnazarly - noble clan of Gekdja (Gokchi) area, from there they flee and upon arriving to Garabagh, they became dizzy by power in Varand area". To mid of XVIII century the power in Varand was captured by melik Shahnazar, who killed his brother.

In the same book of Armenian historian it is said about Gulistan, melikate: "According to legends, the ancestor of Gulistan melikate - Melik Beglyaryanov-was "Karayuzbashi" Abov, who at the start of XVII century together with subordinate people migrated from Udinian village Nij to village Talysh". In one of the documents of Yerevan Matenadaran it is said about Gulistan melikate that founders of this melikate moved into Gar bagh from Shirvan.

Mirza Adigezel bey wrote about this melikate: "Its melik was Melik-Usub. Ancestors of this melik were from Shirvan. For some period of time they lived in village Talysh. Many members of this clan were meliks. Later Melik-Usub captured Gulistan fortress and settled there". That is why in historic sources Gulistan melikate frequently named as Talysh.

P.Arutyunan in his work notes about Jeraberd melik: "ancestor of sovereign of Charaberd melikate was son of melik-Israel the melik-Esai, which killed su-ni khan and moved with his subordinates in 1687. After the death of Esai the melikate were ruled by melik-AllakuliSultan and his brother."

In this respect Mirza Adigezel-bey wrote: "Melik-Allah-Kuli was the melik of this area. His clan came herefrom Magaviz (Ma-gavuz) and became meliks here and settled on banks of river Ter-ter in area with a rough terrain named as Jermykh. Chosen Jer' mykh as a shelter, they became the independent sovereigns of area Chilabyurd) Jeraberd, and became known in that area ".

At the start of XVIII in Garabagh another melikate is emerged -Dizak. P.Arutyunan wrote about this melikate that its founder: "was melik-Egan, son of Gukas (Movses)-varda-peta. In some sources it is indicated that family of melik-Egan moved to Garabagh in the beginning of XVIII: according to some sources it is moved to Dizak from Persia, according to others - from Lori (Georgia)". More confident notes about Dizak area are seen in work of Mirza Adigezel-bey: "Meliks of this area were named Melik-Egan. They are refugees from Lori. The title of melik they received during the rule ofNadir-shakh and according to his order they became meliks." It must be also noted Dizak meliks had a large influence while rule of Nadir-skah, which assigned melik Egan as a head of other meliks of Garabagh and sometimes gave him power to rule in Khamsa. In his turn, melik of Dizak provided Iranian troops by arms and supplies during their punitive marches into north Azerbaijan territories and Dagestan.

Meliks of Garabagh participated in war with Ottoman empire on the side of Nadir-shah. They provided shah troops by supplies and forage. When the war between Ottoman empire and Iran had started, meiik Allah-Kuli, the ruler of Jeraberd, which "was the first who rushed with several horsemen from Chelyaburd onto artillery and for this he was raised to a rank of sultan ". Almost the same we may read in book of Mirza Adigez 1-bey: "Melik-Allah-Kuli showed example of unparalleled courage and prowess. Nadir-shakh considered that title of melik is insufficient for him and ordered that from this time on the simple people and nobility called him as sultan, not melik".

In order to weaken the influence of Ugurlu-khan II Gadjar, the Garabagh beylerbey, Nadir-shakh gave regions of Borchaly, Gazakh, Shamshadil to the rule of Georgian tsar. Part of Garabagh population was moved to Khorasan according to order of Iranian shah. In addition Nadir-shakh issued a decree for meliks of Garabagh "to throw away from neck of noble and simple people the chair- of obedience to Gandja khans and consider themselves free from them and all their requests and demands sent directly to sovereign ".

To the mid XVIII century Garabagh meliks had all rights of feudal rulers - had juridical and administrative power. Within their properties, meliks possessed by feudal immunity. They had their armed units. But the power of Garabagh

meliks did not spread beyond borders of their fortresses and neighbor villages. They all were vassals of Garabagh khan.

It must be noted, that the title "melik" was characteristic not only for Alban feudal of Daglyg Garabagh. The title "melik" as mentioned Azerbaijani historians belonged also to some Azerbaijani feudal of Garabagh and Shirvan. Large feudal of Gabala and Sheki also were meliks. Meliks are known in the history of Aze -baijan since Xn-XIV centuries - i.e. long time before emerging of Sefevids stpte.

Establishment of independent Garabagh khanüte on the huge territory of former Garabagh belerbeylik and enforcement of Bayat fort by Panah Ali-khan caused a serious concern of meliks, which did not want to lose their power and privileges gave them by Iranian rulers. The fierce struggle started between Garabagh khan - Panah Alik - han and meliks.

This struggle was only of political nature. This struggle was in fact intestine struggle within ruling class of feudal, characteristic for feudalism. The proof for this is appeal of Garabagh meliks to some Azerbaijani khans about joint fight against Panah Ali-khan. At first, Garabagh meliks appealed to ruler of Sheki khanate Hadji Chelebi-khan as one of the strongest rulers in Azerbaijan. In their letter to Shekhi khan they wrote: "Panah-khan came to the throne, builds a fort and reinforcements and if his idea will not be timely liquidated, later it will be impossible to resist him".

Gadji Chelebi -khan, who did not desired strengthening of power of Garabagh khan, together with his ally khan of Shamakhy, besieged a fort Bayat - the residence of Panah Ali-khan. For a month they unsuccessfully attempted to capture the center of Garabagh khanate. In the end they failed and having large human losses Sheki and Shirvan khans retreated. Gadji Chelebi-khan was forced to accept: "Up to now Panah-khan was like the silver without engraving. We came and engraved this (silver) and went back."

After this event the power of Panah Ali-khan even strengthened. Garabagh khan decided to bend all meliks to his power.

The first who recognized the power of Garabagh khan was melik Shahnazar of Varand, which daughter married to son and successor of Ibrahim Khalil-aga, khan of Garabagh. Melik Shahnazar by all means "underlined his devotion and love to khan; the latter regarded obedience of such huge personality and respectable man as a pride of his rule and regarded him with a deep respect and honor."

Then it was a turn of melik Khachen. Local population at first fiercely resisted Panah Ali-khan and forced him to retreat. However, Garabagh khan used a trick and forced Khachen melik to leave their reinforcements in mountains and went out with his armed forces to plain area. In plain area cavalry of Panah Ali-khan defeated the enemy. As a result, Khachen melik and its supporters of about two thousand people, were forced to retreat and hide in mountains of Garabagh with rough terrain. Troops of Panah Ali-khan attacked them. "For three days the

fire of battle was burned. On the third day Panah khan captured their reinforcements". To tally defeated and having up to 300 people killed, Khachen melik gave up. To remember this Panah Ali-khan built the monument in the battle field on the coast of Khachen river.

Thus, this was the second melik in Garabagh which recognized his dependence on Panah Ali-khan. "He obeyed -wrote Mirza-Jamal- and was assigned by Panah khan the melik of separate inherited property, which exists up to now. Population of Khachin [displayed] obedience and conscientiously fulfilled their obligations". Panah Ali-khan, forcing Khachen melik to obey him, allowed him to mint Khan coin - panabad. Mirza Adigezul-bey also wrote: "Melik Mirza-khan for his loyalty and favor ... started to mint a coin pure as silver, of melikate on behalf of Panah-khan".

Soon after, Allah Kuli Sultan, melik of Jeraberd, who understood usefulness of fight against Garabagh khan attempted to conclude peaceful agreement. Accompanied by noble people of his melikate he went to meet Garabagh khan to conclude the peace. "Panah-khan met them with respect and let them go, previously giving presents to him and his companions". However, peaceful relations between Garabagh khan and melik of Jeraberd did not last for a long time. Shahnazar, melik of Varand, "having hostility to Allah-Kuli-Sultan", pushed Panah-khan to break relations with Jeraberd melik.

Then melik Allah-Kuli-Sultan accompanied by a large suite visited the Garabagh khan for the second time, Shahnazar, melik of varand, said to Panah Ali-khan: "/// is hard to believe that a person who surrounds himself by such splendor will always depend on you and be faithful to you. At the first opportunity he will become your enemy and that is why to free a bag and scorn the opportunity are not the rules of great people, like you".

At the same period the ruler of Nakhchivan - Heydar Kuli-khan was a guest of Garabagh khan. Nakhchivan kHan, "noting splendor and wealth, which surrounded Allah-Kuli-Sultan, started to tell to Panah-khan that this Sultan will not obey him and! two oovereigns with equal opportunities, wealth and luxury can not exist in one town (in one state)".

As a result of these intrigues, Allah-Kuli-Sultan was captured by the order of Garabagh khan and executed the same night. Panah Ali-khan assigned his brother-melik Khatam as melik of Jeraberd area.

Despite that melik Khatam was assigned by khan, in a short time melik Khatam joined melik of Gulistan against Panah Ali-khan. These meliks fiercely resisted and for several years refused to recognize power of Panah Ali-khan.

Historian Mirza Adigezul-bey described the struggle of Panah Ali-khan with other inobedient meliks of Garabagh: "Melik-Usub of Talysh with support of this melik (melik Khatam Jeraberd -A.A.) killed his uncle and came to throne. Both these meliks, concluded an agreement between them rose the flag of hostility and

discord. They both locked in Jermykh fortress and for a long time they made sallies from there ".

Panah Ali-khan fulfilled several attacks against inobedient meliks. However, due to inaccessibility of Jeraberd fortress rebellious meliks succeeded to beat off attacks of Garabagh khan. For four years Jeraberd fortress fiercely resisted. Rebellious meliks personally headed and commanded armed units and "did not take a single step back in the struggle with him (Panah Ali-khan) ".

Only after Panah Ali-khan destroyed all areas under the crops and surrounded fortress, those within the fort were in hard situation. Azerbaijani historian wrote: "Then they (meliks - A.A.) saw that their crop lands, gardens and cattle are exterminated by peoples and troops of Panakh khan, [such] life became a burden to them. Without any way out, they left their homeland, crops and gardens and flee to Gandja. During seven years they lived in Gandja province and [Shamkur] district"".

Struggle of Garabagh khan with his rebellious vassal - melik Dizak was also fierce. Melik Isai dislocated the large portion of population of Dizak to reinforced village Tuk. There were armed units of Dizak of up to three thousand people. Several days Tuk village was under siege of khan's troops. There were bloodsheds with large human losses. Panah Ali-khän wounded in one of clashes was forced to move back. The next attempt to capture Dizak, undertaken a year later was also unsuccessful. According to Mirza Jamal: "he (Panah Ali-khan) was smashed and Melik-Isai-bey pursued him, destructing everything on his way". Only new attack of reinforcements of melik Isai, undertaken by a Garabagh khan after a short period of time brought a success to Panah Ali-khan. Defeated Dizak melik, who "saw critical circumstances, especially food shortage and lost any hope to achieve any support, decided to ask for peace"

Upon order of Panah Ali-khan, melik Isai was deprived of all his property and sent with his family to fort Shusha. There also were other safety measurements. In particular, all dwellers of Tuk village were dislocated by Garabagh khan to other areas of khanate.

After a short period, in 1759 the Garabagh khanate was attacked by Fatali khan Afshar, ruler of Urmiya, which attempted to establish his power in Azerbaijan. Once troops of enemy entered the Garabagh, some meliks took part of Fatali-khan Afshar. In this respect, Mirza Jamal wrote: "Meliks of Chilyaburd (Jeraberd) and Talysh, which fostered a hidden hostility to Panah khan, joined to Fatali khan. Six months they located nearby to fortress...".

In decisive battle meliks of Varand and Khachen supported Panah Ali-khan of Garabagh. Troops of Fatali-khan were defeated.

Thus, in 50-ies of XVIII century the Garabagh ruler Panah Ali-khan in severe intestine struggle with local feudal - meliks of Khamse, succeeded to smash their resistance and subject them. Neither support of Sheki and Shirvan khans from

north of Azerbaijan to Garabagh meliks, nor invasion of Mohammed Hasan-khan Gadjar and Fatali-khan Afshar from south of Azerbaijan, were not able to stop the process of establishment of strong khan power in Garabagh and subordinate of small feudal rulers to sovereign of this Azerbaijani territory.

Conclusions: 1) To mid of XVIII century on the territory of Garabagh a powerful Azerbaijani Garabagh khanate emerged with supremacy of Azerbaijani; 2)"Armenian" meliks of Garabagh are in fact previous Al bans. That is why, no one of families of Garabagh meliks ascended to noble, nakharar Armenian clans. These were local feudal, which were not Armenian by their origin. 3. Struggle of Panah Aki-khan against Garabagh meliks was feudal intestine fight for power. More stronger ruler forced other smaller rulers, which had land properties in Garabagh, to recognize his power¹ Garabagh khan used various means in this struggle -from marital diplomacy to armed rule.

Why Armenian historians are so insistent in attempt to display melikate of Garabagh as Armenian feudal principalities?

The box opens very easily! As wrote Armenian authors themselves, nowhere in any Armenian region by XVIII century there are traces of Armenian statehood. Only in Garabagh there were "only remnants of Armenian statehood", which is said to be in Caucasus.

Armenian authors use Garabagh meliks because feudal of Garabagh are their only chance to confirm mythic idea about existence of Armenian statehood on the territory of Caucasus. Those historians do not want to see obvious things: at the ancient times Garabagh was ethnically and politically the part of Alban state; in I-IV centuries Garabagh area was subject of Alban Arshakids, in VII-VIII centuries it subjected to great knyaz Mihranids; in XII-XIII centuries in Garabagh there was Khachen principality, which according to academician I.A.Orbeli "was part of ancient Albania", in XVI-XVIII zone of Garabagh was within Garabagh beylerbeylik of Sefevids state and then state of Nadir-shakh. From mid XVIII century to 1822 this territory was within Azerbaijani Garabagh khanate, which at the beginning of XIX century belonged to Russia. Tsar Russia recognized only one of khans of Garabagh - Ibragim khalil khan as an authoritative ruler of Garabagh region and hold negotiations only with him. On May 14 of 1805 between representatives of Russian command in Caucasus and Ibrahim Khalil khan of Garabagh the Kurekchay treaty was signed, which was an official document for conveying Garabagh territory under the rule of Russia.

Elchin Ahmedov
HISTORIC, POLITICAL
AND MILITARY STRATEGIC VALUE OF SHUSHA

At the beginning of XVIII century Azerbaijan consisted of four beylerbeylik: Tabriz, Shirvan, Chukhursad and Garabagh. Garabagh beylerbeylik with its center in Ganja city covered vast territory between Araz and Kur rivers.

In XVIII century complicated historic events happened in Garabagh. Being one of administrative units of Sefevi state the beylerbeylik of Garabagh was occupied by Ottoman Turkey in 1724. Ganja city, the center of beylerbeylik was invaded by Turkish troops.

In 30-ies of XVIII century armed attacks of Nadir shah Afshari temporarily changed situation in Iran and Garabagh. Iran revived under the rule of Nadir shah succeeded in regaining of Azerbaijan territories, including Ganja, from Ottoman empire (1735). Nadir shah was also harsh to population of Garabagh beylerbeylik existed by that time for over two centuries. This was caused by objection expressed by Garabagh beylerbeylik while inauguration held in 1736 in Mugan when Nadir shah was announced as the ruler.

In 1747 after the death of Nadir shah his state collapsed. In mid-XVIII century after the liquidation of a long lasted ruling of Iran on the territory of Azerbaijan the independent and semi-independent feudal states - khanates were created.

Garabagh khanate was one of eighteen khanates established in Azerbaijan in the middle of XVIII century. Founder of Garabagh khanate Panah Ali khan was from Javanshir kin. Panah Ali khan was the head of Otuzikiler tribe and emir of 20 thousand yards of Jevanshir and Gazakh. He announced himself a khan and ordered to build Bayat fort in Kebirli district in 1748 in order to defend Garabagh khanate from attacks of enemies.

During the rule of Panah Ali khan the first war took place at the end of 1748 in Bayat fort. This was due to attack of Haji Chelebi, the khan from Sheki. Panah Ali khan victory over Sheki and Shirvan khanates had brought him a fame. Taking into account weak strategic position of Bayat fort and difficulty to hold their troops he decided to build a new defense fort and started construction of a Ternekut fort nearby to Agdam and famous as Shahbulag.

During that period the fame of Panah Ali khan increased every day. He extended his influence over Ganja, Irevan and Nakhchyvan khanates by force and marriage diplomacy. In 50-ies of XVIII century meliks of Khamse became the subjects of Garabagh .khanate. L iter Panah Ali khan transferred the center of khanate to unreachable area and built a fort there. It was the fort of Shusha.

Building of Shusha fort started in 1750-1751. According to Garabagh historians at a some distance from Shusakend, in 1750 on a high steep mountain

the building of the fort had been started and completed in 1756-1757. Panah Ali khan made Shusha the capital, reinforced it and turned it into Fort-city. For a some period of time to a honor of Panah Ali khan it had been named as "Panahabad", later as "Shusha fort" and "Shusha".

Enemies of Panah Ali khan were concerned by construction of unmatched Shusha fort. In political events which took place after the year 1751 the name of Shusha was always mentioned. Shusha fort resisted a large number of attacks and evidenced bloody battles.

In 50-ies of XVIII century while Panah Ali khan was involved with reinforcement of Shusha fort the troops of Mohammed Hasan Gadjar, shah of Iran, attacked Garabagh in 1751. Gadjar troops made a camp in vicinity of Shusha, where they stayed for about a month. But strong fortifications of the city had forced troops of Iran shah to go back. Several years later - in 1758 Fatali khan Afshar, the ruier of Urmiya attacked Garabagh khanate with a large army. Fatali khan held Shusha under the siege for 6 months and he failed to capfi re the city.

After the death of Panah Ali khan, during the rule of mrahimkhalil khan (1763-1806) the Garabagh khanate became even stronger. On the territory of khanate strategically important forts have been built, such as Askeran, Agoglan and other forts and walls of Shusha fort.

In mid-80-ies of the XVIII century the founder of Gadjar dynasty Aga Mohammed khan came to power in Iran. In order to restore former strength of Sefevi state he strived for occupation of new territories. In 1791 as a result of struggle lasted for over ten years, Aga Mohammed Gadjar made all provinces of Iran and Azerbaijan obedient to his power and prepared to invade the northern portion of Azerbaijan.

In 1794 Aga Mohammed khan Gadjar demanded from Ibrahimkhalil khan to obey him and sent his son as a hostage. Ibrahimkhalil khan turned down his demand. Aga Mohammed khan had sent 8 thousand troops to Garabagh. But troops of Aga Mohammed khan were defeated at Askeran fort. The same year Aga Mohammed khan was forced to increase quantity of arms and troops by ten times.

In summer of 1795 a number of Iranian troops, which crossed Araz river and moved to Garabagh exceeded 85 thousand. Gadjar aimed to totally subordinate Azerbaijan and Georgia. True aim of summer attacks in 1795 consisted in occupation of new territories and filling state coffers by looting. The major obstacle, which impeded reaching this aim by Aga Mohammed khan was the fort Shusha.

To reach Shusha the troops of enemy had to cross Araz. Clearly understanding this, Ibrahimkhalil khan ordered to destroy Khudaferin bridge built long time ago. Undertaking serious efforts to defend Shusha fort, Ibrahimkhalil khan ordered to make ready cannons and deployed troops in Garabagh mountains and Shusha.

All population of khanate prepared to fight against enemies attacked Garabagh. Troops of 15 thousand people were gathered in Shusha. Along with men, women are also participated in defense. To capture Shusha the Iranian forces also used foreign forces and strongest weapons of that period. Enemy cannons under commanding of French officers three days fired Shusha. But they failed to destruct fortifications of the city.

Since the siege of Shusha was unsuccessful, Aga Mohammed khan burned surrounding villages, took away the cattle and captured a lot of people. Despite several attacks to Shusha the attacking troops had huge human losses and were repulsed. While repulsing attacks the population from the city walls thrown out fire and stones over soldiers of enemy. Garabagh historians after detailed description of Shusha fort by Iranian forces explained reasons of defeat of Aga Mohammed khan. One of the reasons of Garabagh forces over Iranian troops was guerilla war of people of Garabagh. Along the roads from forests on the shores of Araz river to Shusha fort the people fought against invaders and captured food supplied to Iran army. Thus, leaving the enemy without provisions they seriously hit army.

Siege of Shusha continued 33 days. Through this period the army of Aga Mohammed khan significantly decreased. Almost all cannonr went put of order. Thus, Aga Mohammed khan was forced to cea^e the siege of Shusha and move towards Georgia.

In September of 1795 troops of Aga Mohammed khan after fierce battles entered Tiflis. Gadjar put Tiflis on fire and went back to Mugan in the fall of 1795. He intended to spend the winter here and start a new attack to Shusha in the spring. But events, which took place in the spring of 1796 in Iran changed plans of Aga Mohammed khan.

In April of 1796 the local rulers appealed to Russian officials and as a result Russian forces under the commander General V.Zubov moved towards Azerbaijan. But this time, Russia was unable to strengthen its positions in Azerbaijan. After the death of Yekaterina II in 1796 the Russian forces were called back by Pavel I, who came to throne in spring of 1797.

When in fall of 1796 Russian forces went out of Azerbaijan Aga Mohammed shah Gadjar announced himself a shah and prepared a plan of attack to Garabagh and its invincible capital Shusha. In the spring of 1797 Aga Mohammed shah crossing Araz river led his strengthened army towards Shusha fort.

Aga Mohammed khan was concerned by his failure to capture Garabagh, including Shusha in 1794-1795. Despite that resistance to Aga Mohammed khan increased patriotism and will for fight among population, in Garabagh khanate they felt that there is a need for stronger allies in a fight with Iranian occupation. Population of Shusha yet suffered of looting and plunders of 1795. At the same time, drought in Garabagh resulted in starvation.

In this situation it was impossible to defend Shusha similar to that of

1795. Despite this, Ibrahim khan took a decision to resist the enemy. According to French historian Jan Khuren, Ibrahim khan in 1795 again destroyed Khudafarin bridges and thus provided defense of Shusha fort. Aga Mohammed khan approaching the fort understood that it would not be easy to capture Shusha and ordered his soldiers to fire from all cannons to the same part of the city wall. In his turn Ibrahimkhalil khan decided to destroy cannons of Iranian forces and attacked them with 200 soldiers. He had succeeded in this, but on his return found that gates of the fort are closed. In this situation Ibrahim khan was forced to move to Car-Balaken.

Aga Mohammed khan sent a letter to people of Shusha and offered to obey him. Shah noted that citizens had to collect 500000 ashrafi as indemnity. Thus, Aga Mohammed khan entered Shusha easily and without a fight.

After Aga Mohammed khan entered the city there were looting by Iranian army. Hundreds of people were thrown into the prison. But soon after, on July 4 of 1797 Aga Mohammed khan was killed by those close to him. After the death of shah, forces of Iran disorderly left Shusha and Garabagh.

In the II half of XVIII century under conditions of complicated internal and international situation Garabagh khanate was the feudal state of Azerbaijan which succeeded to preserve its sovereignty. Its capital Shusha was the major stronghold of Azerbaijan in fight against occupants. Courageous defense of Shusha, counter-attacks of its citizens evidence that successor of Panah Ali khan - Ibrahimkhalil khan was successful commander as well as skilful state person.

According to the Kurekchay agreement ("Promised commitment") signed between Russia and Iran on May 14 of 1805 the Russian troops were deployed in Shusha. Based on Turkmenchay agreement signed on February 10 of 1828 Azerbaijan was divided into two parts. The northern Azerbaijan was invaded by Russian troops. Until the law adopted on April 10 (1840) the territory of former Garabagh was called as "Garabagh province". By reforms of 1840 "Shusha district" was created instead of "Garabagh province" and it was given to Yelizavetpol (Gandja) province in 1868. This was in force until Soviet rule coming to power in Azerbaijan in 1920. In 1917 Shusha district during Temporary government was the administrative unit of Yelizavetpol province subjected Caucasian Committee. Through 1918-1920 during the period of Azerbaijan Democratic Republic it entered Gandja province.

Then Soviet rule came to power in Azerbaijan the issue of borders between Azerbaijan and Armenia was in responsibility of Moscow. Armenians living in mountain portion of Garabagh received a status of autonomous region on June 7, 1923 and this was due to patronizing of Soviet Russia only. Establishment of Daglyg Garabagh Autonomous Region (DGAR) no doubt was the result of farsighted and purposeful policy of Soviet Russia which used territorial claims and hostility of Armenia towards Azerbaijan. Thus the basis was put for future

territorial claims of Armenia.

Administrative territorial division of Azerbaijan was seriously violated while establishment of DGAR. This was because until establishment of DGAR in Azerbaijan there were no cities or regions named Stepanakert, Martuni, Mardakert or Hadrut. By the order of 1923 territories of Shusha, Jevanshir and Gubadly districts were divided for favor of DGAR, and Khankendi and Askeran regions were wholly taken away from Shusha district. In 1923 tens of villages of Shusha district such as Khankendi, 'Khodjaly, Kerkidjahan, Ulubab, Pirdjamal, Jamyly, Aranzemi, Ballidja, Demirchiler, Syghnaq, Garabulag, Mukhtarkend, Dagdaghan, Shusakend and Dashbashy were given to Khankendi and later on those areas the Askeran region was created.

From the day of establishment of DGAR the economic potential of Azerbaijan was directed for development of Khankendi. Consisted of 10-15 houses the Khankendi village transformed into the center of economically strong region under the name "Stepanakert". Shusha which administratively belonged to this region was put in position of dependant on Khankendi: phone lines connected Shusha to other regions of the Republic were managed from Khankendi; gas pipeline Yevlakh-Lachin was through this region; Agdam-Shusha highway was surrounded by Armenian settlements of Askeran and Khankendi. All this was done according to a certain plan and this became clear only after 1988.

It can be seen that tens years earlier there was preparation for the events of February of 1988 and basis of separatist movement was created. At the end of 1987 political and ideological activity of Garabagh Armenians increased. In November of the same year A.Aganbekyan in his speech in Paris underlined his confidence that Garabagh will soon be given to Armenia. This speech played a role of signal for start of marches in Khankendi in the beginning of 1988.

In February of 1988 in Khankendi the meetings and strikes started at which Armenians demanded annexation of DGAR to Armenia. In Yerevan also meetings were held with the same demands. The same year on September 18 Armenians by use of violence have withdrawn 15 thousand Azerbaijani from Khankendi and forced them to settle in Shusha and surrounding regions.

On January 1989 the government of former USSR in order to stabilize the situation a special governing committee was created in DGAR under the supervision of A.Volski. Despite that this committee was created in order to prevent deterioration of ethnic relations and stabilization of situation, the situation in DGAR became worse during the period of rule of the special governing committee. A.Volski, committee chairman, instead of stabilization of situation inflated the tension. As a result of his active "efforts" through a short period of time almost all enterprises and organizations were conveyed from subordination of Azerbaijan to that of the center. In all documentation DGAR was erased from composition of Azerbaijan.

Through the period of its activity the special governing committee failed to provide return of Azerbaijani fled from Khankendi to their homes. On the contrary, several other Azerbaijani villages were emptied by "assistance" of the committee. A part of withdrawn Azerbaijani population came to Shusha. In general, due to "serious care" of A.Volski the province went out of control of Azerbaijan government.

Starting from 1991 the tension in mountain portion of Garabagh was gradually increasing. Social and political situation evidenced incoming of large tragedy. At the end of October of 1991 and during November the villages in mountain portion of Garabagh, including Tug, Khodjavend, Garadagly, Imaret-Gervend and other strategically important villages were put on fire, destroyed and looted by Armenians.

Telephone communication lines of Shusha passed from Khankendi were cut on November 24 and population of Shusha and surrounding villages were absolutely isolated. As a result Khodjaly and Shusha turned out to be under the siege. On December 2, Armenian army, equipped by Russian armaments and armored machines driven mostly by Russian servicemen attacked from Khankendi the Kerkidjahan settlement. It was impossible to send army units from Shusha for support, because Russian forces closed the road from Shusha to Kerkidjahan. At the same time, Shusha itself was the target of everyday intensive shelling.

Starting from 1992 Armenian army occupied other remained Azerbaijani villages in mountains of Garabagh. Thus, on February 12 Malybeyli and Gushchular villages of Shusha were occupied by Armenian armed forces.

On February 25 at night Armenian forces by support of 366 regiment of Russian army deployed in Khankendi attacked Khodjaly and killed about thousand civilians.

After occupation of Khodjaly by united forces of Armenian and Russian armies it became clear that the next target will be Shusha. Armenians did not hide this and openly prepared to capture the city and Lachyn in order to make a corridor. Strategic position of Shusha almost zeroed probability of its easy capture. But in aim to reach Shusha, Armenians occupied our territories with unbelievable atrocity and step-by-step moved towards Shusha. What was the loss of Shusha for Azerbaijan? If one will look through the history, the political and strategic importance of Shusha will become clear.

In March there were heavy battles in surroundings of Shusha. Starting from mid of April a large number of armored machines and troops of Armenians accumulated in vicinity of Shusha. On April 29 Armenians undertook an intensive attack over Haji talasy and Dashashyran areas in surroundings of Shusha. All these attacks displayed Armenians move towards, Shusha, which was under the blockade. At night on May 7 Shusha was under fierce missile attacks by missiles of "Grad" and "Krystal" type, cannons, tanks and machine guns. Shelling continued

until the morning. From the early morning Armenians forces started to move towards Shusha from directions of Khankendi, Shushikend and Kerkidjahan. Despite that the city was defended until the evening of May 8, Armenians occupied Shusha and then villages of Kosalar and Shyrlan.

Thus, Armenian armed units deployed in mountain portion of Garabagh together with other Armenian terrorist groups fulfilled another crime on the territory of Azerbaijan Republic and captured the last remained settlement of Azerbaijani, in mountains of Garabagh - Shusha. Fall of Shusha, which once was under the siege for 33 days and was not captured, for such short time was caused by very weak defense system within the city. Our armed forces deployed in Shusha and their military training was weak in comparison to that of Armenians. It is true that there were a certain number of military equipment and troops within Shusha. Prior to the attack there were 2 tanks, 7 armored machines, 1 "Grad" missile unit, 700 soldiers, however of these 400 were dismissed for leave. According to data of Armenians they had 100 armored machines and tanks and 11 thousand soldiers.

On May 8 of 1992 by the initiative of Iran the meeting between officials of Azerbaijan and Armenia was held in Tehran. Later it became evident, that ceasefire along Azerbaijan-Armenian border and mountain area of Garabagh served for special interests of Armenia. This meeting was necessary for Armenia in order to hide from international community their true intentions. Undoubtedly, Armenian authorities were aware of preparation of attack. Because invasion into Shusha coincides with the period when Armenian authorities held negotiations in Tehran and demanded ceasefire and that is why, signed peace agreement was in force just until the ink dried. At the same time, Armenians, as always, prior to their attack spread false information about fierce attacks undertaken from Shusha over Khankendi.

This event once more proved aggressive intentions of Armenia which did not suite to any international law norms and its intention to annex Daglyg Garabagh to Armenia by use of force, violating Bylaws of UN and principles of OSCE. By capturing Shusha Armenia resolved this problem only from positions of military tactics. Political resolution of problem deepening further, was driven into the complicated course.

After the invasion into Shusha, which is the ancient musical and cultural center of Azerbaijan, Armenian forces closed the road from Shusha to Lachin and started bomb shelling of Lachin from territory of Armenian Republic. The goal of Armenian forces consisted in strengthening their positions on Azerbaijan territories and make corridor in order to connect Daglyg Garabagh to Armenian Republic. Lachin was the major obstacle to fulfill this. Soon after occupation of Shusha in a short time on May 18 Lachin was captured by army of Armenia. Occupation of Lachin displayed that the war extended beyond the borders of autonomous region and showed huge aggressor intentions of Armenia.

Azerbaijan Republic after occupation of its territories used efforts of all mediator missions and showed its intention to resolve the problem according to principles of UN and OSCE. In May of 1992 the first stage of negotiations within the framework of Minsk group of OSCE started in Rome. The meeting in Rome constituted preparation for Minsk Conference on Nagorno Karabakh and was attended by eleven countries - the USA, Turkey, Russia, France, Italy, Sweden, Czech, Slovak, Byelorussia, Azerbaijan and Armenia. But occupation of Shusha and Lachin by Armenia turned into the hurdle for Minsk conference.

It is already quite a long period of time when troubled spirits of Panah Ali khan, Ibrahimkhalil khan, Molla Panah Vagif, Nadjaf bey Vezirov, Abdulrahim bey Hagverdiyev. Khan Gyzy Khurshudbanu Natavan, Uzeyir bey Hajibeyli, Ahmed bey Agayev, Yusif Vezir Cheminzeminli, Khan Shushinsky, Bulbul, Rashid Beybutov and tens of other outstanding personalities calls for help. Now everyone understands the truth: "Garabagh belongs to those who possess Shusha". Namely loss of Shusha later played significant role in loss of other territories of Azerbaijan ...

Garabagh history, which is inseparable of Iran history or in other words, Garabagh history, which is very similar to history of Iran, reflects many tragic days. During the era of Afsharies in Iran, Garabagh was the subject of several attacks and a large number of people were killed due to attacks of Nadir Shah. Garabagh, which had a small period of calmness, faced serious tragedy. The founder of Gajar dynasty aga Mohammed khan came to throne in Iran, fulfilled massacre in most cities of Iran (khaca shah) attacked Azerbaijan and finally reached fort Shusha. Mohammed aga personally headed the troops. His arrival to Shusha started the major stage of Iranian-Russian war. A large number of human losses were in Garabagh. Due to order of Mohammed khan famous poet Molla Panah Vagif, the vizier of Garabagh, was arrested in Shusha and on the next day Mohammed khan ordered to kill Vagif. But Gajar shah was killed by his own relatives and the poet was set free.

As we already said during the rule of Gajar dynasty Garabagh went through hard times. Population of Garabagh, which lived during the relatively calm period of Nasreddin Shah rule, evidenced the tragedy during governing of Fatali Shah. At that period a new stage of Iranian-Russian war started. A lot of people were killed in Garabagh. The territory of Garabagh trampled for 10 years under feet of England, France and Russia has been lost because of indecency of Fatali shall. Only famous politician and far-sighted statesman Abbas Mirza liberated Garabagh from Russian troops. According to Gulustan and Turkmenchay agreements most cities, Garabagh region in particular, were given to Russia. After Garabagh fell under the control of Russians, Russians started to implement their policy in Garabagh. Moslem population of Garabagh was forced to live together with Christian Armenians, which was not easy and both parties clashed in a number of conflicts and had losses.

At the start of XIX century by Christian chronology, bases of Russian empire became unsteady. And immediately prior the Bolshevik movement notorious Armenian-Moslem or Azeri-Armenian conflicts took place. Armenian-Moslem war started in 1905 by Christian chronology or in 1323 by Hijra led to settlement of Armenians in Garabagh, however Moslems were forced to flee their houses for Armenians. Intentions of Russians were not limited by Garabagh only. They wanted to locate on the territory of present Azerbaijan Republic the Christian Armenians, who are extremists in a true sense of this word.

Armenians by support of Russians appropriated most portion of territory of present Azerbaijan Republic.

Due to signed Gulustan and Turkmenchay agreements Iranian government could not stop this process. In the end, Anver Pasha headed Ottoman troops freed territory of Azerbaijan Democratic Republic, including Ganja and Baku, from this evil.

Famous writer Mohammed Ordubadi in his precious book (Bloody years) wrote about atrocities, which took place in Garabagh:

"May 24, 1905 ... Armenians shooting was not halted by the government and no measures were undertaken to suppress unrest. At 12 o'clock firing was started by Armenians once again, thorough fear covered the area and killings of people, which did not see the war was very close".

From beginning of the XIX century to 1918 severe clashes took place between parties. Movement of workers generated in Russia gained victory in 1917 by Christian chronology. Despite of this, Armenian -Azeri war in Garabagh did not stop and became even deeper.

1918 was the year of Musavat revolution in Azerbaijan, which took control over Baku and surrounding towns and regions. Musa-vatists had to fight with Bolsheviks and at the same time they had to fight with Armenians in Garabagh. Finally, after two years, the governing of Musavat party was ended and in 1920 Bolsheviks returned to Azerbaijan Soviet Republic. Armenians taking advantage of this crisis, started to reinforce their positions in Garabagh and withdrawn Azerbaijani from Garabagh by use of money and force, and located Armenian families there.

During the period of establishment of Soviet rule the endless conflicts took place in the region, especially in Middle Asia and Caucasus. After Stalin became the ruler, he suppressed burning ethnic conflicts by his strong will. Despite the end of conflicts in Russia, Georgia and other places, settlement of Armenians in Garabagh continued during period of Stalin rule.

Brejnev became the head of Soviet Union after Stalin. His rule distinguished from that of Stalin and there was some mildness in policy of Union. But this mildness was not for the favor of Azerbaijan nation, on the contrary, may be namely this mildness gave a push to strengthening of Armenians position in Garabagh. Several

short-lived Soviet rulers at the end of XX century were succeeded by Mikhail Gorbachev with his policy of "perestroika". Gorbachev, who attempted to reinforce bases of Soviet Union, in fact initiated its collapse starting from 1989. Across the former Soviet Union the war for power has started. Instead of strengthening of weakened positions in Garabagh the new government was established in Baku.

Armenians taking advantage from crisis in the Soviet Union undertook serious measures to annex Garabagh to Armenia. First of all, Armenians withdraw those who were of Azerbaijani origin from the Republic and then initiated the process of annexation of Garabagh to Armenia. This resulted in bloodshed and Azerbaijan territories fell under the control of Armenians by support of Russian troops and Russian military equipment. Azerbaijan nation, which severely suffered from war and evidenced day-by-day flee of Azerbaijani from their homes, voted for nationalists. Ebulfaz Elchibey won at the presidential elections by 90% of votes. But his government also was unable to withdraw Armenians from territory of Azerbaijan.

One year later Azerbaijan nation tiring of hard economic situation and tiagic days of Garabagh war resulted in weakened fighting ability of soldier? and the nation made plans to liberate territories not b) use of armed forces, but through diplomatic paths. Finally, Elchibey distanced from the power and people voted for Heydar Aliyev. Policy implemented by Heydar Aliyev resulted in ceasefire. It has been indicated earlier that this situation continues for over 10 years.

Up to now international organizations were unable to fulfill required measures, but we believe that justice will win some day...

Faig Ismayilov
ARMENIAN VANDALISM
AGAINST MONUMENTS OF AZERBAIJAN

Occupation of territories of Azerbaijan by Armenians is a long-term process implemented through hundreds of years.

Armenians, which always lived with desire to create their own large and powerful state, passed through territories of India, Syria, Iran, France, Greece, Russia and Turkey and finally came to Azerbaijani territories. It can be said that before their arrival to Azerbaijan, they have already walked around the globe.

Armenians intending to take advantage from confrontation between Russia-Turkey and Russia-Iran at the end of XVIII and start of XIX centuries appealed for support of Russians and undertook to assist them to cause unrest within the countries of their residence. Armenians won the sympathy of Russians by creating diversions with large number of human losses on territory of Iran and especially in Turkey. In February of 1828 after signing of Turkmenchay agreement between Russia and Iran, by instigation of Russians, Armenians migrated from territories of Iran, Turkey and Russia into Irevan and Garabagh khanates. Densely

populated in those areas, they have created their own religion and later, their own state by support of Russia and other countries.

This policy of displacement, implemented by Russia for along 178 years has brought a tragedy to every Azerbaijani family. Millions of people turned into prisoners of this policy, hundreds of thousands of innocent people became victims of terror and separatism, which did not receive juridical evaluation even today.

Armenians, taking advantage from naive nature of Azerbaijani, were changing names of places of their dense population and building temples and churches in classic style for their religious ceremonies.

With increased number of Armenians in areas of their location and in workplaces they gradually withdraw representatives of other ethnicities. Since the policy of ethnic cleansing of Armenians is based on a long-term concept, at first they implemented this policy very slowly and carefully.

Their major intentions included wide allocation on those territories, mix with large nations, spread their influence in areas of residence, give their young girls as present to local influential people and implement their plans by killings if necessary.

Music: Armenians newly settled on territory of Azerbaijan, soon after mixed with local population. They took part at wedding ceremonies and holidays of Azerbaijani. Since Indian, Arabic and French music they brought here was not useful, they in a very short time learned Azerbaijan national music and language. They had not their own national music and culture because their lifestyle was that of nomads. Poetry and arts of Armenians started with Sayat-Nova, reflect history of recent times. Even Sayat-Nova, who is regarded as .Armenian classic, confessed that he used many peculiarities of Turkish culture.

At their wedding ceremonies and other events they used only Azerbaijani music. At the same time, they started to learn singing in Azerbaijani. They have learned to play on such instruments as tar, kamancha, drums such as def and nagara, percussion instrument and started even to teach playing on them to Azerbaijani children. In XVIII-XIX centuries in most renown Mugham trios of Azerbaijan the players of kamancha were Armenians. Armenians were involved in many musician groups and developed their s. kills as singers.

Starting from the early XX century they openly introduced Azerbaijani folk music and songs by composers as Armenian music. Armenians, living today with Azerbaijani -music and announcing themselves as ancient and eternal enemy of ^urkic nations, will understand once that their behavior contradicts to international convention and law and will be grateful to Azerbaijan nation for pleasure they enjoyed from Azerbaijani music.

Sculptures made of stone: In the beginning of XX century after creation of Armenian state by Russians on the territory of Azerbaijan the ethnic cleansing plans of Armenians became even intensive. Only through the period of Soviet rule

they deported over 500 thousand Azerbaijani from Western Azerbaijan. Then they started to liquidate their sacred places and cemeteries. In most cases they removed tombstones, hewed them and repeatedly used. However, figures of horses and rams -totems left in cemeteries had a special value. By such vandal actions, Armenians intended to erase a large portion of history of Azerbaijan. Despite that they attempted to remove any traces of Azerbaijani, in most archives around the globe there are information about these territories.

It is noteworthy that figures of horses and rams, inscribed stories and ornamental carvings are characteristic for regions of Irevan, Dereleyaz, Zangezur, Nakhchivan and Garabagh. Large number of these figures and variety of their style give detailed information about art of sculptures made of stone in our country.

Stony figures of ram in those territories are various by their extensions. The length of largest of them is 150 cm, its height 110 cm and the length and height of smallest one are 45 cm and 30 cm respectively,

Figure of ram dated back to 1577 in cemetery of Urud village in region Sisyan and carvings in form of stories attributed to XVI century were rare samples of craft of carving over the stone.

In 1834 French traveler Lubua-de Monpere noted that he had seen across Garabagh a lot of figures of animals made of stone and evidenced a deep respect of local population to those figures. These notes are not about Armenians. These figures are the only monuments, which Armenians failed to appropriate. Travelers arrived at Azerbaijan through that period did not indicate settlement of a large number of Armenians in Garabagh, as Armenians claim now.

By cutting these figures into pieces, Armenians transfer them to other regions and use them for other purposes. They destroyed with unbelievable cruelty about 100 thousands samples of art and tombs in Western Azerbaijan and other occupied territories. Now there is not a single intact cemetery on territories under occupation.

Architectural monuments: Ethnic cleansing policy of Armenians also touched our historic and architectural monuments on occupied territories. In Garabagh and surrounding regions only over thousand historic, architectural and cultural monuments existed and most portion of them were totally or partially destroyed by Armenians. Today in Western Azerbaijan there is not a single historic and cultural monument or tombstone belonged to Azerbaijani.

Armenians implement policy of vandalism in a planned manner in Garabagh or any other region of Azerbaijan. They think that bydestroying historic monuments it is possible to prove that Azerbaijani did not live on these territories. However, they are mistaken, and it is not easy to erase Azeri Turks from historic sources.

Most ancient samples of images made over the stone by carving and scratching techniques and made by people in our territories from Neolite age to the

XX century are found in Kelbadjar and Lachin. Ornaments over the stone are consist of floristic and geometric images and images of birds and animals.

Starting from XIII century among decorations of architectural monuments it is possible to see images of birds, animals and humans. However, they were not gibbous, they were mostly plain and made as inscriptions. To these monuments primarily belong images inscribed over tombs of Melik Ajdar nearby to Jijimly village of Lachin region and Khachin Turbetli village of Agdam region.

Unfortunately, these monuments left on occupied territories, have turned into targets of Armenian vandalism. Armenians totally destroyed such monuments as Kerbelayi Behbudaly spring in Lachin region, Hamza Soltan palace, Damirovlu sacred place, Soltanbaba, Sheikahmed Melikajdar, Khalife, Khanoglu, Panah khan tomb and two tombs in gipsy cemetery, 12 bridges, 126 cemeteries, hundreds of tombstones, historical architectural reserves in Shusha, including Haji Abbas, Haji Yusifli, Yol-gala, Khodja Merdjanly, Kocharli, Seyidli, Mamay, Govharaga, Ashagy Govharaga, mosques of Malibeyli village, dwellings, which were historic monuments, caravan-saray in Shahbulag village and many other similar monuments .

In general, during the last conflict 1200 historic monuments were totally or partially destroyed, a Gallery and 27 museums were looted, over 100 thousand exhibits were transferred to Armenia from the territory of Daglyg Garabagh and occupied territories. This is the reality of Armenian vandalism on territory of Azerbaijan in XXI century. There is no nation around the world, which music, history, cuisine, culture and arts are so deeply suffered from aggression.

Fazil Gazanfarogly **DAGLYG GARABAGH: LOST FUTURE**

Existence of program for resolution of Garabagh problem of Azerbaijan authorities or in brains or coffers of opposition, which may replace authorities in the future, fairly causes suspicion of any Azerbaijani. However, from viewpoint of interests of Azerbaijan the problem has two ways of resolution: accept occupation of territories and conclude peace agreement or mobilize army and withdraw enemy from occupied territories and in this case to face most powerful countries, which support Armenians. Both these ways do not seem real. That is why, everyone awaits what will be dictated to us by international will. And it seems that international will has no intention to refuse to support Armenia. As in former cases, Azerbaijan's ability to hold intensive consultations with Turkey is seriously limited. Especially, the fact that Turkey is not included into co-chairs of Minsk group and incomplection of resolution of North Cyprus problem forced both representatives of "one ration, two countries" to reconcile with reality. However, it must be kept in mind that Garabagh problem is more complicated than problem of

Cyprus and, if in the latter case all significant cards were in hands of Turkey, in the former case Azerbaijan has no any mean for influence. It is already over 15 years that Azerbaijan does not take part in political, economic, cultural and social institutions. Despite that ceasefire is in force for quite a long period of time, parties did not sign any document, which may make closer the resolution of the conflict and number of those killed is constantly increasing. Irrespective of what is happening in negotiations held by international mediators, the revival of war is regarded as a real danger. And despite authorities of Azerbaijan frequently emphasize that "if peace negotiations will not be successful, we will liberate our territories by war", we have to keep in mind that Daglyg Garabagh, now populated by Armenians only, has turned into most militarized zone around the globe. On the other hand, the USA, Russia and Iran holding conflicting positions, at the same time support Armenia and this evidences that if war starts Azerbaijan will not fight against Daglyg Garabag or Armenia only.

The situation is complicated by the fact that authorities of Azerbaijan through that period totally removed public organizations from resolution of this problem and the issue was given to power of several officials and kept it confidential as state secret. The most regretful thing is that despite repeated initiatives in Milli Majlis (Parliament) of Azerbaijan Republic, the governing majority refused to discuss the issue in any form.

Thus, it can be inferred that any discussions held at various levels of society due to Garabagh problem and which might influence decisions will not be allowed in the future also. That is why, the Azerbaijani government, which clearly understands the situation and uninformed society of Azerbaijan wait for a miracle in one of the proposals made at highest levels by the USA, Russia or OCSE. But there will be no miracle. Because the leading countries of the West, OCSE, European Union, International Crisis Group, Minsk group have come to common conclusion: resolve Daglyg Garabagh problem without use of force and without emphasizing territorial integrity of Azerbaijan. Even the subject of liberation of regions surrounding Daglyg Garabagh is not deliberately excluded from negotiations and they do not interested in underlining this fact as aggression by Armenia. Up to now, i.e. after ceasefire was established it is possible to observe the folloy ing: keeping Daglyg Garabagh within Azerbaijan and giving it the highest autonomy and postpone the issue of status; consider Daglyg Garabagh and Azerbaijan as part of a "common country"; governing of Daglyg Garabagh by both countries under the protectorate of Azerbaijan and Armenia; changes in Daglyg Garbagh and Armenia in form of territorial exchange of Mehri corridor; granting transition sovereignty to Daglyg Garabagh for 25 or 50 years with further recognition of its independence.

Various versions of status were proposed during various periods. I would like to remind one of these, which was proposed by Minsk group of OCSE in 1997.

According to this proposal, Daglyg Garabagh may be the state and territorial unit within Azerbaijan, providing it will be given a wide range of rights and guarantees. Despite that Daglyg Garabagh turned down this proposal, Armenia displayed intention to discuss agreement related to giving formal autonomy to Daglyg Garabagh within limits of Azerbaijan. However, Armenia's thesis that "there must be no vertical relations between Azerbaijan and Daglyg Garabagh" was fairly rejected by Azerbaijan. On the other hand, Azerbaijan, confidently refusing to discuss the version of Azerbaijan confederation, considers that it is possible to keep status-quo by keeping Daglyg Garabagh de-jure within Azerbaijan and de-facto as independent structure. This is) the most disadvantageous of all versions and is similar to continuation of aggression. However, this may be considered as a part of! strategy for gaining time. Unless the issue of status is resolved Azerbaijan holds its right to use force for restoration of its territorial integrity. According to International Crisis Group keeping status-quo corresponds to strategy of winning time both for Armenia and Daglyg Garabagh.

International organizations clearly understand that without liberation of 7 occupied regions it is impossible to define status of Daglyg Garabagh. After start of Prague process the issues, which considered as promising became more abstract with unfinished negotiations in Rambouillet. No doubt, mediators from time to time smooth extreme positions, keeping Kelbadjar and Lachin on background and express possibility to discuss withdrawal of armed forces of Daglyg Garabagh and Armenia from 5 occupied regions in surroundings of Daglyg Garabagh. Negotiations held for the last years do not consider the package resolution of problem of status.

Armenians themselves attempting to keep the status issue outside present negotiations, try to create firm basis for gaining more stable position. Their official position, according to foreign ministry of Armenia consists in basic principle of "confirmation of right for self-determination of Daglyg Garabagh population and recognition of this right at international level. Acknowledgement of this fact and its reflection in agreement by Azerbaijan will make it possible to start resolution of the problem". Namely this step will make it possible to define the status in the future according to plan of Armenians and this maneuver is considered as a major compromise, which can be made by Armenians. Sometimes Armenian officials bring to the agenda such amorphous term as "temporal mutual activity regime" during which it is envisaged to withdraw troops from occupied territories. According to this proposal, along with keeping the status issue as unresolved, everything indicates the intention to hold referendum in Daglyg Garabagh in 10, 15 or 20 years period. We have to be more interested than Armenians in saving Garabagh from insolvency. That is because the prolongation of this problem leads to day-by-day increase of Armenians statehood resources in the region. Irrespective of our false self-prizing on "Azerbaijan model of economic development" relying on oil incomes

and fairy-tails about Armenians fleeing from those territories, we hardly believe in realization of these predictions since all previous predictions failed. Real situation is that we lost Daglyg Garabagh and significant part of adjacent territories. Today our agenda must consist of gaining a share in Garabagh and gaining back by Azerbaijan of the regions surrounding Garabagh without any loss. It seems, that very real plan, similar to Annan plan proposed to Turkey in respect of Northern Cyprus, may be proposed in respect of Garabagh. In fact, proposals made by M'nsk group of OCSE and other international organization may become quite real one day. For instance, according to plan proposed by International Crisis Group "withdrawal of Daglyg Garabagh armed forces backed by Armenia may start soon from regions surrounded the entity, instead of this Armenia may request from Azerbaijan to guarantee not to use force and guarantee from international organizations for Population of Daglyg Garabagh. The final status of Daglyg Garabagh may be defined in the future through implementation of mechanism, indicated for example in peace agreement. In this case, Daglyg Garabagh may provide itself by interim status recognized at international level, continue activity and keep most of the institutions, because it will not be regarded as "illegal" since it will not violate sovereignty of Azerbaijan. Elections supervised by international organizations may be held for population. Defense army may turn into National Guard. Trading may lead to collection of custom duties. Donors may implement various programs and may issue travel programs recognized at international level". Certainly, all this is not discussed due to unconformity of this to official position of Azerbaijan, but this can be demanded from us in the near future. Position of Azerbaijan up now consists in the following: first of all, further occupation must be stopped, armed forces had to be withdrawn and IDPs have to return to their homelands. At the same time, despite that it is not possible to give Daglyg Garabagh any status, which violates territorial integrity of Azerbaijan, it is not the exception that Azerbaijan will make compromises in versions which will create de facto independence of Daglyg Garabagh. Azerbaijan government and community being unprepared for preventive measures had to use at least harmless actions in version of displacement and try to limit activity of Armenians in international arena. Resolution adopted by European Parliament about destruction of Armenian tombs in Nakhchivan is the clear example of our sluggishness. That is why implementation of the following measures may create conditions favorable for any progress in the future:

1. First of all, urgent measures must be undertaken to restore status of refugees of Azerbaijani withdrawn from territory of Armenian SSR by support of Soviet Army, their former identification cards must be recognized as juridical documents. Autonomous Republic of Azerbaijani in Armenia must be established with its Parliament, head of state elected by parliament and the government in exile has to be formed. For activity of official institutions of this country the headquarters has to be formed in one of large cities of Azerbaijan and diplomatic

efforts must be directed for its trans-formation into subject of international law. Representatives of Azerbaijani in Armenia have to require from the USA to show its sincerity as an ally and register them similar to registering of Daglyg Garabagh Republic as a non-governmental organization at Ministry of Justice of the USA. Refusal of the USA to do this will display its intercession or in worse case, the USA will be forced to refuse from registering of Daglyg Garabagh representation as a non-governmental organization.

2. In the Parliament a special group has to be formed from MPs elected from occupied territories. Participation of legitimate representatives of whole occupied territories of Garabagh instead of those of Daglyg Garabagh, which status was liquidated, may also remove the fact of Azerbaijan's Parliament being outside the negotiation process. Since Daglyg Garabagh problem is not discussed in Milli Majlis for a long period of time this allowed bureaucratic minds to lead the situation and limited discussion of new proposals.

3. If it will be impossible to stay neutral if there will be the USA-Iran conflict in any form, Azerbaijan similar to Armenia, has to attempt to become an ally of the USA. This is because to take hostile position towards neighbor countries as Russia and Iran in favor of the USA may create good opportunities for Armenia in Daglyg Garabagh dispute.

4. In the near future Azerbaijan has to require withdrawal of France from co-chairing in Minsk group of OSCE and replace it by Turkey.

5. Serious changes in army have to be undertaken in Azerbaijan in order to struggle with cases of corruption. It would be naive to think that higher army budget will make the army stronger, since now army is the structure where corruption is widely spread. Increasing political seismicity of South Caucasus region show that the losses will be minimal in a country, which is more prepared to the earthquake. Daglyg Garabagh game: Neither white figures nor bracks start. It is not known who plays this game. Everyone knows one thing: Azerbaijan society indifferently walks around the chessboard. The ^{lo}ser will be known soon.

Feliks Tsertsvadze
PROBLEM OF "GENOCIDE OF
ARMENIANS": HISTORY AND FALSIFICATIONS

For the past period the international community is feverishly imposed by a hastily fabricated new version of "genocide of Armenians" of 1915. First of all, time interval of this tragedy is sharply extended - from one to 45 years. Secondly, they decided (repeatedly!) to increase number of those killed and indicated it as 2 millions. To make their arguments more weighty they decided to quote such/authoritative person" as Adolf Hitler.

And nobody is concerned that Armenians put forth another fabrication.

On April 22, 2005 Yuriy Tsaturyan in his paper "It must not be forget!" ("New Russian word" - NRW) states: "...in 1915 in Ottoman Turkey over 1.5 million of Armenians were killed...". He confirmed his own pretentions by a statement of Hitler made before his invasion into Poland. After 4 days while broadcasting of "Ricochet" program of Russian radio in New-York the quote of Hitler was mentioned by other person, which was introduced to listeners as Armenia's Ambassador in UN Martirosyan. He explained that "genocide of Armenians" took place from 1896 to 1915 and 1.5 million of Armenians were killed through that period. Both Tsaturyan and Martirosyan are remorseless cheaters. So called quote of Hitler "...anyway who does remember today about extermination of Armenians?..." - is a deliberate lie. This lie was unmasked many years ago at the faculty of political sciences in Ankara, as well as by works of American historians, in particular Khif Leuri in book "Congress of the USA and Adolf Hitler about Armenians". Hitler never told anything like that. Newspaper "Armenian reporter" was forced to admit this on August 2 of 1984.

Mister Pariants in newspaper "In a new light" (INL) with reference to Kris Zakyan, the head of department for relations with press of Eastern-American eparchy of Armenian Church, in his paper "90 years of mourning" published April 22-28, 2005 emphasized that 1.5 millions of Armenians became "...victims of tragedy from 1915 to 1923". Penitential advertisements placed in various papers and invited to the meeting on April 24 of 2005 in Times Square in New York stated also that "...from 1915 to 1923 there were killed 1500000 Armenians...".

Such hubbubs of lobby confirm the fact that insistent statements of deceptiv: Armenian propaganda about death of 1.5 mln. Armenians in 1915 is not the other thing than bluff. Motivation of Armenian propagandists and lobbyist is clear to any sensitive person, especially to analysts: they intend to make as events of equal value of 1915 and Holocaust of Jews and then claim reparations in billions from Turkey. It is no doubts how these milliards of dollars or Euros will be spent-it will be distributed among "themselves".

A worldwide speculation is prepared and the memory of innocent victims of Moslem and Christian population of Turkey in 1915 is just the token money in hands of these dealers of politics and finances. And they even do not hide this. For example, mentioned Armenian lobbyist Pariyants, earlier worked in pro-Armenian newspaper INL, approximately a year ago from pages of this newspaper offered a bribe to authorities of the United States. He wrote: "...over a million of American Armenians - quite a powerful lobby. New Republic (i.e. Republic of Armenia - note of the author), created on remnants of Soviet Union, for the last years has received from the USA the significant aid - approximately 42 dollars per capita, US \$ 126 millions per year - note of author)... Armenians would gladly change these dollars for official acknowledgement of genocide...". I wonder whether in White House and Capitol Hill they know about this impudent offer? Do President

G.Bush, senators, congressmen know that Armenian lobby openly discuss possibility of their bribery by money of American taxpayers. I think that they have to know. In this respect, I already wrote a letter to our President G.Bush in May of last year, but unfortunately did not receive an answer. Some members of Senate and House of Representatives have also been informed. But regrettably, they played deaf to this.

While detailed consideration of tragic events of 1915 it became obvious that in mass killings of civil citizens of Turkey irrespective to their ethnicity the blame is firstly with Russia, secondly with England and Turkish authorities held only the third position. Russia was first to deport civil Moslem population on territory of Turkey across the front line. It also assisted to intensive activity of many Armenian armed forces on both sides of front line. As a result of fighting of many Armenian armed forces - of 2295705 people of civil Moslem population in eastern Anatolian provinces as Trabson, Erzindjan, Erzerum, Van, Bitlis and others the human losses constituted 1600000 people. In other words 1 million 600 thousand Moslems were killed or lost. And blame for this rests with Russians and Armenians. The England actively armed and instigated Armenians to revolt against Turkish authorities, but in most heavy and tragic moments for Armenians it is just betrayed them and left them to the mercy of fate hiding behind the phrasing of type: Britain has no constant friends, it has constant interests.

Turks struggled as they could and just copied actions of members of Entente. Proceeding from military viewpoints the Turkish authorities deported from battlefields the civil Armenian population. 700000 Armenians were deported, 300000 of these died. Turkish authorities are responsible for their death because they had to provide necessary safety measures, feeding and medical aid. Figure, which reflects a number of victims of civil Armenian population during deportation is based on many independent researches, including that of Americans, and includes a number of lost, i.e. those who flee, crossed Russian border and settled in Armenian SSR. The figure of 300 thousand coincides with data indicated by Armenian delegation on December 11 of 1918 in letter to Foreign Ministry of France, compiled exceptionally by data of Armenian sources. Consequently, it must be considered as exact. It is clear now why repeated initiatives of Turkey to create commission for so-called problem of genocide of 1915 and an nounce the truth are blocked by Armenians and its European allies - France and others: they know sensational data that losses of Turkish are much higher than that of Armenians and that tragedy of 1915 could not be classified as genocide of Armenians since Turkish authorities had no intentions to exterminate civil Armenian population. On the contrary, they held investigation of tragic deaths of Armenian population, found those guilty and prosecuted about two thousand officials for crimes against civil Armenian population. Is it possible to talk about genocide in this case? Compare this to genocide implemented by Germans against Jews. Can anyone imagine at

least a single fact of investigation initiated by Hitler in respect of killing of a Jew, prosecuting them by SS and execution? May be, Gorbachev - the Nobel Prize Laureate investigated genocide in Baku? Or the first Russian President Yeltsin with his Armenian partner Kocharyan did investigation of genocide in Khodjaly?

Besides, neither Armenians nor other nation has any juridical, legal and other bases for making any claims to Turkey for events of 1915 and events from 1915 to 1921. All mutual pretensions were once and forever resolved by agreements of 1921, which was signed by Armenians also. The international community is unaware of all this. Turkey keeps silence, because scrupulously keeps clauses of agreement of 1921, which are in force today.

Screechy and insistent propaganda of Armenians backed by powerful Armenian lobby with total absence of resistance from someone, has increased figures of their human losses in 1915 from 300 thousand to 2 millions and intend to increase it further. It is time to stop them, gentlemen. From time to time opponents blame me for repeating Turkish or Azerbaijani propaganda. First of all, I do not consider the phrase "Turkish propaganda" as something indecent. Especially on the background of Armenian propaganda, which by its organization and skills left far behind both Turks and Azeri. Thus, in April of 1999 Armenian propaganda (ArP) through the INL announced to the world that genocide of 1915 claimed lives of 1.8 mln. Armenians. In April of 2005 ArP through the same INL decreased this figure to 1.5 mln./i.e. 300 thousand Armenians were revived by version of ArP. However, after several days almost revived 300 thousand Armenians died again. In addition, they took with themselves additional 200 thousand compatriots (the author has all original issues of indicated newspapers and may display it to anyone).

It is no doubt that we deal with another exaggeration, another fabrication of Armenians based on blasphemous jugglery by hundreds of thousands of innocent spirits of Armenians. Now, let us calmly and without emotions make it clear what did happen in Turkey in 1915? Version of ArP is known. As if a number of victims of civil population by data of various Armenian sources vary within the ranges from 800 thousand to 2 millions. Due to this it is demanded from Turkey to acknowledge the genocide of Armenians and even made it as condition of its entering into European Union. France and Russia have already recognized genocide of Armenians in Turkey. At present there is an intensive pressure of lobby to Congress and Government of the USA.

However, real events of 1915 totally refute version of Armenians. It is clearly not true since it contains the long suite of falsifications and manipulations. Judge by yourselves: On November 1, 1914 Turkey entered into the war, in December its troops on the Eastern front started attack towards Kars. However, near Sarykamysh Turks defeated, the front stabilized a little further to the east from Erzerum. In January of 1915 Russian forces attacked in South front, from Persian border and round to Ararat. Once it became known, Armenian so-called civil

population held a rebellion in Turkish province of Van. By February of 1915 Armenian population of a whole Eastern Anatolia joined to rebellion. Turkish governor fled from Van and independent Armenian state was announced there. Beatings and withdrawal of Moslem population from Eastern Anatolia were very extensive.

Armenians from all Turkey were called together to Van and other settlements. Until the rebellion, Armenian population in Van constituted 33.8 thousand people or 42 % of a total number, by start of March there were 300 thousand Armenians. Situation deteriorated because a large number of Armenian servicemen deserted from Turkish army with their weapons and joined to rebels and units of Russian army. Their number constantly increased and reached approximated 15 thousand.

All these actions of Armenian population can be regarded only as unfaithful and treacherous. All irrefutable facts and documents evidence that in August of 1914 prior to Turkey's involvement with war there was a congress of "Dashnaksutun" party in Erzerum. At the congress it was announced that: "party desire that Turkey would stay neutral and party is ready to cooperate with Government in order to avoid war. However, if war starts, then members of "Dashnaksutun" party similar to other Armenians, will implement their duty as citizens...". It is impossible to refute this fact. Armenians vowed for fidelity to Turkey, which citizens they were. But when the war started, Armenians supported enemies of Turkey - Russia, England and others. The leaders of Armenian section in Turkey, members of dashnaks party, which did not keep their pledge to be loyal to Turkey, set an example to ordinary members of Armenian community. This is acknowledged by Armenian historian Papazyan, who wrote in particular: "they (Armenians) were not aware of danger... Any caution was thrown away...there was a call for Armenian volunteers to fight against Turks on Caucasus front...".

Historian Rafael de Nogaes underlined that example of treachery came from rulers of community. He wrote: "When military operations started, deputy Pasdermadjyan from Erzerum in Ottoman Assembly took a side of enemy together with all his Armenian soldiers and officers of the 3rd Turkish Army... They put on fire villages and mercilessly killed all civil Moslems...".

Lord Bris, who later became one of the most active accusers of Turks during the campaign about "genocide", jointly with "Friends of Armenia" collected money in London and armed Armenian volunteers, which took part in bloodshed in Van. After extermination of Turkish population, they gave Russians everything rest to Russian forces..."

Except for eastern Anatolia the Armenian population of Zeytun region in Kilikia also revolted. In February of 1915 the Ambassador of Russia in London proposed Englishmen to send arms to about 2 thousand rebels. And this is in the back front of Turkish army, which held defense in Western front in Daradell

region. In this situation when revolt in Eastern Anatolia started to spread over central province \ it would be absurd to blame Turkish authorities for taidng measures for safety of its army and loyal civil population.

Activists from ArP clearly understand this. That is why, talking about various facts, they carefully silence Armenian re/pits. These events preceded counter- measures of Turkish authorities, which later with activity of ArP named as genocide, although Turkey through 1908-1915, in my opinion, was more democratic state than modern Israel.

Israel up to now can not make a decision to give Arabs the rights equal with Jews. Arabs are not allowed into the army of Israel. However, lurks regarded Armenians as citizens with equal rights. They served in the army. They were trusted and given arms. This, once again refutes statement of ArP about mythic plan on extermination of Armenians. There was no such plan. No one will give arms to the nation, which one intends to exterminate. Armenian officers served at all levels of Turkish army. Armenians dominated in the spheres of finances and trade. Armenian population had their own advocates, physicians, lawyer, scientists and bishops. Thousands of Armenian churches, schools, libraries, newspapers, publishing houses were functioning in Turkey and books were published in Armenian. By March of 1915 Turkish authorities had serious bases not to trust to Armenians and in Armenian community a plot w? * planned against Turkey.

According to circular note of General Headquarters (GH) N 8682, Armenian servicemen were disarmed, but in regular army they were left in quartermaster and_engineering troops. This measure is evaluated by ArP as a first step to genocide. They say that Armenians were disarmed in order to kill them easily. This is a very naive argument, that at level of kindergarten. If Armenians at first were armed, and were disarmed only 4 months after the start of war, consequently, there were serious events, which convinced GH of Turkish army in treachery of Armenian servicemen, their violation of oath, mass desertion with arms, ammunition and military supplies.

It must be noted that circular note of GH stated, in particular: "Everywhere, where there is no aggression acts, it is necessary to control situation and refrain from any actions, which may depress Armenian population... and not to drive them to despair...". This and other similar documents adopted by authorities of Turkey in February-March of 1915, could not characterize its actions as preparation to extermination.

But ArP with insistency, which has to be applied for better things, continues to convince international community that there was some secret plan of extermination of Armenians. Their aims have been explained at the beginning of the paper.

Firdovsiyya Ahmedova
THE PROBLEM OF STATUS OF DAGLYG
GARABAGH: HISTORY AND MODERNITY

Creation of Armenian state in Caucasus became a problem displayed in the plain of international confrontation. From viewpoint of Azerbaijan's statehood, integrity of its territory the ultimately dangerous compromise was giving to Armenians of Yerevan as a political center for establishment of Armenian federation. However, Armenians did not satisfied by gaining a state in historic regions of Azerbaijan and initiated bloody conflicts by making new claims. Armenians lived in mountain portion of Garabagh attempted to announce "independence" on July 22 of 1918. On July 31 the head of Azerbaijan government Fatali khan Khoyski wrote to Mahammad Amin Rasulzadeh, the chairman of Azerbaijan delegation in Istanbul, that if Armenians will claim Garabagh, then he had to refuse to give Irevan and part of Gazakh district. Despite that according to agreement with Armenians, Irevan was officially given to Armenia providing that they will not claim other territories of Azerbaijan, they appropriated Zangezur and other territories of Azerbaijan, continuously expressed claims for Garabagh and continued armed aggression.

According to map given by Armenians to Enver Pasha their claims covered Surmeli, Nakhchyvan, Ahalkalak, Echmiadzin, Irevan, Borchaly, Gazakh, Garabagh, Zangezur and Ordubad regions.

At the stages when foreign military forces had also a political power in Azerbaijan, Armenians expressed their claims for Garabagh. By support of Ottoman military forces, Baku fall under the rule of Democratic Republic, armed Armenians in Garabagh prayed for mercy from representatives of Turkish authorities and surrendered. Greeting Azerbaijani troops with bread-and-salt, Armenian population in towns and villages of Garabagh, adopted subjection to Azerbaijan, voluntarily returned arms and expressed readiness to obey to all orders of Azerbaijan government. After the defeat of Turkey in World War II, its troops were forced to leave the region and English military units were deployed in South Caucasus under the commanding of V. Tomson, English general-governance was established in Baku and this revived Christian solidarity, which immediately was shown in position of Armenians. In December of 1918 Andronik started to spread rumors that "Garabagh is given to his power by Englishmen". On December 22, the General Thomson refuted this speculation. Starting from fall of 1918 the factor of foreign forces is shown in political plain. Armenian separatists, understanding that political and diplomatic activity will not give required results, continued ethnic cleansing policy against Azerbaijani. In order to prevent mass extermination of its population Internal Ministry of Azerbaijan Democratic Republic in January of 1919 proposed to establish temporal general-governance covering Shusha,

Jevanshir, Jebrail and Zangezur districts. On January 15 of 1919 Azerbaijani government issued an order to establish temporal general-governance. Khosrov bey Sul-tanov on January 29 was assigned as General-Governor. In this situation Armenian government outspokenly claimed mountain portion of Garabagh. Despite that this was unexpected for Azerbaijan government, it considered this absolutely baseless and in a response note had stated that Garabagh is historically the inseparable part of Azerbaijan. Armenia's protest against establishment of general-governance in Garabagh was evaluated as an attempt to break sovereignty of Azerbaijan. From beginning of 1919 between two states, Azerbaijan and Armenia, official correspondence took place in respect of mountain areas of Garabagh.

Armenian government in the beginning of 1919 considers it useful to apply principle of "historic right" and started to use government forces and various armed units for bloody clashes. In official note of Azerbaijan government it was stated that Armenian government claims for Garabagh is baseless from historic, economic and ethnographic viewpoint. Despite that Armenian government attempted to influence Azerbaijan by appealing to officials of Great Britain army units in Caucasus (Uoker, Thomson and others), their attempts gave no results. Colonel Shatelwort went to Shusha and demanded from Armenians to obey Azerbaijan Democratic Republic. Nevertheless, Armenians continued their separatist activity. In the end of April of 1919 at their congress they refused to recognize general-governance in Garabagh. Adoption of such resolutions was mostly influenced by destructive activity of Armenia's government and its representatives in Daglyg Garabagh. Foreign mediators for the first time gained experience in settlement of territorial disputes emerged between republics in Caucasus. Mainly the Great Britain and the USA were actively involved and proposed various projects. General Thomson on May 5 of 1919 announced that he had signed an order to send to exile those who involved with separatist activity. On June 5 reactionary Armenians accompanied by representatives of English commander were exile'd from Shusha to Tiflis. At the meeting held on June 6 in Armenians populated district of Shusha Armenians declared that they recognize the government of Azerbaijan. Armenians accepting principles of general-governance started to hold 'discussions. By signing agreement with Azerbaijan's government on August 15 of 1919 Armenians recognized areas of their location as territories of Azerbaijan. It was envisaged to give Armenians of Garabagh the "cultural autonomy". It must be noted that through that period the foreigners in capacity of representatives of organizations might travel to Shusha without acknowledging Azerbaijani government and without presenting any mandate to local officials. After recognition of Azerbaijan government by Armenians of Daglyg Garabagh, Azerbaijan Foreign Ministry expressed its objection to arrival of Americans to Garabagh without relative letter.

In spring of 1919 Armenians again attempted to make an agreement based on principle of territory exchange. Despite that in spring of 1918 Armenians agreed not to claim Garabagh providing that they will own Irevan, one year later they prepared bases for claiming for Sherur-Nakhchyvan area in exchange for considering Garabagh as territory of Azerbaijan. To fulfill their claim for Azerbaijan territories, the Armenian government spent finances along with military intervention. At the end of 1919 Armenian government rendered 19 million manats for "liberation" of Nagorno-Karabakh.

In order to distract attention of international community from opinion about forced annexation, Armenians (at official and non-official level) pretended that the "conflict" is caused by desire of Armenians living in Azerbaijan for self-determination. The similar claim was expressed by Armenians living in Georgia. Republic of Armenia speculating on issue of national self-determination (official support, but in fact, it is known from historic and modern experience as instigation) of Armenians densely populated territories of neighbor countries (irrespective of how this was developed historically) in fact intends to create independent or half-independent Armenian states as a stripe embracing it, in order to make easy their later occupation.

Conflict emerged within the borders of Nagorno-Karabakh and claims aimed at a same target are also traditional tactic moves of Armenians. Resolution of "Nagorno-Karabakh conflict" apart from history of Armenia's invasions into Azerbaijan could not be objective. Foreign Affairs Minister of Azerbaijan F.Khoyshi considered as incorrect the analysis of events in Nagorno-Karabakh without studies of processes in South Caucasus, and predicted that if appropriate measures would not be taken the bloodshed may repeat.,,

The fact of violent withdrawal of all Azerbaijanis from their ancient lands in Armenia as a result of bloody events due to claiming of Nagorno-Karabakh at the end of XX century is out of sight of international community. The issue of moving back of Azerbaijanis, who densely populated a vast area in Armenia (on ancient lands of Azerbaijanis), and the issue of giving them autonomy is not the subject of negotiations at all. Since the last stage of Armenian-Azerbaijan conflict is the part of process, this issue "does not draw attention" of international mediators. Presentation of Azerbaijan territories occupied by Armenians around of Nagorno-Karabakh (which also provide joining of Nagorno-Karabakh to Armenian Republic) as a safety stripe is the confession of Armenian as aggressor country. It is advantageous for Armenians, which occupied Azerbaijan's territories by mass killings and violence, to discuss the conflict at international arena: in aim to gain better results than regarding it as internal affair of Azerbaijan and at this stage re-

solve the problem according to international standards, i.e. in civilized manner, without allowing Azerbaijan to use force and create reliable image of international law after their bloody and merciless behavior.

At present due to various versions of peaceful resolution of "Daglyg Garabagh conflict" the contradiction of territorial integrity and self-determination principles is included into discussions.

As Minsk group of OCSE announced Azerbaijan's agreement on holding a referendum on status of Daglyg Garabagh will be a real compensation to Armenia for liberation of occupied territories of Azerbaijan. Resolution of the conflict, more precisely proposal to held referendum on issue of status of Daglyg Garabagh caused ambiguous attitude in Azerbaijan. Opposite positions of official and unofficial institutions and individuals once more proves the existence of potential power, which may influence resolution of the problem.

Irrespective of autonomous status form of Daglyg Garabagh within Azerbaijan, the consideration as the only way for definition of its status the referendum held on territory of whole Azerbaijan, and consider as unacceptable the establishment of autonomy at Presidential or government structures level contradict to historic documents related to initial autonomy status. In 1921-23 resolutions adopted while discussions related to Armenian population of Daglyg Garabagh were implemented by government structures or institutions of party. On July 7 of 1923 by Azerbaijan Central Executive Committee's decree Daglyg Garabagh Autonomous Republic was established. Is it possible to discuss the form and essence of autonomy, which was not established by the referendum. It would not be correct to oppose the mechanism of referendum. Established by resolution of government structure and later liquidated by government structure also, the autonomous region may be governed only by supreme government structures. Taking into account principles of democratic rule and taking as a basis the present Constitution, expression of opinion by every citizen of Azerbaijan in respect of destiny of the region, which is the portion of their own country, is quite normal. But forms of referendum make the process as useless. Prior to analyzing of present versions let us consider the history related namely to this subject. It is possible to make conclusions according to historic experience through the period of Soviet rule, starting from discussions held between two Caucasian countries to official discussions related to definition of the region status. After Soviet Russia invasion into Azerbaijan, the Bolsheviks thought it as important to stop the "game of independent republics". "Elasticity" of principle of Soviet autonomy created possibility for development of national statehood. One of the forms of "elastic autonomy" was establishment of DGAR. This territory was preserved for Azerbaijan in all versions

during discussions held by Bolshevik authorities of Russia in 1920. Discussion of Garabagh problem at the highest official level resulted in giving of autonomy to upper part of Garabagh with administrative center of the region in town Shusha. Modern Armenian politicians considered as the only "juridical basis" the resolution of Caucasus Bureau of RK(b)P Central Committee dated from July 5 of 1921 on "Inclusion of Daglyg Garabagh into Azerbaijan", could be advised⁴ to remember at least Kurekchay agreement of 1805, even without studying many thousand years of Azerbaijan history and culture. On July 4 of 1921 the forms of plebiscite for status of Garabagh were also discussed. Armenians and their supporters insisted that plebiscite must be held only among Armenians without participation of Garabagh Azerbaijani. This opinion was due to a small number of Armenians in Garabagh. However, Azerbaijan in 1921 proposed to held polls with participation of all Azerbaijani and Armenian population of Garabagh and refused to hold opinion poll among Armenians only. Another round of separatism is intensified in the region where number and influence of Armenian population is increased, policy of "ethnic cleansing" implemented against Azerbaijani and occupation of 7 regions of Azerbaijan named as "safety stripe", and Khodjaly tragedy, all this makes it possible to derive results of referendum by 100% certainty. In 1989 in contradiction to Constitution of USSR and international law the DGAR was withdrawn from subordination of Azerbaijan and given to subordination of Special Governing Committee (SGC), which subordinated directly to Federation Center. Another stage is annexation of DGAR to Armenia and liquidation of SGC. The initial version of this scenario was proposed in 1920: join to "Russia through Baku". After withdrawal from subordination of Azerbaijan it would be easy to give the region to Armenia. Principle of self-determination does not mean provision of territorial adjoining to "protector" country. Positions of parties in respect of principles proposed for resolution of Daglyg Garabagh problem will depend on their interests. Disarmament in the region, referendum, temporary status of Daglyg Garabagh, deployment of peacekeeping forces, creation of a joint commission, refuse from use of force and threats, etc. are principles which discussed in relation with Garabagh dispute through 1918-1923. These principles proposed for the last 90 years reveal the rich classification which is distinguishing and repeated at various stages. Historic cases of application of these principles for similar situations and motives will be very useful from point of view of prediction of further events and results.

Gasym Hajiyev
MATERIAL CULTURE OF GARABAGH IS INSEPARABLE
PART OF MATERIAL AND SPIRITUAL CULTURE OF AZERBAIJAN

It is about two hundred years since Armenians have turned Garabagh into the arena of tragic events, falsifying our history from time to time, fabricate their own history and force Azerbaijani to flee their homelands. Armenian "historians", which turned into a tool in the hands of policy-makers, collect "facts proving" belonging of Garabagh to Armenians, prepare "juridical documents" and try to legally substantiate occupation of territories by Armenians.

Armenian ideologists and "archaeologists" display Alban Christian monuments in Garabagh as "Armenian monuments" and even attempt to prove the whole area between rivers Kur and Araz as "ancient Armenian territories". In fact, then even were no dense population of Armenians in Garabagh and across the whole Caucasus until the XIX century and that is why tfo&e monuments could not belong to them.

Examples of material culture and numismatic samples found during archaeological researches in Daglyg Garabagh, namely in Khankendi, Aghdere, Khojavend, Shusha, and in lowlands of Garabagh, such as Barda, Terter, Aghdam, Aghjabedi, Fizuli, Beylagan, as well as in Lachin and Kelbajar reflect ancient material culture of Garabagh, its ethnic composition and culture, social-economic development and lifestyle.

In the beginning of the V century in Albania the Alban alphabet had been developed in a new form and it is considered that the alphabet was applied in official documents. Due to this, education centers were created and one of the major centers was Barda -the ancient town of Garabagh.

After advance of Christianity to Albania in the early Middle Ages (IV century) in Garabagh, which is the ancient territory of Azerbaijan, Albanian Christian monuments were built, similar to those characterizing Christian architecture of the IV-VII century. Amaras in Aghdere (in ancient Turkish this word means "white hun"), Govurgala in Aghdam (non-Moslem fort - fort belonged to Alban Christianity - G.H), Alban Christian temples in Gebele (Beyuk Amidli village), in Lachin (Agoglan), in Kelbajar (Hashavend (Khotavend), Chahartag), in Zagatala (Kilsedag, Mamruk) and in Gakh (Lekit), as well as Alban Church in Khojavend (Sos village), a building with basilica in Tezekend settlement of Aghjabedi, a temple with three half-circled apsidal in Barda are characteristic monuments of architecture, history and culture of Garabagh region of Azerbaijan.

In medieval sources there are notes which reflect existence and preservation of Alban Christian temples even after the Islam had been spread across Azerbaijan.

In spite that through various periods the religions dominated on the

territory of Garabagh had changed, population preserved specifics of traditions and national character. However, this was not the same everywhere.

Existence of various religions in Garabagh seriously influenced the social life. This played a certain role in lifestyle, spiritual life, as well as in town-building - construction of social and religious buildings, architectural styles, structure and planning of towns. The large part of population in the region in distinction to Armenians migrated here, according to their origin, language and culture consisted of ethnic groups of Turkic origin which for thousands of years lived in areas between Great Caucasus and Araz river and belonged to Caucasian group of languages. Depending on historic time interval there were various lifestyles, religious ideology and due to this, distinctive features of spiritual culture emerged. In distinction to other regions of Azerbaijan, existence of various religions in Garabagh led to serious changes occurred long after. When Alban Christianity was replaced by Islam, the fact of presence of autochthon Alban Christians in mountain areas of Garabagh was used for move of a large number of Armenian families to the region in the XIX century. They turned the local Christian Albans to Grigorian confession, assimilated, named themselves as hayks and described the area as a "part of country of hayks". Once taking a refuge in Azerbaijan, Armenians for the last period named Azerbaijan's territories as "Eastern Armenia", show these as part of "Great Armenia", regard this region as their ancient Motherland and fabricated false history of "Armenian cultural settlements". Researches show that material and spiritual culture of Upper (Daglyg) Garabagh is part of Azerbaijan culture and contradictious viewpoints are groundless.

Gorkhmaz Mustafayev

ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS AND POPULATION OF GARABAGH AND GANDJA KHANATES AT THE BEGINNING OF XIX CENTURY

Among khanates emerged on the territory of North Azerbaijan the khanates of Garbagh and Gandja had a special place. These khanates were created on the territory of Garabagh (Gandja) bey-lerbeylik, which was one of the significant administrative-territorial units of Sefevi empire.

Period of khanates is one of the most interesting and important stages in history of Azerbaijan. Despite that various aspects of history of Azerbaijan khanates have been studied by scientists, researches on demographic processes in khanates constitute the new trend in historic studies fulfilled in Azerbaijan. Demography of population embraces diverse, wide spectra of problems - dynamics of population number, ethnic and religious composition, allocation, migration, immigration, etc. Thorough studies of these problems in Garabagh and Gandja khanates have a crucial value from viewpoint of enlightening of many dark points in history of khanates in Azerbaijan.

At the start of XIX century after Aleksander I came to power in Russia the policy towards South Caucasus seriously changed. Russian empire started the policy of open aggression of Azerbaijan khanates. Assignment of P.Sisyanov as a General Commander of Caucasus in 1803 initiated the most rude military policy against nations in Caucasus. All battles of the I Russian-Iran war took place on the territory of Azerbaijan and this left deep trace in dynamics of population number and demographic processes. Soon after the start of war Russia increased the pressure over Azerbaijan, including Garabagh khanates. Under these circumstances as the only way out Ibra-himkhalil khan signed Kurekchay agreement on May 14 of 1805 and thus was forced to accept protection of Russia. By signing this agreement the integrity of Garbagh khanate was guaranteed by emperor. Thus, Garabagh khanate lost its independence and Russian forces were deployed in Shusha. Russian troops, which came to "protect" population of Garabagh, under the supervision of Major Lisanevich in 1806 killed Ibrahimkhalil khan together with other people close to him (17 people). September 13 of 1806 decree of Aleksander I assigned Mehdigulu aga as a khan of Garabagh. After the occupation of Azerbaijan's northern khanates a new governing body "Rule in Moslem provinces" has been established in 1813 for governing in Moslem provinces with its headquarter in Garabagh. Establishment of this body is considered as a significant measure undertaken for liquidation of Azerbaijan khanates and especially of Garabagh khanate. It is the interesting fact that for position of "Moslem provinces ruler" the Christian fanatic knyaz Madatov was assigned. Madatov, being the "right hand" of Yermolov, turned into the "leading landowner" in Garabagh. It is known that Azerbaijan khanates were divided administratively into mahals, mahals into the towns and villages. One year after the liquidation of Garabagh khanate in 1823, officials of Russian empire Mogilevsky and Yermolov in there reports described Garabagh khanate as consisted of 21 mahals - Sisyan, Demirchi-hasanly, Kupara, Bergushad, Vahabyurd, Kebirli, Tativ, Jevanshir, Talysh, Khachin, Kolany, Chelabyurd, Khirdapara, Dizakh, Pu-syan, Dizag Jevanshiri, Otuziki, Iyirmidord, Garachorly, Varanda, Dizakh and Adjanan-rurk.

Documents of 1727 and 1823 show that administrative units of Garabagh undergone some changes in the course of time. According to description of 1823 only Shusha town was shown on the territory of Garabagh. Evidently, town of Barda shown in documents of 1727 later had lost its value. However, while analyzing cameral descriptions of 1823 some mistakes done by Russian officials were identified. For example, final table displays that 18563 families Were registered in Garabagh. If 139 families from Jebraill registered later will be added to that figure it will reach 18702 families. Analyzing data of cameral accounting from year 1823 it can be inferred that in fact 18769 families lived.

However even most correct accounting and cameral descriptions do not allow precisely define population number in Garabagh khanate. This was also

confirmed by empire's officials. Mogi-levsky and Yermolov in their report N22 sent on May 2, 1823 indicated: "Despite our efforts we are unable to precisely evaluate population number of Garabagh... Population from one mahal is allocated across the other mahals". It can be seen that real number of population in Garabagh was higher than that indicated earlier.

According to "Notebook thoroughly describing Gandja-Garabagh province" there were of 12 mahals in 1727 within Gandja khanate. These are Gandjabasar, Sungurabad, Beyuk Kurekbasan, Kichik Kurekbasan, Dangy, Garagaya, Turkanlar, Yukhary Zeyem, Ashaghy Zeyem, Shemkurbasan and Khykhyna. From indicated mahals Gandjabasan. Sungurabad, Beyuk Kurekbasan, Kichik Kurekbasan, Kurekbasan and Dangy mahals wholly were within Gandja khanate while Garagaya, Turkanlar, Yukhary Zeyem, Ashaghy Zejyem, Shemkurbasan and Khykhyna mahals partially were belonged to Gandja.

Documents reflecting accounting after occupation of Gandja khanate by Russia give more accurate data about administrative division of khanate at the start of XX century. Cameral description held in Yelizavetpol in February of 1807 by officials of empire indicates mahals of Gandja, Kurekbasan, Shamkhor, Samukh and Ayrym. Documents reflecting cameral accounting in Yelizavetpol district in 1817 show 5 mahals here: Gandja, Kurekbasan, Shamkhor, Samukh and Ayrym.

Cameral accounting of 1831 indicate 6 mahals presence in Yelizavetpol: 1) Daglyg mahal - in south-west of the district, in Gandja mountains; 2) Shamkhor mahal located on both banks of Shamkhor riVei bordering with Shamshadil; 3) Kurekbasan mahal bordering with Garabagh province and covered mainly left bank of Kurekchay and partially right bank; 4) Gandjabasar mahal situated between Shamkhor and Kurekbasan; 5) Samukh mahal embraced mountain belt of Samukh along the right bank of Kur river; 6) Ayrym mahal, which population being nomads allocated across the whole district. It is evident that after liquidation of Gandja khanate, most probably, empire's officials in the second half of 20-ies of XIX century made changes in administrative structure of Yelizavetpol district and as a result the new - Daglyg mahal was created.

It has been shown above that whole territories of Gandjabasar, Sungurabad, Beyuk Kurekbasan, Kichik Kurekbasan, Kurekbasan and Dangy mahals and parts of Shemkurbasan, Ashagy Zeyem, Yukhary Zeyem, Turkanlar, Garagaya and Khykhyna mahals belonged to Gandja khanate. Because it was impossible to define which toponymic units in districts of Shemkurbasan, Ashagy and Yukhary Zeyem, Turkanlar, Garagaya and Khykhyna belonged to Gandja khanate and which were beyond the border of khanate, we wholly conditionally attribute them to Gandja khanate. According to evaluations in 1727 in the same district 7450 were registered as tax-payers. If to take into account only districts which wholly belong to Gandja khanate, then according to statistic data from "Notebook of thorough description" 4285 families lived in 1727 in Gandjabasar,

Sungurabad, Kichik Kurekbasan, Beyuk Kurekbasan and Dangy districts. Political disputes, armed attacks and conflicts through 30-80-ies of the XVIII lead to large human losses in Gandja khanate. Attacks of Nadir shah in 1734-1735, looting of Gandja by armed forces of Panahali khan through 1750-1751, occupation of Gandja by Ibrajimkhalil khan and troops of Irakly II in 1780, the second invasion into Gandja by armed forces of Ibra-himkhalil khan in 1795 led to sharp decrease of population of Gandja khanate.

Our studies display that empire's officials made mistakes while these evaluations also. Thus, accounting of March 2, 1804 shows 7303 people in Yelizavetpol and move of 2033 people from Gandja to Shamshadil. Adding to this figure 1119 people moved from Shusha to Yelizavetpol the figure will reach 10455. There are valuable data reflecting dynamics of population of Gandja khanate and Yelizavetpol district in Central Historic Archives of Azerbaijan Republic. According to archive documents 2517 families were registered in Gandja khanate by accounting on March 2, 1804. Data of February of 1807 shows 2025 families in Yelizavetpol district, while data of December of 1808 recorded 8913 people. Detailed accounting of 1817 in Yelizavetpol showed 17901 people.

Sharp decrease of population in Yelizavetpol in 1807 and 1808 in comparison to 1804 was due to the first Russia-Iran war. After returning back of population due to signing of Gulistan peace agreement population of Yelizavetpol district increased by two times in 1817. Cameral description held in 1833 in Yelizavetpol recorded 5424 families (12149 m.g.). This increase happened in comparison to 1817 was possible only due to migration of Armenians to Yeliza-
vetpol.

Guldane Najafli
FACTORS WHICH TRIGGERED
ATTEMPTS OF ARMENIANS TO ESTABLISH
STATE IN GARABAGH IN THE I HALF OF XVIII CENTURY

Territory of our independent and democratic Republic for many years is under occupation of Armenian aggressors and thousands of people were displaced from their historic lands. Roots of this evil policy, which was prepared for several centuries and implemented according to a certain plan, go back to ancient times. It is crucially important today to unmask diligence of Armenians, who once have not even an inch of area in South Caucasus, to create their own state for expense of Azerbaijan's territories and displayed in various documents and exaggerated false facts. Through the history the territories which were the subject of serious falsifications and appropriation by Armenians by use of fabricated facts is the territory of Garabagh. As we know, during the rule of Sefevis the country was administratively divided into bey-lerbeyliks (provinces). One of these was

Garabagh beylerbeylik with a center in Ganja city. Beylerbeys were assigned from kyzyl-bashs and they ruled those provinces by inheritance. The first bey-lerbey (ruler) of Garabagh was Shahverdi Soltan Ziyadoglu of Gadjar clan.

Garabagh province by its territory was one of the largest of state of Sefevis. Even being occupied by Ottomans in the I quarter of the XVIII century the territory of this provinces stayed unchanged. Researcher H.Mamedov wrote: "Either in the end of XVI century and start of XVIII century the territory of Ganja-Garabagh province in general was unchanged. Borders of province in the north pass along the Kur river, from the area of junction of Kur and Araz rivers border directs to the west along the Araz, Bergushad liva (province) and from here towards the north, passes the east portion of Goyce lake and further to north enters Tiflis province and elongated till Lori district, which bordered south portion of Borchaly and Tashir area". During Sefevis era the Christian melikate as a new administrative unit was created within Garabagh beylerbeylik. Armenian authors and their supporters try to exaggerate the role of five Christian melikates on territory of Garabagh and describe each melikate almost as example of "Armenian statehood", as the structure which "preserved traditions of Armenian statehood through the centuries" and simultaneously attempt to prove that Armenians were indigenous population of Garabagh. For example: Armenian historian A.Ioanissypn along with describing territories of Garabagh and Irevan as "historic territory of Armenia" where the major portion of Armenian population is gathered, showed Christian meliks on territory of Garabagh ruled during the era of Nadir shah as "practically independent rulers, holders of total power and possessors of their own armed forces".

First of all about meliks themselves: let us consider information written by XIX century annalists of Garabagh. According to Mirza Adygozel bey there were separate names for each of five regions known together as Khamsa. Name Khamsa was given due to number of regions, i.e. five. Melik Yegan of Dizak came from Lori, melik Shahnazar of Varand came from Goyce, melik Allahgulu of Chile-bord was from Maghaviz, melik Usub of Guustan (Talysh) was from Shirvan. Rulers of only one melikate - meliks of Khachin were children of Hasan Jalalyan. Other authors of "Garabagname" also confirm this fact. Even Mirza Yusif Garabagi, who was South Azerbaijan Armenian, notes in his work that meliks came to Garabagh from other areas. Other source of that period - "Tezkiret-el-mulk" does not mention. . .names of Garabagh meliks at all. This can be explained by the fact... that these melikates were smaller feudal properties in comparison to "country", secondly melikates were formed during XVII-XVIII centuries and at the start of XVIII century their status as inherited properties was not recognized".

About population of Christian melikates of Garabagh: Armenian historians and their supporters try to convince community of the following: population of Garabagh melikates consisted of Armenians. From the letter of four meliks - Isay, Shirvan, Sergej and Iosif, written to Russian tsar Peter I in 1723 it is

clear that Christians which lived on territory of Azerbaijan during that period named themselves Alban (avqan).

Major factor which pushed forward the idea to create independent state of Armenians, which were scattered across the territory of present Armenia and adjacent areas, was long lasted wars between Sefevis and Ottoman Turkey. Armenians, which took advantage of any opportunity during these wars purchased Azerbaijani territories from Ottomans. H.Mamedov citing the work "Gen-cineyi-fethi-Ganja" by the author Ibrahim Rahimizadeh shows that in 1588 the beylerbey of Ganja-Garabagh before approaching of Mohammed khan Osmanly troops to Ganja withdrawn 50 thousand people, including his own family from the town. Despite that these people crossed Araz river and settled in Garabagh, the ottoman troops came here and massacred them. However, non-Moslem meliks of Ganja-Garabagh province came to show their obedience to Ottomans and along with keeping their positions they received new territories.

Policy of Armenians, which through the history always desired to grasp territories of others and fostered an idea of "Great Armenia", suited the interests of Russia and its policy implemeted under the cover of "protection of Christians". Russian empire, aiming to occupy India and the Middle East, needed to create reliable buffer zone in conjugation area of borders of Turkey, Iran and Azerbaijan in order to be able to use this zone as military base.

Armenians tried to use their close ties with Russian authorities to favor of their national interests. That is why, in historic sources and letters along with information about South Caucasus, ethnicities located here, economy, roads, harvests, they wrote false data about number of Armenians populated various regions and their being tormented by Moslems.

Israil Ori, shown as "outstanding figure of national independence movement of Armenians", who in fact fostered insidiousness towards Azerbaijani in the I quarter of XVIII century while his meetings with representatives of authority of Russia and Western European coun tries described Armenians as "oppressed" nation, with "tragic destiny" and "being under the tyranny of giaour". Casting aspersions on Moslems he tried to justify instigation policy of Armenians. Armenian historians of XIX century, as well as modern Armenian historians inilate value of letters with indication that Armenians on territory of Garabagh live "under oppression of giaour, under conditions of starvation and destitu ion" and justify invasion of Russian forces to South Caucasus, including Azerbaijan, displaying them as a force which "liberated them from tyranny of giaour".

But they play blind when it comes to other letters, which did not reflect that social-economic situation was hard. Let as consider facts: the letter written by meliks on April 9, 1799 to knyaz Platin says: "We have everything - money, property, people capable to hold arms. But we have no one to rule our country. We pray for God to make this true. We are ready to serve you by everything we have".

In other letter, Armenians promise to give 60 thousand pood of flour and 10 thousand bulls to Russian forces in case if they will be deployed in Garabagh.

With weakening of Sefevis state at the start of XVIII century, strengthening of Russia and inclusion of South Caucasus into the sphere of interests of Russia, the Alban Katalikos and meliks changed their political orientation and played the "card of Christianity" and requested the help of their "Christian brothers".

Appeals of Christian meliks of Garabagh such as "we Christians, day-by-day we lose our Christianity under the oppression of giaour" made during that period were not the other thing that excuses to mask strategic plans of Russia for South Caucasus. Name!}, these excuses created the ground for "special care" shown by Peter I marches to regions of Azerbaijan on the Caspian sea shore. Thus, Peter I signed a decree related to Armenians on November 10 of 1724. That decree stated: "the area must be chosen for settlement of migrated Armenians in occupied territories of Azerbaijan and General Matyushkin have to be commissioned ... to regard Armenians kindly, provide their safety and give them emptied houses and fertile areas. Suspicious Moslems must be immediately withdrawn and Christians have to be located in their areas. ... Try by any means to invite Armenians to these areas and decrease a number of Moslems. However, do this in such a way, that they would not understand this."

This decree of Peter makes it clear that he paid attention and supported Armenians only due to interests of Russia. His approval to locate Armenians in provinces on Caspian sea shore, especially in regions with Moslem population was the part of his Eastern policy intended to be implemented in future.

Armenians being aware about marches of Peter I into provinces nearby to Caspian sea shore intensified their activity for mobilization. The bishop of Low Khachin monastery vardapet Miiias also participated in those marches. According to the plan of Peter I, after capture of Derbend he had to go to Shamakhy to join to armed units of Armenians and Georgians. In this respect Katalikos of Gandzasar monastery -Yesai wrote to Peter I: "... armed forces of about 12 thousand (?) people headed by Armenian meliks... nearby to Ganja together with Georgian forces are waiting for Russian tsar arrival to Shamakhy".

Armenian authors broadly apply this false figure, indicated in letter written prior to arrival of Peter I, in order to fabricate number of Armenians lived in Garabagh. However, the first reliable statistic information about population of Garabagh melikates was given in account held in 1823 due to abolishment of Garabagh khanate. According to that data in the whole Garabagh there were 18 thousand 563 families and of these only 1 thousand 559 families or 8.4 % were lived in Christian melikates.

Thus, Armenians in order to fulfill their evil policies rely on support of foreign countries, first of all, Russia. Their attempts to appropriate our territories

are clearly shown in their letters sent to those countries. However, since this evil policy had no historic roots, Armenian fancy about creation a state on Azerbaijani territories, especially in Garabagh in the I half o XVIII century, had failed.

Guntekin Najafli
INTENTIONS OF RUSSIA TO CREATE ARMENIAN
STATE ON THE TERRITORY OF GARABAGH KHANATE

One of the most powerful khanates in Azerbaijan in the second half of the XVIII century was Garabagh khanate. Through the indicated period Garabagh khanate distinguished from other khanates by presence of Christian melikates. Some of these Christian melikates being under protection of Russia, even from the period of rule of Panah Ali khan impeded centralization of power within khanate, on the one hand assisted to external forces to attack Garabagh in order to break its independence. (Garabaghname, I vol., Baku, 1989, p.36-37).

In 80-ies of the XVIII century while implementation of aggressor policy towards South Caucasus by the government of Yekaterina II the use of "Armenian card" was one of priorities. Russian military A.Suvorov, G.Poyomkin and P.Potyomkin played an active role in attempts to create Armenian state on territory of Azerbaijan, implementation of dirty plans of Armenians and establishment of close ties with Armenian wealthy people and bishops. Russian government assigned G.Potyomkin as senior commander for Caucasus and his close relative P.Potyomkin as head of defense line in Caucasus. According to order of G.Potyomkin on September 6, 1782 "...Ibrahim khan from Shusha had to be overthrown and independent Armenian province under protection of Russia had to be created in Garabagh". (O.Markova, Russia, Transcaucasus and international relations in the XVIII century, M.1961\ p. 160).

From "written inquiry of 13 articles" sent on December 21, 1782 by P.Potyomkin to Armenian archbishop I.Argutinsky it becomes evident that the General was preparing to attack Garabagh. In 10th article of his inquiry he wrote: "Please inform me where is the fort in which Shusha's khan did settle, its surroundings, how is possible to approach to this fort and by which routes it is possible to reach this famous and regarded as impregnable fort" (A.Ioannisyan. Russia and Armenian liberation movement in 80-ies of XVIII century. Yerevan, 1947, lecture 3, p.206). In order to implement this plan on April 6, 1783 G.Potyomkin in private order to commander in Caucasus wrote: "Ibrahim khan from Shusha must be overthrown, because starting from this moment Garabagh will be Armenian province depending only on Russia. Apply any measures in order to create this province. Thus, Armenians from other regions will anve here." (A.Ioannisyan. Russia and Armenian liberation movemen: in 80-ies of XVIII century. Yerevan, 1947, lecture 3, p.68). It is evident that Russian authorities by

creating all favorable conditions for "Armenian province of Garabagh" tried to provide a move of a large number of Armenians to Garabagh in order to use them for their own interests in the future.

Taking into account that through indicated period the international situation was not favorable for Ibrahimkhalil khan (Ottoman empire defeated in war with Russia was unable to defend khanates of Azerbaijan), the khan, who understood danger to Garabagh khanate, had no other way out than to make political maneuver. On April 6 the same year P.Potyomkin received a letter from Ibrahimkhalil khan with assurances that "for a long period of time I wish to be a subject of Russian throne and unlimitedly generous empress" (A.Ioanissyan. Russia and Armenian liberation movement in 80-ies of XVIII century. Yerevan, 1947, lecture 3, p.71-72). Upon familiarizing with appeal of khan of Garabagh Yekaterina II agreed that if there are no any difficulties or doubts for taking of Ibrahimkhalil khan under protection of Russia, when it is possible to sign an agreement similar to agreement with Irakli II (Collection of Russian historic society. Vol XXVII, p.756).

Further processes showed that this farsighted and diplomatic step of Ibrahimkhalil khan postponed for some period th 3 intention of G.Potyomkin to overthrown him. On May 19, 1783 knyaz in his secret order wrote: "obedience of Ibrahim khan from Shusha and his request to be regarded as Russian subject cancelled liquidation of khanate" (T.Butkov. Materials for new history of Caucasus through 1722-1803. SPb, 1896, vol.111, p. 170).

But, despite G.Potyomkin had changed his order dated from April 6 to overthrown Ibrahimkhalil khan, he did not give a clear answer to khan's request in order not to miss a chance to use khan of Garabagh against of Guba khan and secretly continue policy of "fondling" Armenians. On May 19 G.Potyomkin wrote to Yekaterina II: "When the situation will be favorable it is necessary to make Ibrahim khan obey and give his province under the rule of national authority (it means Christian melikates - G.N.). Thus the Christian state for Armenians will be created in Asia according to your promise and by my efforts" (A.Ioanissyan. Russia and Armenian liberation movement in 80-ies of XVIII century. Yerevan, 1947, lecture 3, p.74; G.Butkov. Materials for new history of Caucasus through 1722-1803. SPb, 1896, vol.11, p. 142). In May of 1783 knyaz A.Potyomkn gave an order to General P.Potyomkin: "It is necessary to support Armenians in order to create strong Christian state on territory of Garabagh ...under the supreme protection of Russia" (G.Butkov, Indicated source, vol.III,p.170).

Letter of Russian spy Reynegs "informing about depriving Ibrahim khan of the power as a result of attack of Russian forces and "restoration of Armenian kingdom" and sent to melik Abov, was captured by khan of Garabagh". (G. Yezov. Relations of Peter Great with Armenian nation, SPb, 1898, p.?????). Khan of Garabagh by use of diplomatic skills proved treacherous position of meliks and

succeeded to break their resistance. Ibrahimkhalil khan understood that Russia did not refrain from idea of influence over Garabagh and Russia just wanted to win some time. That is why he gathered about a thousand of his supporters and went to reinforce fort Shusha. (A.Ioanisyan, Indicated source, p.79).

P.Potyomkin induced Irakli II to advise Ibrahimkhalil khan to send his courtiers to the General. Obviously, Russian commanders desired to influence the khan of Garabagh through Irakli II in order to make khan to refuse from reinforcement of his positions. Finally, Mirza Vali, the envoy of Ibrahim khan arrived at Tiflis on February 6, 1784 and brought the appeal of the khan to Yekaterina II. In that appeal, Ibrahim khan along with his request to become the subject of Russia, also asked "if khan will accept to be Russian subject, whether it will be provided that no one will interfere his internal affairs and support him in fight against enemy?" (A.Ioanissyan. Indicated source. p:08). From this question it becomes evident that khan was aware of Salib attack prepared against him and tried to prevent that attack. Soon after Ibrahimkhalil khan undertook more courageous measure. In May of 1784 Haji Ismail, one of reliable friends of Ibrahim khan, went to Tiflis and on behalf of khan asked Irakli II: "If khan will agree to be the subject of Russia, will you (Irakli II -G.N.) guarantee that no portion of his properties will be given to someone other?" (A. Ioanissyan. Indicated source, p. 101). In order to prevent insidious intentions of some Christian meliks, Ibrahimkhalil khan used his diplomatic skills and tried to keep bilateral relations with Russia. In July of 1784 vizier of the khan Musa Sultan meet G.Potyomkin and then went to Petersburg, where he was regarded with a respect similar to that of ambassador of a large country (O.Markova. Indicated source, p. 184). Evidently, Russia taking into account authenticity of Ibrahimkhalil khan and power of khanate, and intending to attract Azerbaijan khanates one-by-one carefully behaved while then diplomatic relations with Ibrahimkhalil khan. Through that period due to diplomatic efforts of Ibrahimkhalil khan it was impossible to create Armenian state on the territory of Garabagh khanate.

Gyulzade Akhundova CRAFTS IN GARABAGH

The important role while studying the history and culture of any nation belongs to researches on its farming and manufacture. Manufacturing is most fully reflected in crafts existed through that period.

Azerbaijani nation through its long history accumulated a huge handicraft heritage, which honed at the expense of empirical knowledge and skills. Most of them were preserved up to now, being conveyed from generation to generation. These crafts are also widely distributed within historic-ethnographic zone of Garabagh, which is inseparable part of Azerbaijan. They are famous by their

workpieces, skillful masters and their successors.

Carpet weaving holds the leading position among widely spread crafts in Garabagh. Abundance of raw material boosted development of this craft. It must be noted, that population is historically bound to carpet weaving and gained high professional level in this. The important value for studies of weaving in Garabagh belongs to bone needle found during archaeological researches in Uzerliktepe in vicinity of Agdam, which was the first town-type settlement in Caucasus. No doubt, the needle was intended for weaving. S.Semyonov involved with studies of ancient tools also confirms that this is a weaving tool.

According to opinion of experts, carpet weaving historically started in ancient Egypt (N.Sholpo. Textile-weaving industry in ancient Egypt. Archives of Institute of history of science and techniques, vol.V, M., 1936, p. 126-127). Development of carpet weaving in Garabagh underwent simultaneously with that in Iran. There is also other opinion, for example Ropers notes: "It is most probable that Caucasian carpets were weaved from times earlier than that in Middle Asia, and it is not the exception that Caucasus is the homeland of weaving of eastern carpets, because woven fabrics, namely kilims, weaved long before all knotted (piled) carpets were better and more perfect and currently are weaved mainly in Caucasus" (H. Ropers. *Mordenlandische Teppic'i*. Berlin, 1922).

Garabagh carpets were always preferred among Caucasian carpets. By the quantity and quality of weaved carpets and *pas Shu-sha* holds the first position in the whole Caucasus (E.Zedgenidze, S.Zakharbekov, A.Ter-Egizarov. Elizavetpol province, Shusha. SMOMPK, issue XI, Tiflis, 1891, p.1 1-301). E.Zedgenidze indicates that carpets of Shusha "... lose to Persian and especially to Tekin carpets. This is caused... by lower quality of wool here in comparison to that of Tekin and Persian" (p.34). This is also confirmed by A.Piralov (*Short description of crafts in Caucasus*. Tiflis, 1900), K.Khatisov (*Crafts in Caucasus in book "Reports and researches on crafts in Russia"*, vol.II, 1894) and other authors.

In data attributed to the end of XIX century there is also indication on preferable position of Garabagh carpets on the territory of then Elizavetpol province. "Carpet weaving is widely developed in town Shusha and Shusha region". (F.Brok-gauz, I.Efron. *Encyclo-pedic dictionary*, vol. XI, SPb, 1894, p.620). In the 40th volume of the same edition, published in 1904 it is written: "Shusha is the largest center of carpet weaving in Caucasus, and carpets manufactured here are sold far away from this region and reach Moscow and Petersburg". All these notes make it possible to state that the art of carpet weaving existed in Garabagh from ancient times and reached high level of development.

Carpets were weaved by many in Garabagh. Thus, E.Zedgenidze wrote: "It is hard to define a number of craftsmen, it is not known even to local authorities. However, it can be said that all tatars are involved with weaving" (p.2). Further the author explaining reasons of inability of carpet weaving by Armenians,

moved to Garabagh during various periods, notes: "Only few Armenians are involved with carpet weaving. Armenians themselves explain this by a danger they undergo when go out to locations of nomad tatars during sheep clip for wool, while buying wool in shops is too expensive. Besides, historical and life conditions impeded development of this craft: carpet weaving is brought here by tatars from Asia; thus Armenians had to learn this from tatars, but this was impossible due to national and religious hostility between these two nations". In addition, Armenians regarded to carpet weaving as "existence on expense of women". Thus, Armenians with such attitude to carpet weaving at the end of XIX century, at the end of XX century were not ashamed to show masterpieces of neighbor nation as "Armenian carpets". Let us remind, that Armenian aggression touched not only Garabagh carpets, but also carpets of other regions of Azerbaijan. Thus, the carpet of "Achma-Yumma" type (Shusha. XIX century) belonged to Garabagh group is named by Armenians as "Karvn". "Mugan" as "Guchark", "Chelebi"- "Vishapagorg" or "Svunik". "Malvbevli" - "Vishapa-torg" or "Artsakh". "Talvsh" - "Artsakh".

Another craft - pottering in Garabagh is related to ancient times - Neolite era. During Eneolite period pottering had a nature of domestic craft and starting from Bronze age it turned into one of leading branches of manufacture. High level of pottering in Garabagh is also confirmed by a large amount of pottery found while archaeological researches in Khodjaly. Even during Eneolite to meet requirements of population in pottery their assortment was widened and potter stoves were used. Garabagh potters used potter wheels, which were one of technical innovations during the history of mankind. Pottery made in Garabagh during Bronze period was black and engraved by various geometric and plant decorations. Distinguishing feature consists in filling of lines on the surface of pottery by white matter. Samples of pottery named as "ceramics with white incrustation" are found in monuments of Shusha, Khodjaly and Gulyatag. Found in Uzerliktepe wooden tool, ceramic skimmer used for fusion of metal and the figure of a woman made of clay (K.Kushnareva. Settlement of Bronze Age on the hill Uzerliktepe nearby to Agdam, p.418), show that ceramics also was used for various purposes. During the later periods also Garabagh masters made pottery and improving them created masterpieces. Population of ancient Garabagh was also skilful in processing of metal. Population in Garabagh was the first who acquired bronze in Caucasus. (R.Eyubov. Travel to the past of Garabagh. Baku, 1993, p.17).

At the start of the I millenium B.C. on the territory of Garabagh people started to use iron. Bronze antler of deer and bronze statue of bird identified in 1930 in Dolalanlar village evidence that metal was processed since ancient times in the region. As a result of further specialization such crafts emerged as gunsmithing, black-smithing, copper processing, casting, jewelry, processing of tin and metal.

In a note dated from 1836 it is indicated that there were working 25

blacksmiths in Shusha only (D.Zubarev. Garabagh prov-ince.OPB3K, part III.SPb, 1836, p.309). In 1860 their number reached 112 (A.Sumbatzaden. Industry of Azerbaijan in XIX century, p. 15 8-159).

Jeweler's art of traditional art of metal processing in Garabagh specialized in the processing of gold and silver jewelry. The period of intensive development of jewelry started after foundation of Shusha. Golden jewelry was made by Azerbaijani. In 1860 and in 1902 in Shusha there were 8 i and 56 jewelers respectively. Jewelry made by Garabagh masters were distinguished decorations during many exhibitions. Writing about one of such exhibitions, N.Khanykhov wrote: "Here we can see enamel and niello, notches, filigrane made in Baku and Garabagh, in other words everything made by jewelers of the East. All this was created by their imagination to dress harem anchoress and for foppery of their owners, and all this has here worthy and curious representatives" (About exhibition of natural works in Tiflis. TKOCX, NI-2, p.90). In jewelry art of Garabagh the work of forming was the most distributed. There was a whole dynasty of jewelers, which founder was jeweler Abbasgulu. Masterpieces created by his successors - jewelers Rustam, Behbud, Ismail and Ali brought the fame to Garabagh jewelers. Their successors Jahangir and Fahreddin continued and preserved this art.

Bringing up of world famous Garabagh horses made the basis for blacksmithing and saddlery. According to information of sources in 1859-1860 in Shusha there were 52 farriers. Farriers also lived in surrounding small settlements. In villages this task was fulfilled by blacksmiths. While of horse-shoeing the shoes of Asian and European types were used.

The art of stone carving also was widespread in Garabagh. The roots of this art go back to Paleolite. Primary man lived on the territory of Garabagh made necessary tools from stone. Tools of stone found while archaeological researches in multistory caves of Azykh and Tartar allow to infer that Garabagh during Paleolite was one of the first centers, may be primitive, of stone carving. In the course of time fie technique of stone tools carving was improved. In middle ages the art of stone carving in Garabagh was widely spread. From this art the crafts of stonemason, sculptor, decorator, carver, gravers.

Threshers found on the territory of Garabagh and m ^de of stone enable us to derive knowledge about agriculture and about tools used for stone carving. Such stony threshers were also found in former Zangezur district of Garabagh (S.Eseyan, A.Shaginyan. Archaeological findings in Zangezur. C.A., N3, 1962, p.200). Informing about this finding Armenian authors describe it as a sample of Armenian material culture. While doing this Armenians, which created their state in ancient Azerbaijani territories, silenced the irrefutable fact that Zangezur district of Garabagh was given to Armenian SSR while its establishment in 1921. Consequently, any sample of material culture found on this territory belongs to Garabagh and its indigenous population - Azerbaijani.

Depending on nature of farming of Garabagh population there was a huge requirement in horses as a transportation mean. Samples of material culture, found during archaeological researches allow to state that in Azerbaijan the horses were saddled since II millennium B.C.

Available archive sources about craft of saddle-making in XIX- XX centuries evidence that in 1848 in Shusha there were 27 people, in 1860 - 41. E. Zedgenidze in his work shows that local saddlers made only saddles, while horse-collars and bridles are made in Nukha and Elizavetpol. In Garabagh mainly complex, heavy saddles were used, which were called as "Moslem saddles". Such saddles made by masters - *galtachi*.

Simple saddles were made for poor, while rich people used saddles made by special order, decorated by precious stones and with saddle-cloth, silver ornaments and smooth pillow. Russian poet M.Lermontov while being in Caucasus appreciated saddles made in Garabagh and Garabagh horses.

Garabagh, one of the most beautiful places in Azerbaijan, played an important role in economic, political and cultural life of Azerbaijan, as well as Caucasus. Inhabitants of this region do not resist foreign aggressors and through the history of development of the region they created samples of richest material culture. Within the framework of small paper it is impossible to totally embrace theme of development of various crafts in this region, however, from all said above it can be seen that Garabagh made significant contribution to development of world culture.

Hadjar Gasymova

GARABAGH CONFLICT AS INTERNATIONAL PROBLEM

Study of Daglyg Garabagh conflict in the social and philosophical context is of important scientific-methodological value. Thorough consideration of this problem is a special part of political studies. This conflict constitutes a certain universality by its character and nature since such conflict may emerge in any polyethnic society. Of course, we are not of opinion that the situation is typical for all polyethnic societies and think that in regions of certain geopolitical value (for example, Caucasus) emerging of such problem is related to certain regional causes.

However, this major problem is that Garabagh problem soon after its start became international and due to this its regulation was complicated. Clash^J of interests of great powers in geopolitical games taking place in South Caucasus, especially of interests of USA and Russia, opens the ground instead of problem regulation.

In diplomacy fulfilled under the name "Garabagh card" the special role plays political participation of United States, Advantages of political system of USA consists in ability to rationally use its political and economic potential by this

superpower. In addition, military superiority of this country in comparison to other large countries allows us to infer that United States can play a leading role in any conflict, including Garabagh conflict. However, as process show that despite this country is interested in resolution of conflict, it could not interfere or, may be, does not consider it necessary.

Realistically evaluating the situation, it should be noted that the role of international organizations in regulation and management of conflicts is very important. The major task is to build fruitful cooperation with international structures. International organizations predicted that major causes of conflicts in former Soviet Union and East Europe are social and political structures of countries in those regions. In any case crisis taking place in these countries are the common factor causing these conflicts. And the interesting fact is that with collapse of socialistic system the factors preventing such conflicts were liquidated.

Despite positive and helpful diplomatic efforts of countries interested in regulation of Garabagh conflict, even high status of international organizations does not provide any progress in conflict regulation process. For example, inability of OSCE to achieve any real results together with discrediting itself also decreases confidence of society into political institutions of Europe. At the same time, efforts of international organizations undertaken for resolution of conflicts meet serious hurdles and lead to emerging of crisis in those institutions. The second complex problem is that political integration process in Europe does not allow to control ethnic-political conflicts beyond the Europe. This, in its turn, creates good opportunity for United States, which is already striving for presence in Caucasus. Clashes of interests of Western Europe and the USA over the influence in Caucasus do not permit establishment of stability here. That is why, serious hurdles may arise while regulation of Garabagh conflict. If clashes of interests of great powers will deepen it is not the exception that there will be facts of violence.

That is why, territory covered by security of OSCE must be enlarged. However, in practice, OSCE today regards post-soviet countries as a laboratory for testing ethnic-political conflicts. In general, OSCE is the only political institution which provides security related to conflicts emerged in Europe and removes hurdles jeopardizing peace processes. This institution plays an important role in preventive diplomacy and collapse of Soviet Union added new experience to activity of this institution.

However, it must be noted with a regret that until now OSCE did not gain any positive results in regulation of Garbagh conflict. In fact, this political institution loses its major function - function of mediator. This is confirmed by words of OSCE representative: "if parties will not reach agreement between them, the regulation process will be prolonged". However, at present preventive diplomacy of OSCE may play a special role for regulation of Daglyg Garabagh conflict. Despite that it uses all its resources, it was unable to vtap&sQ&sA any real

work related to 4 resolutions adopted by Security Council of UN for regulation of Garabagh conflict.

Regulation of this conflict is one of issues related to implementation of concept "Defend peace". In this respect, it is ultimately important to strengthen mediator mission of OSCE and efforts of Azerbaijan's diplomacy.

Ismayil Musa
DIPLOMATIC CONFRONTATION
BETWEEN AZERBAIJAN AND ARMENIA (APRI-JUNE 1920)

From the very first days of April aggression there was severely tense "diplomatic fight" between Azerbaijan and Armenia. On April 29 of 1920 the Foreign Ministry of Dashnak government -H.Ohandjanyan sent the telegram (note) number 2886 to N.Narimanov, chairman of Azerbaijan Revolutionary Committee (ARC). The telegram contained information about sending additional troops indicated as Soviet armed units to the border of Armenia where Azerbaijan's armed forces were deployed. The note also stated confidence that new authorities of Azerbaijan will stop military operations in Garabagh and Zangezur and withdraw its troops from that region.

Deputy of RC of ARC M.Huseynov in response note (April 30, 1920) to Armenia demanded in three days: 1) withdraw their troops from Garabagh and Zangezur; 2) go back to their borders; 3) stop ethnic confrontation and hostility. In other case Azerbaijan Revolutionary Committee will consider itself in the state of war with Armenian Republic. ("Communist" newspaper issued in Russian (May 4, 1920. N2) wrote that refuse of Armenia to withdraw its troops from Zangezur and Garabagh may result with attack of Soviet forces to Armenia.)

At the same time Azerbaijan forces were ordered to stop attack on Garabagh and Zangezur, hold favorable position and be ready to defense. In telegram (May 1, 1920) signed by S.Kirov, G.Ordjonikidze and others and sent to Irevan it was demanded to withdraw troops from the territory of soviet Azerbaijan in "24 hours". It was also noted, that if this condition will not be implemented it will be considered as disregard to Soviet Russia and Russian troops will withdraw Armenian armed forces from those regions.

Immediately after receiving note of Azerbaijan government, Armenian authority appealed to Soviet Russia. Foreign Ministry of Armenia in his telegram sent to G.Chicherin (April 30, 1920; number 2659) said 1 lat a regiment of red soldiers entered Gara-bagh and Zangezur and thus attempt to join to Turkey. It was also noted that delegation of parliament members consisted of L. Shant and others will hold negotiations with Soviet Russia. In other telegram (May 3, 1920) sent to G.Chicherin (copy was set to V.Lenin) it was stated that during the period of proclaiming of independent republics in North Caucasus the territories of Zangezur

and Gara-bagh fell apart from Armenia. Presence of any Armenian forces was denied.

In note (copies were sent to V. Lenin, G.Chicherin, ARC) sent by H.Ohadjanyan on May 1 to Revolutionary Committee (G.Ordjonikidze) it said that there were no Armenian forces in disputed areas and requested to order withdrawal of Azerbaijan's troops from those regions. Desire of Armenians to use "mediation" of Soviet Russia for resolution of disputes between Azerbaijan and Armenia is clearly seen from these documents.

At the meantime, exchange of notes is intensified between Azerbaijan RC and Armenian Foreign Ministry. H.Ohadjanyan in his note sent on May 3 to M.Huseynov (copies were sent to V.Lenin, G.Chicherin, G.Ordjonkidze) in respect of note-ultimatum of Azerbaijan government from April 30 repeatedly stated that there were no Armenian forces on the territory of Azerbaijan, ami! regarding Garabagh-Zangezur as its own territories expressed its concern^k due to deployment of Azerbaijan military forces there.

The note also indicated that Azerbaijan never had authority in Zangezur and therefore it has no juridical and actual bases to regard it as its territory. Zangezur is ruled by villagers themselves, by Soviet, which consider Zangezur as inseparable part of /irme-nia. Describing himself as pacifist H.Ohandjanyan finished his notes by proposals made in order to prevent new armed conflicts: a) stop all military operations; b) start negotiations in order to resolve dispute over borders between two republics.

In response note (May 8, 1920) of Azerbaijan government to Armenian authorities, Azerbaijan did not agree with above indicated "arguments" and expressed its readiness for negotiations. On May 9, Azerbaijan RC made an appeal to "Armenian nation and Armenian government, Chicherin and everyone, everyone ...". In that appeal Armenian-Azerbaijani conflicts occurred in Zangezur, Nakhchivan, Sherur and Ordubad were reminded, the idea was underlined that in case of Sovietization of Armenia it would be easier (?!-I.M.) to agree with Armenia, and proposed to send their representatives to Baku not later than May 15 in order to hold negotiations.

On May 12 Armenia's Foreign Ministry sent a note addressed to M.Huseynov, deputy of Azerbaijan RC and Azerbaijani nation (copies were sent to G.Chicherin and V.Lenin). This note contained a lot of "interesting considerations". It said that in contrary to repeatedly and firmly expressed will of Armenians located in Garabagh and Zangezur the first step of new Azerbaijan government is directed to keep them under servitude by force. In the note aspersions were cast to Mustafa Kamal, Enve" Pasha and Nuru Pasha (they were shown as organizers of Armenian massacres in their countries and in Caucasus) and blames of Azerbaijan government for relations with them.

By this note Azerbaijan was blamed for voicing atrocities against

Moslems in Armenia and keeping silence about violence against civil Armenian population (?-I.M) in Nakhchyvan. In the end Armenian government indicated that it accepts proposal of ARC to start negotiations and informed that diplomatic representative in Baku M.Arutyunans and others are assigned as representatives for these negotiations.

Considering appropriation of Garabagh, Nakhchyvan and Zangezur regions of huge political and strategic importance, the Soviet Russia used diplomatic means and developed a special plan of military operations. There also were attempts together with some internal forces to create ideological basis for this. In this aim, the deputy of RC of Russian Federation - Garakhan, who was Armenian by origin sent telegrams to Irevan on May 15 (1101) and Baku (1102). Telegrams informed: a) positive response of Soviet Russia to proposal of Armenian government to play the role of mediator for regulation of disputes with Azerbaijan and b) required agreement of other party for mis (no doubt, this was just for formality and protocol).

Soviet Russia government stating its aim by this teiegram informed that Red Army will enter territories of Nakhchyvan, Zan-gezur and Garabagh in order to prevent ethnic clashes and bloodshed. Azerbaijan RC agreed with mediator mission of Soviet Russia. It was also advised to speed up assignment of representatives and proposed Baku as site for negotiations instead of Gazakh (due to distance from railway and from capitals of both republics, etc.) suggested by Armenia.

Despite entering under the subjection of Russia, Russian forces did not hurry to enter Azerbaijani territories claimed by Armenians and where Armenian troops were deployed. This is confirmed by telegram (June 2, 1920) of G.Chicherin sent to G.Ordjonikidze. Telegram said: "Inform government of Azerbaijan that we have to confine by entering Shusha and Jebrail... I request to inform government in Baku about objective causes of impossibility to enter Nakhchyvan and Julfa and necessity to satisfy with military status quo... Please use your influence in Baku to make Azerbaijani government to accept as disputable areas not Sherur-Dereleyaz district, but territories of Garabagh and Zangezur".

Later G.Chicherin in telegram N 168/174 dated from June 19, 1920 underlined that Garabagh, Zangezur, Nakhchyvan and Julfa must be annexed neither to Armenia nor Azerbaijan, but have to stay under the occupation of Russian iroops with consent of local Soviets. However, from the telegram of G.Ordjonikidze to G.Chicherin (June 21, 1920) it became obvious that G.Chicherin meant annexation of Garabagh and Zangezur to Azerbaijan in his telegram to N.Narimanov.

In our point of view, such indefinite (conflicting) position is explained by intention of Soviet Russia to make Armenia dependent due to territories of Azerbaijan regarded as "disputable" and increase pressure on our nation which started revolt in order to resist invasion of XI Army.

Important information was sent to G.Chicherin and G.Ordjonikidze in 1920 signed by N.Narimanov, R.Mdivani, the member of Caucasus Committee of RK(b)P, A.Mikoyan, member of AK(b)PMK and A.Nuridjinyan, member of Armenian Committee of RK(b)P.

It has been written in information: "In respect of Zangezur and Garabagh, which are already belong to territory of Soviet Azerbaijan and regarded as if these are disputable areas we resolutely state that these territories are not the subject of dispute and should be within the borders of Azerbaijan. Thoroughly populated by Moslems, separated for more than a year (?!-I.M.) regions of Julfa and Nakhchyvan defended from Dashnak government by local population themselves have to be invaded by our troops and annexed to Azerbaijan. Any negotiations with Dashnak government ... we consider as untimely".

Following considerations in this information, N.Narimanov wrote: "Nobody in the world may stop us to influence decision expressed by population of indicated regions (Garabagh and Zangezur) to be annexed to Azerbaijan". "Now making a compromise (to Armenia) in issue of these regions ... will mean lost of prestige of Soviet rule in Azerbaijan, as well as in Iran and Turkey" (As it can be seen the concern was caused not by lost of territories, but by lost of prestige by Soviet power).

Above indicated viewpoint at first was defended by G.Ordjonikidze, who seemingly held objective and neutral position (doubtful in best case) but in fact supported Armenians (named by N.Narimanov as "representative in Caucasus" and by M.Mamedzadeh as "New Sisyanov of Russian Army"). Thus, in his letter addressed to V.Lenin, I.Stalin, G.Chicherin he wrote: a) occupation of Nakhchyvan-Ordubad region and its north portion by Bayazid division of Turkey; b) serious danger to this region by troops of Dro; c) Gabrielyan's intention to hold negotiations with N.Narimanov due to considerations "if Azerbaijan will refuse of Sherur-Dereleyaz district and Nakhchyvan region the Armenian delegation will immediately agree to annex Garabagh and Zangezur to Azerbaijan".

It is clear from that information that G.Ordjonikidze expressed his confidence in possibility to annex Daglyg Garabagh to Azerbaijan in order to strengthen Soviet power and withhold Baku, but he was also firm that Zangezur and other regions are not the issue of dispute. He also stated that he will provide security of Armenian population in those areas and will hold Armenian population together by announcing of autonomy - without allowing there of Moslem armed forces. He also underlined that other way of resolution of this problem would make our position in Azerbaijan as unsteady and Armenia will gain nothing (of course, without exception that the latter will be useful for us under certain political circumstances); such approach to Azerbaijan will discredit us in opinion of its population and create basis for our opponents.

Later while direct phone call N.Narimanov said: "You say: do not claim

other territories. It is interesting which territories are these... (It is not clear in the document - I.M.). Garabagh and Zangezur are indisputable territories of Azerbaijan... I agree with your formulation of the problem". In his response G.Ordjonikidze said:

- in addition to Zangezur and Garabagh you have claimed also Nakhchyvan, Sherur-Dereleyaz district and Ordubad;

- I talked to Chicherin about Garabagh and Zangezur and proposed immediately and unconditionally annex these regions to Azerbaijan, instead you have to refuse of claims for other territories, give autonomy to Garabagh and Zangezur without indicating this in peace agreement (between Armenia and RSFSR - I.M.) and strictly fulfill this agreement.

In one of the letters sent by G.Ordjonikidze to G.Chicherin, he informs that he received telegram about dispute territories between Azerbaijan and Armenia, he hold meeting with B.Legran and Ter-Gabrielyan and informed that Azerbaijan insists on immediate and unconditional annexation of Garabagh and Zangezur to Azerbaijan and necessity to agree with this.

Explaining his position due to political circumstances G.Ordjonikidze wrote: "both districts from economic point of view tends to Baku and absolutely separated from Irevan (in this case also the issue was not based on historic or juridical reasons but was explained by economic relations and ridiculous idea as separation from Irevan - J.M.). Especially now, when Bayazid division wedges within, continuation of dispute over these regions will result with the occupation by Turks and massacre of all Armenian population and we will not be able to prevent this". According to Sergo annexation of indicated regions to Azerbaijan will strengthen position of communists there and induce official Baku to refuse from claims for other regions., That is why at the end of telegram he underlined his opinion: "urgently annex Garabagh and Zangezur to Azerbaijan; I can force Azerbaijan to give autonomy to these regions, however this must be proposed from Azerbaijan and should not be indicated in the agreement."

G.Ordjonikidze in telegram (June 19, 1920) sent to V.Lenin and G.Chicherin wrote:

- Azerbaijan claims territories of Garabagh, Zangezur, Nakhchyvan and Sherur-Dereleyaz;

- in Garabagh and Zangezur the Soviet power has been established and regions indicated above are regard themselves as part of Azerbaijan Soviet Republic. Nakhchyvan for several months in the hands of rebels - Moslems (! - I.M.) and I have no any information about Sherur-Dereleyaz;

- Azerbaijan can not manage without Garabagh and Zangezur

- in general, in our point of view it is expedient to invite representative of Azerbaijan to Moscow and discuss all issues related to Azerbaijan and Armenia. This has to be done before signing an agreement with Armenia.

G Drdjo'iikidze repeated these proposals in his telegram (July 16, 1920) to V.Lenin, I.Stalin and G.Chicherin. But, at the same time in other telegram sent to G.Chicherin on July 14 he described Zangezur as dispute territory and proposed to annex other regions... to Armenia. It can be seen that thi dubious position of G.Ordjonikidze, which in fact served to interests of Armenians, put the basis of documents and measures undertaken at the end of 1920 in order to annex Nakhchyan and Zangezur to Armenia.

Jamil Hasanly
200 YEARS OF GARABAGH TRAGEDY

Over 200 years passes from signing of Kurekchay agreement and Garabagh khanate entering under the rule of Russia. This is an important historic event and this event directly relates to Garabagh khanate of Azerbaijan and to Russia. Some Russian and Armenian scientists, journalists and even politicians without a hint of hesitation falsify historic events and lie about annexation of Garabagh to Russia as the Armenian province. However, this event took place not long ago and there are a lot of historic documents reflecting those events. Signing of Kurekchay agreement by Garabagh khanate and accept of Russian rule has no any relation to Armenians. At that period Armenians constituted such a minority of population and were unable to influence any political decisions.

After collapse of Nadir shakh empire in 40-ies of XVIII century about 20 khanate emerged in Azerbaijan. Garabagh khanate was one of the first and one of the largest. Emerged khanates such as Sheki khanate, Guba khanate, Baku khanate, Gandja khanate, Ta-lysh khanate, Derbent, Shamakhy, Nakhchyan and Irevan khanates were independent administrative units in the north of Azerbaijan.

Garabagh khanate was established by Panahali khan, the member of Jevanshir clan. In 1748 he built Bavat fort and according to renown historian Mirza Jamal Jevanshir "khan had settled in that fort with all family members, relatives and families of elderly of the clan". When Panahali khan established Garabagh khanate there was a Christian minority and these were Dizag, Varand, Khachyn and Chilaberd melikates. However, these melikates constituted such a small part of 130 thousand population of khanate that they could not influence politics. Wars with neighboring khanates, in particular "Bavat war" with Sheki khanate, resulted in building of Sheki fort in 1751 by Panahli khan. After the death of Panahali khan, during the rule of his son Ibrahimkhalil khan (1763-1806) Garabagh khanate become even stronger.

Russia, at the start of XIX century during the rule of Yekaterina II, started to implement its Caucasus plans, which basis was developed during the era of tsar Bejer I. In 1801 Georgia was annexed to Russia. In March of 1803 after Car-Balaken was captured the fight over Ganja, started. After 9 raonths of siege Ganja

capitulated. Then, it was a turn of Sheki and Garabagh khanates.

It must be taken into account that attitude of some Azerbaijani khans, which frequently faced aggression of Iranian shahs, towards such distant protector as Russia was not bad. They thought that Petersburg is far away and with existence of such prelection khans may keep their independence-. These mistakes were mostly related to paucity of their knowledge about Russia. War started in 1804 between Iran and Russia caused hard situation in Azerbaijan. After capitulation of Ganja the commander of Russian troops - General Sisyanov in the begging of 1804 sent Major Lisanevich to Ibrahimkhalil khan of Garabagh in order to demand to enter "under the rule of Russia". In aim to protect khanate, Ibrahimkhalil khan agreed to meet Sisyanov. In May 1805 Ibrahimkhalil khan with his sons Mohammedhasan aga, Mehdigulu aga, Khanlar aga and son-in-law Salim khan, who ruled in Sheki, went to the Sisyanov's camp over Kurekchay. On May 14 the khan of Garabagh - Ibrahimkhalil khan sealed "Oath of responsibility" known in the history as Kurekchay agreement. Sisyanov signed the agreement. This was a process and as we can see, there were no traces of Armenians and no Armenian factor.

Kurekchay agreement consists of 11 articles. According to the 1st article the khan of Garabagh, his heirs and all population of khanate agreed to become vassals of Russia's tsar, enters under the rule of Russia and were obliged to be loyal to Russian tsar. In the second article, the Russian tsar as emperor on his own behalf and behalf of his successors guarantee to protect "integrity of country (Garabagh khanate) of his Highness (Ibrahimkhalil khan) and his successors. According to the fourth article Ibrahimkhalil khan refused of the right to lead foreign policy in favor of tsar. In the fifth article the tsar pledged to keep unchanged the rule of khan's successors over "Garabagh khanate, internal governing, court and di-vankhana and income of the country within the authority of his Highness (Ibrahimkhalil khan). According to the eighth article, Garabagh khan obliged to pay annual tax to tsar treasury in amount of 8000 chervon. One of the severe articles of the document envisaged that Russia had the right to keep office of commandant of 500 people supplied by cannons in Khan garden adjacent to Shusha fort. According to Kurekchay agreement, khan had to send one of his grandchildren on his own expense to Tiflis to the headquarter of head commander. According to the agreement, by the decree of tsar, Ibrahimkhalil khan will be given the rank of General-Lieutenant of Russian army, his sons Mehmedhasan and Mehdigulu aga the rank of General-Major, Khanlar aga the rank of Colonel. Due to their ranks Garabagh khan and his sons had to obey to orders of Commander of Caucasus. A week after, on May 21 of 1805 the agreement of the same content was signed with Sheki khanate. Of 11 articles of Kurekchay agreement no one reflect anything related to Armenians. The agreement is political and juridical document, which reflect convey of Garabagh, one of khanates of Azerbaijan, under the rule of

Russia and everything is clearly stipulated in that agreement. It is difficult to understand why those who consider themselves as historian and politicians distort this important document, which distinctly reflects historic events.

As it can be seen all, obligations and privileges in the agreement relate directly to Ibrahimkhalil khan from Shusha of Garabagh, and not to Alban meliks.

As usual, Russia did not keep its obligations, in spite of the fact that Kurekchay agreement was signed for ever. In 1806 then Iranian forces approached Shusha, Ibrahimkhalil khan, who earlier sent his family to nearby Khankendi, and all his family, except for his son Mehdigulu aga, were killed by the Major Lisanevich. This murder displayed that all obligations of Russia stipulated in Kurekchay agreement had temporary nature. At the same time, through the period of war with Iran, Russia did not change the status of Garabagh khanate.

On September 10, 1806 by the decree of emperor Aleksander I, Mehdigulu aga was assigned as khan of Garabagh instead of his late father Ibrahimkhalil khan. The decree stated: "We, emperor Aleksander I, who provides independence and prosperity of Russia, as well as other regions and countries by favor and assistance of God, who's highest mercy is for everyone, we say: Let all scientists, respectful people, famous and honorable courtiers, beys, commanders, village heads, elderly leaders of the tribe and all subjects, relying upon our royal favor and care, power and mercy, let them know that last year the late Ibrahimkhalil khan signed with General knyaz Sisyanov, representative of our royal authority, the "Testament", which was immediately brought to residence of empire. Upon familiarizing with stipulations of that "Testament" we regard all desires and demands expressed by late khan with unlimited royal mercy and care and taking him with all population of Garabagh under our protection, assigned the late Ibrahimkhalil khan by a special decree of emperor as independent ruler of Garabagh province. We guaranteed that all population of Garabagh, which become the subjects of emperor, and successors of late khan will be provided by the right to possess the khan throne of Garabagh and independent rule". The decree also said: "after such grievous event as murder of Ibrahimkhalil khan as a result of unrest, the good will and attitude of His Majesty to provide independence of his loyal subjects will be unchanged. Keeping his promise His Majesty with royal mercy and care assigns Mehdigulu aga, successor of highest rank on the throne of Garabagh province instead of his late father and this decision is confirmed by emperor's decree". By this decree all rights, which previously was given to Ibrahimkhalil khan, now was given to Mehdigulu khan and ordered to "all population to bow and obey him and fulfill orders and decisions of the khan". There was nothing related to Armenians. The decree of emperor Alexander I dated from September 10, 1806 is very important document, which makes it possible to know to whom Garabagh was belonged. After Gulustan treaty of 1813 Russia's positions in Azerbaijan became even more stronger and despite "Testimonies" signed "for ever", Russia

started to liquidate khanates. In 1819 Sheki khanate and in 1820 Shirvan khanate were liquidated. In 1822 Garabagh khanate as so was abolished and instead administration of Commandant was established. Thus, after 17 years Kurekchay agreement lost its value.

One year later in 1823, Russian authorities prepared "Description of Garabagh province..." (Opisannie Karabakhskoy povincii, sostavlennoe v 1823 godu po rasporejaniyu glavnoupravleoshego v Gruzii Ermolova deystvitelnim statskim sovetnikom Mogilevskim i polkovnikom Ermolovim Tiflis. 1866). This is more or less reliable source about number of population, ethnic composition of Garabagh.

Researches of prof. S.Aliyarly in relation of this source display that in 1823 Russian authorities in Garabagh registered 18563 families and of these only 1559 families, i.e. 8.4 % were within Aiban melikates. But Armenian scientists referring to this source wrote that in 1823 of over 20 thousand families in Garabagh 5107 were Armenian families.

Even in this case Armenian themselves confirm that they constituted minority in comparison to Azerbaijani population before mass migration of Armenians from Iran and Turkey into Garabagh. Since "Description of Garabagh province..." do not suite interests of Armenians they took away and liquidated this book from all libraries across Russia. In this respect it is of vital importance to thoroughly study, publish (in foreign languages also) and disseminate this historic source.

In 1828 after signing of Turkmenchay agreement, migration of Armenian*: from Irani to Garabagh fulfilled in larger amount and had organized nature. At that period these events were supervised by General Paskevich and his assistant Lazarov, who was Armenian. On February 29, 1828 General Paskevich ordered to "locate Armenians mostly in Irevan and Nakhchivan provinces and partially in Garabagh", "dislocate some Moslem villages to places where their coreligionists are densely settled" and locate Armenians in those emptied villages. Lazarov, who supervised move of Armenians from Iran wrote to Paskevich: "At first, Armenians of Maraga, then all Armenians decided to leave their locations". S.Glinka, who described dislocation of Armenians, wrote in 1831: "Armenians lived in villages bordering with Turkmenchay migrate to Garabagh. For three and a half months period 8 thousand Armenian families passed across Araz river".

According to Russian authors, in particular according to N.Shavrov, through 1828-1830 from Iran 40000 Armenians and from Turkey 84600 Armenians were moved to provinces of Irevan and Yelizavetpol, which included Garabagh. Shavrov also noted that of 1 million 300 thousand Armenians living in Caucasus over 1 million are immigrants. These figures given by N.Shavrov were also confirmed by 8 volume history of XIX century written by French authors Lavissa and Rambo. This thorough work published in 1925 in France was also

published in the end of 30-ies in USSR with editorial work of academician E. V.Tarlen. They also confirm that except for Irevan province Armenians were immigrants in Caucasus (History of XIX century. Editors: Professor Lavissa and Rambo. 1939, vol.8, p.298). In other words, Russia, after invasion into Azerbaijan and Caucasus, implemented policy directed to location of more Christians in those regions and as a result of this policy Armenian population number had increased in these ancient regions of Azerbaijan and this put the basis for future problems.

After the first and second Russian revolutions tragic events happened in the region. For example, let us consider the speech of Ismail khan Ziyadkhanov, who was elected from Ganja to the I State Duma. On June 12, 1906 meeting of Duma he said: "Dear members of parliament, every minute I receive bad news from our country. Gentlemen, for about two years we walk over corpses in our country flooded by blood. But we already lose our patience. We have seen babies taken away from their mothers arms, thrown in the air and stabbed with daggers, we evidenced hands of unborn babies fallen out from body of pregnant women when stabbed by daggers. You, who take pleasure in screams and cries of mothers and children, in corpses full of wounds, you go away". This situation was also characteristic for the period after October revolution. Appearance of Bolshevism in Caucasus in face of Armenians caused tragic events for Azerbaijani Turks. Only in Baku in March of 1918 during 3 day period 12 thousand people were killed because of their ethnicity and religion. Similar events were repeated in Shamakh, Garabagh, Nakhchivan, Irevan and other places. Only proclaiming of Azerbaijan Democratic Republic in May of 1918 stopped this tragedy.

Over 1918-20-ies Armenia was a country of South Caucasus with territory of 10 thousand sq.km. After establishment of Soviet rule its territory enlarged to 29.8 thousand sq. km. Nobody expresses interest where these territories were taken. These 19.8 thousand sq.km added to Armenia's territory were Azerbaijan's areas. During era of Azerbaijan Democratic Republic it became possible to stabilize situation in Garabagh. In 1919, after members of National Council from Armenia were expelled from Garabagh, Armenian population hold a Congress and adopted a resolution about subjection to Azerbaijan government. That resolution given to the head of Azerbaijani delegation and sent to Paris Peace Conference, was handed to Versailles Supreme Council by A.M.Topchubashev. It said: "Representatives of Armenian population in Garabagh adopted resolution about their subjection to Azerbaijan government".

Garabagh never belonged to Armenia. Armenians deceive international community by such false concepts and say as if Garabagh belonged to Armenia and was given to Azerbaijan by Stalin. By this, Armenians just wanted to take advantage from campaign against Stalin started after collapse of USSR. In fact, everything was as ccWary¹ Both mountain and plain portions of Garabagh was united and was always known as inseparable part of Azerbaijan. Namely due to

initiative of Moscow, by support of Stalin the mountain portion of Garabagh was separated as administrative unit from its plain area and was established as the DGAR in Azerbaijan. Thus a delayed-action mine was put in the Republic.

Azerbaijan government made a serious mistake at that period. If we will consider settlements included into DGAR we will see that 90% of them are Azerbaijani settlements. There are a number of very important documents reflecting borders of Azerbaijan and Armenia in Central Archives of Russian army. For example, one of these: "Description of border of indisputable territory of Azerbaijan Soviet Socialistic Republic with Armenia". It says: "The border of Azerbaijan and Armenia is along the former administrative border from Surmeli district to Araz river: through villages of Agamzaly, Bash-Gerni and Imizrin, then passes through Yeni-Bayazit and Sherur-Dereleyaz districts and turns from Goyce lake in such a way that Gozel-Dere village belongs to Armenia, Dash-kend and Basarkecher villages goes to Azerbaijan. The border passes in the middle of Goyce lake, then through Ganja and Irevan provinces in such a way that Chubuglu village stays in Armenia, the eastern portion of Goyce lake goes to Azerbaijan. Based on this division Azerbaijan territory includes Ganja province and all districts of Surmeli, Nakhchyvan, Sherur-Dereleyaz, Irevan provinces, as well as together with Kemerli, Beyuk-Vedi and Develi villages the districts of Irevan province and eastern portion of Ye-ni-Beyazit".

The next campaign related to Garabagh started after the World War II. Claiming Gars and Erdahan provinces of Turkey, Armenian Communist Party leader G.Arutyunov on November 28, 1945 sent the letter to I.Stalin with a request to annex DGAR to Armenia. To investigate the subject, I.Stalin sends the letter to G.Malenkov, who in its turn sends the letter to Secretary of Azerbaijan Communist Party - M.C.Bagirov. The latter answered G.Malenkov on December 10 of 1945. M.C.Bagirov in his answer emphasized that it is impossible and noted that if Moscow insists it is possible to fulfill exchange of territories. He underlined that firstly, Shusha can not be the issue of discussions, secondly, Vedi, Garabaglar and Azizbeyov regions of Armenia with totally Azerbaijani population must be given to Azerbaijan and thkdly, fae issue may be considered only if Derbend and Gasymkend regions, which belonged to Azerbaijan until recently, will be given back to Azerbaijan. After such answer Moscow did not raised the issue once more.

However, in December of 1947 Armenian government succeeded to gain the resolution signed by I.Stalin for withdrawal of Azerbaijani from Armenia. The issue was not related to the problem of provision of Azerbaijan villages by labor force, as it was stated in resolution. In fact, Moscow in order to ground territorial claims against Turkey in December of 1945 announced the decision of Soviet of People's Commissars about repatriation of Armenians lived in foreign countries to Soviet Armenia. Move of 360-400 thousand Armenians was planned. Unexpectedly the attitude of international community to that decision was not

good. Due to this decision in 1947 over 50 thousand Armenians came to Soviet Armenia. In total, through 1946-1949 the number of repatriated people was not over 90 thousand. When it became clear that it will be impossible to get territory from Turkey, it had been decided to withdraw Azerbaijani from Armenia in order to locate there repatriated people. This event is reflected in letter of G.Arutyunov and M.C.Bagirov to I.Stalin dated from December 3, 1947. In the letter, dislocation of Azerbaijani was explained by necessity to provide repatriated Armenians by area and improved living conditions. 2 weeks prior to this letter, on November 21 in Moscow at the meeting of Political Bureau the issue of Azerbaijan Communist Party was discussed. Up to now documents of that meeting are kept secret in State Archives of Social Political history of Russia. Due to some unknown reasons related to that meeting M.C.Bagirov on December 3 agreed with dislocation of Azerbaijani. Just imagine, that houses and savings of 100 thousand Azerbaijani were taken away and they were deported. Those deported seriously opposed this.

On May 3, 1948 Ministry of Internal Affairs of Armenian SSR prepared 11 paper document by a signature of General-Major Gri gory an : "Information about spirit among Azerbaijani population of Armenia in relation to their expected move to Azerbaijan SSR". It said: "We have identified a number of facts reflecting that they do not want to move to new locations and some of them go to cemetery and cry over the graves of late relatives praying not to be moved". Armenians themselves note the true course of events while deportation of 100 thousand people.

The term Daglyg Garbagh emerged in Azerbaijan during Soviet rule. On August 1 of 1921 the extraordinary Congress of Soviets of Shusha district was held. Speaking at that Congress L.Mirzoyan underlined that he considers the decision of Caucasian Committee to establish a special administrative unit with subjection to Baku in mountain portion of Garbagh as absolutely correct and expedient. At the meeting of OrgBureau and PolitBureau in September of 1921 the decision about sending a proposal to Caucasus Bureau about autonomy of mountain part of Garabagh was not adopted because it was opposed by N.Narimanov and D.Buniyadzadeh. In December of 1922 members of Committee for Daglyg Garabagh (Garagyozev, Shaduns, Manusyan, Mirzebekyan) once again proposed to consider the issue of Garabagh administrative division into mountain and plain parts. For this, Commission involved Ga-rayev, Dovlatov and Mirzoyan prepared a proposal document and submitted it to Caucasian Regional Committee of Russian Communist Party. Based on recommendation of Regional Committee the Communist Party of Azerbaijan made a decision to give autonomy to mountain part of Garabagh on July 1 of 1923. The decision had been announced on July 7 and DGAR was established. As we can see, this term and this evil have been brought to Azerbaijan by communists.

Unfortunately, from that time on, Azerbaijan government made serious

mistakes, DGAR establishment inclusive. Instead of displaying of clear, thoroughly considered and substantiated position, the government of Azerbaijan preferred to hold capitulating and compromising position with some minor exceptions, in respect of Armenians' claims. For example emissaries came from Armenia in 60-ies attempted to collect signatures for annexation of Nagorno-Karabakh to Armenia. In 1961 the visit of N.Khrushov to Yerevan was expected on occasion of the 40-ieth anniversary of Soviet rule establishment in Armenia. Armenian authorities speculated that N.Khrushov will come with "present". Similar to the occasion of the 300 years anniversary of Ukrainian-Russian union in 1954, when the Crimea was given to Ukraine, now the DGAR will be given to Armenia. It must be also noted, that this intention of Yerevan was not fulfilled because during that period Armenians of Nagorno-Karabakh refused to sign for such speculative aims. To pay back for that Armenian authority made conditions unbearable for Azerbaijani living in Armenia. In anonymous letters sent by Azerbaijani living in Armenia to L.Breznev and A.Gromyko in March of 1965 due to 50th anniversary of fabricated Armenian genocide they warned "at present Armenia resembles the huge balloon filled with explosive and ready to blow at any spark". Authors of the letter wrote that on day of "genocide" there is a danger for lives of Turks living in Armenia. In 1977 while adopting a new constitution of USSR, authority of Armenia once again raised the issue of annexation of DGAR to Armenia. However, as a result of firm refuse of Azerbaijan government these claims were turned down. In other words, during the whole period of Soviet rule Armenia's authority preserved the roots of Armenians hatred to neighbor nation. In June of 1981 while adoption of legislation about the status of DGAR the Supreme Soviet of Azerbaijan SSR made serious mistakes. Exclusive rights, which even did not exist during that period in autonomous units of USSR, were given only to Nagorno-Karabakh by law adopted on June 24, 1981. For example, it said that without approval of Regional Soviet of DGAR it is not possible to make changes in its administrative territory. In addition two other privileges were given to DGAR. None of autonomous regions existed in Russia had such exclusive privileges.

After H.Aliyev's move to Moscow, Armenians took an advantage of succession of rule by weak leaders in Azerbaijan. Azerbaijan authority, being afraid that Moscow will blame them for nationalism, played blind eye for activity of Yerevan in Nagorno-Karabakh and this resulted in falling of part of Nagorno-Karabakh Armenians under the control of Armenia. No doubt, M.Gorbachev arrival to power in 1985 played significant role in intensification of Armenian claims. When I analyzed records of meetings of political Bureau I found that M.Gorbachov rendered his support to Armenians even before his coming to power. When K. Chernenko was ill, M.Gorbachov was the second person in the party, who chaired the meetings of Secretariat and Political Bureau. Let us consider, which problem was considered on February 21 of 1985 meeting of Political Bureau of Central Committee of

Communist Party. "Plan of events related to 70th years anniversary of Armenian genocide". The aim was to make Political Bureau to make a decision for announcing April 24 as "Day of Remembrance of genocide victims". However, experienced members of Political Bureau N.Tikhonov, A.Gromyko, V.Grishin, M.Zimyanin seriously opposed this. V.Grishin said: "70 years we lived without this decision of Presidium of Supreme Soviet of the Republic, and now it is proposed to adopt resolution. Why we have to do this? In general, I doubt that the Republic has to adopt decision about remembrance day". A.Gromyko noted that "this was a dirty crime of Turkish Sultanate and Russia empire. But it was maid char that for the 6 years of Lenin's rule in the Republic, suvh problems were not considered". N.Tikhonov said: "I was concerned when I read proposal of Central committee of Armenian Communist Party. Our relations with Turkey renewed only , recently". Thus, M.Gorbachov's attempts to support Armenians were stopped. But, it became impossible after he became General Secretary of USSR. As a result, Armenian separatists received support of Kremlin and on December 1 of 1989 violating international law and Constitution of USSR, the Supreme Soviet of Armenia adopted resolution to annex DGAR to Armenia. This resolution was not terminated up to now. When these events started our Republic's authority was unprepared to this. For example, when on July 18 of 1988 the Presidium of Supreme Soviet discussed the issue, the Azerbaijan delegation went to that meeting without thoroughly learning the history of this problem. For example, when representatives of Armenia and DGAR told fictions that Daglyg Garabagh was just mechanically separated from Armenia and given to Azerbaijan in 1921, the Azerbaijani delegation did not attempt to clarify this crucial issue and prove that Daglyg Garabagh never belonged to Armenia.

Mirza Jalil with a specific sense of humor once wrote in the journal "Molla Nasreddin": "Let Unset (Russia) be devastated, since Uriset came here, affairs of Moslems are bad". No doubt, this was a humor with a drop of truth. Azerbaijan has a long, historic way within the Russia. But, losses along this way were also serious. And Daglyg Garbagh is the "souvenir" of 200 years spent within the Russia. Russian invasions at the start of XIX century, experiments of Bolsheviks in 20-ies of the XX century, deals of communists in the end of 80-ies brought Azerbaijan to the risk of loss of Daglyg Garabagh. This is historic result of 200 years of Garabagh issue.

Kerim Shukurov
**KUREKCHAY AGREEMENT: BASIC CLAUSES,
IMPLEMENTATION AND TERMINATION OF THE AGREEMENT**

Attempts of Russian empire to occupy territories of Azerbaijan at the start of XIX century, in fact, had turned into the war. Taking advantage from division of Azerbaijan into khanates, the tsarist government for its interests applied armed forces, as well as had signed agreements. After occupation of Char-Balaken (1803) and Gandja (1804) the Kurekchay agreement was signed with Garabagh khanate on May 14 of 1805 (Acts of Caucasian Archaeographical Commission. Editor Ad.Berse. vol.n. Tiflis, 1868, doc. 1436, p.702-705). Circumstances under which this agreement was concluded, its stipulations., obligations undertaken by Garabagh khanate were expounded in historic papers (Kh.Ibragimbeyli. Russia and Azerbaijan at the beginning of XIX century. M., 1969. History of Azerbaijan. Seven volumes. Vol. IV. Baku, 2000. p.22). However, the experience of development of clauses of Kurekchay agreement, mutual commitment undertaken according to the agreement, especially that of Russia, implementation of the agreement, results of its termination, its value among other agreements concluded by Russia with independent or semi-independent rulers in South Caucasus and some other problems were not the subject of thorough studies.

Along with analysis of clauses of Kurekchay agreement it is also necessary to study agreements signed by tsar government with South Caucasus rulers prior to Kurekchay agreement, stipulations made for annexation of any state structures, documents on their liquidation, etc. In this respect, we have to note such agreements as the one signed between Russia and Guba khanate in 1782 (Brothers forever. Documents. Two volumes. Vol.1 - 1922. Baku, 1987, p. 103-104), Georgiyevsk agreement with Kartli-Kakhetia kingdom in 1783 (P.Butkov. Documents for new history of Caucasus, from 1722 to 1803, part E, SPb, 1869, p.122-129; Problems of history of external policy of Georgian feudal states. Tbilisi, 1970, p. 186-245), Manifests of Pavel I dated from January 1801 and Aleksander I dated from September 12 (PSZ. Collection I, V.XXVII, N 20620; AKAK, v.I, Tiflis, 1866, p. 132-133), Georgiyevsk agreement with Guba khanate and other rulers signed in 1802 (AKAK, vol.I, Tiflis, 1868, p. 1009-1011); sworn obligations of Char-Balaken (Same source, doc. 1179), stipulation made prior the battle against Gandja, agreements signed with dukedoms and kingdoms of Western Georgia (Papers on history of Georgia, vol.V, Tiflis, 1990, p.41), etc.

Agreement signed between Guba khanate and Russia in 1782 was devoted to trade relations. The first agreement related to patronage of Russia in South Caucasus was Georgiyevsk agreement signed in 1783.

Georgiyevsk agreement was in force for seventeen years and terminated according to manifests of Pavel I dated from January 18 of 1801 and Aleksander I

from September 12, 1801 (A.Novoseltsev. Georgiyevskiy tractate of 1783 and its historic value//History of USSR, 1983, N4, p.40-51). Georgiyevsk agreement dated from December 28 of 1802 was titled as union for peace and friendship under the patronage of Russia. But P.Sisyanov assigned as Senior Commander of Russian troops in Caucasus made occupational policy of Russia in Caucasus even more active. After occupation of Char-Balaken very heavy conditions were stipulated. When intention of Sisyanov to subject Gandja khanate by diplomatic means had failed, conditions became tougher. These included the following:

1. Djavad khan Gandjali swears to obey Russian tsar together with all his subordinates;
2. The fort must be totally emptied and cannons and ammunitions of Russian forces are deployed there;
3. Djavad khan Gandjali rules in his province while being under the subordination of Russian empire and gives 20 thousand manats of duty to Russia. Immediately after signing these conditions he pays the duty for 1804;

Supplies food for troops deployed along the road to Gala and Shamshaddil;

5. Population of Shamshaddil and its province must not be oppressed since they transferred under the rule of Georgian government. To guarantee implementation of above indicated stipulations Djavad khan Gandjaly sent his son Huseyngulu aga to live in Georgia. (AKAK, vol.11, dok. 1179.Translation into Azeri: Y.Mamedoglu. Letters: Sisiyanov-Djavad khan//Newspaper "Republic". September 22,1990).

Through,the period from occupation of Gandja in January of 1804 until signing of Kurekchay agreement Sisyanov undertakes diplomatic efforts in order to give Garabagh under the rule of Russia. These diplomatic efforts resulted by signing of the agreement.

Fulfilled analysis of text of the agreement shows that while concluding the agreement with Garabagh khanate .ainely basic articles of Georgiyevsk agreement signed in 1783 with Kartli-Kakhet kingdom were taken as a basis. Facts prove that Ibrahim khan of Garabagh had been acknowledged with terms of that agreement. Document, which informed about conclusion of that agreement also showed a list mentioning Garabagh khanate. (Russian-Dagestan relations in XVIII-start of XIX cc. Collection of documents. M, 1989, p. 181; S.Aliyarov, F,Aliyeva. Georgiyevsk tractate in context of evaluation of external political position of Azerbaijan//Role of organization of workers in development of revolutionary movement in Azerbaijan. Baku, 1984, p.75-83).

At the same time, vizier of Garabagh M.Vagif participated at events related to signing of that agreement in Tiflis, where he read the short poem, which was also important from diplomatic and political viewpoints (Molla Panah Vagif. Poems. Baku, 1988, p. 140). From correspondence of Sisyanov and Ibrahim khan, his orders to Georgian aristocrat Ivan Dzorayev, who played a role of mediator at negotiations

and to Major Lisanevich, it can be derived that Ibrahim khan attempted to sign the agreement with favorable conditions. To which extent this goal has been reached? To answer this question, let us consider conditions of Georgiyevsk agreement signed in 1783. This agreement consisted of 13 basic and 4 separate articles.

According to the first article, tsar of Kartli and Kakhetia agreed to obey to Russia. According to the second article Russia promised to Irakliy II that he will keep his territories. Third article described rules of coming to power of Kartli and Kakhet tsar and the fourth article stipulated that kingdom of Kartli and Kakhet will not possess of right for foreign policy. The fifth article envisaged that Georgian tsar will have its representative in palace of Russian emperor and the Russian tsar will have its representative in Tiflis (here and after selected articles had not been included into Kurekchay agreement - K.Sh.). According to the sixth article Russian emperor accepted internal independence of Kartli and Kakhet kingdom. Seventh article reflected obligation of Kartli and Kakhet kingdom to join to fight against enemy by demand of Russia. Eighth article envisaged that Georgian katalikos will be an eighth archbishop of Russia and member of Sinode, the ninth article stipulated equal rights of Georgian knyaz and aristocrats with that of Russian aristocrats. Tenth article reflected that population of Kartli and Kakhet have rights to settle in Russia, while the eleventh article envisaged that Kartli and Kakhet kingdom merchants may trade freely in Russia. Article twelve indicated that the agreement signed forever and the article thirteen reflected the rules of ratification. The first of separate articles indicated strengthening of good relations with Imeretiya, the second and third articles were about deployment of Russian battalions in Kartli and Kakhetia kingdom and use of local military forces, the fourth article envisaged regaining by use of force or by peaceful means of territories lost by Kartli and Kakhetia kingdom. Thus, Russia by signing of tractate with Garabagh khanate on the basis of Georgiyevsk agreement of 1783 underlined that it highly evaluated the khanate.

The agreement consisted of preamble and 11 articles. Preamble stated subordination of Ibrahim khan of Shusha and Garabagh to Russian empire and the articles defined conditions proceeding from this subordination. Articles 1, 4, 6, 8 and 9 reflected obligations of Ibrahim khan and the articles 2, 3, 5 and 7 the obligations of Russian emperor. According to the agreement, Russia recognized Garabagh khanate as an independent state, and confirmed Ibrahim khan and his heirs as the only sovereigns of the khanate. One of the important aspects is that in all articles Ibrahim khan was mentioned as Ibrahim khan of Shusha and Garabagh. The other important aspect that emperor guaranteed to preserve integrity of Garabagh khanate. Tenth article of the agreement stated that this agreement is signed forever and it would not be a subject of amendments in the future. Eleventh article was about ratification of the agreement. In Kurekchay agreement there is no a single word about claims for Garabagh by Garabagh meliks or Armenians. At the same time, due to Garabagh

khanate being a Moslem country, and because the agreement was signed under new historic conditions in distinction to Georgiyevsk agreement of 1783, it did not allow to take into account provisions stated in articles 5, 8, 9, 10, 11 and others. On the contrary, obligations of Garabagh khanate became even heavier by making new stipulations. In distinction to Georgiyevsk agreement of 1783, which was written in Russian and Georgian, the Kurekchay agreement was signed only in Russian. This is shown in the text of agreement, especially in obligations undertaken by Garabagh khanate. Since Georgiyevsk agreement of 1783 was the basis for major articles of Kurekchay agreement signed on May 14, 1805, the latter in its turn was the basis for Kurekchay agreement signed on May 22, 1805 with Selim khan of Sheki and agreement signed on December 25, 1805 with Mustafa khan of Shirvan. In these agreements only small amendments (taxes amount, etc.) were made according to local conditions (AKAK, vol.11, papers 1301,1366).

One of the important aspects of history of Kurekchay agreement is related to its implementation. In this respect, it is also necessary to look through the history of agreements signed by Russia in South Caucasus. It can be seen, that none of agreements signed by Russian empire with rulers of South Caucasus was implemented forever as it was stipulated, including Kurekchay agreement from May 14 of 1805, which was liquidated seventeen years later, in 1822. However, through these seventeen years there were facts of violation of this agreement, mainly by Russia. And one of these was a cruel killing of p.208-214), occupation of North Azerbaijan except for Nakhchivan and Irevan khanates, establishment of colonial governing system here endangered agreements concluded with Garabagh, Sheki and Shirvan khanate. Through the period when A.Yermolov was the commander (1816-1827) of Russian forces in Caucasus above indicated khanates were liquidated. In 1819 Sheki khanate was liquidated, in 1820 - Shirvan khanate and in 1822 - Garabagh khanate (Notes of A.P.Yermolov. 1798-1826. M.,1991, p.338, 366,382).

After liquidation of Garabagh khanate it became the province. In 1823 the province was "described" (Description of Garabagh province. Tiflis, 1866). After liquidation of Garabagh khanate the tsarist colonial policy was implemented here without any hurdles. Russia, which gave emperor's guarantee for preserving integrity of Garabagh, did not keep its promise. The province established on the basis of Garabagh khanate in 1840 was named as Shusha district. Later on this territory along with Shusha district there were established districts of Zangezour, Javanshir and Jebail. The rule of Ibrahim khan and his heirs in Garabagh was replaced by Russian administration. To increase a number of Armenians in ethnic composition of population of Garabagh they started to implement policy of migration. Armenians strengthening their positions in Garabagh, fulfilled here genocide against Azerbaijani in 1905-1906 similar to other regions of Azerbaijan (K.Shukurov. Garabagh within Russian empire// Garabagh yesterday, today and tomorrow. Baku, 2004, p.118-121; Y.Mahmudov, K.Shukurov. History of Garabagh: From ancient

times up to now. // Garabagh: questions and facts. Baku, 2005, p. 1-52).

Despite of all this, even after the liquidation of Kurekchay agreement dated from May 14 of 1805, Garabagh continued to be one of the major social, political and cultural centers of Azerbaijan and being its inseparable part played significant role in historic progress of Azerbaijan.

Kubra Aliyeva **SHUSHA AND SHUSHA CARPETS**

It is known that Shusha in the mid of XVIII century was the capital of Garabagh khanate. The city was founded by Panah Ali khan. His ancestors were noble, wealthy and famous people from Jevanshir kin.

City Shusha was built on the cliff of a high mountain in most beautiful place of Garabagh on site of ancient town Shusha, which was destroyed by Mongolians. In a short time there were constructed a lot buildings in the city, including Khan's Palace, dwellings for local people, which came from villages of Garabagh, Seidli, Kocharli, Saatly, Merdinli, Kurtlar, etc.

The city had its special architectural style. Houses were mainly two-or three storey. Houses of wealthy craftsmen, poets, physicians were built by professional architects and negligibly distinguished from Khan's Palace. This feature was also noted by traveler August Fon Gagstgauzen, who admired by perfection of architectural style of Khan's Palace and did not see the difference with other houses in Shusha. Shusha was famous as a city of generations of craftsmen. Craftsmen were deeply respected here. Secrets of the craft were transferred from master to his student and sacredly kept this ancient tradition of teaching. Each craftsman was known not only by his works, but also by his master. In Shusha people loved to wear in nice and expensive cloths and on holidays a rare woman could not look like someone from khan's family. Men in Shusha wore cherkez, soft jackboots and high papakhs made of astrakhan. The city was populated mainly by craftsmen, musicians and poets. It was not accidental that Shusha was named the cradle of music and poetry. Almost all renown singers and musicians of Azerbaijan were from Shusha. Among them poetess and painter Khan gyzy Natavan Khurshudbanu, musician-theorist, painter avid poet Mir Mohsun Nawab, singers Bul-Bul, Rashid Behbutov, Kurban Primov; scientist, artist-carpet expert, who made famous Azerbaijani carpet around the world Lyatif Kerimov; founder of professional music Uzeyir Hadjibeyov and many others.

In XIX century in Shusha there were 95 poets, 22 musicians, 38 singers, 16 painters, 5 astronomers, 18 architects, 16 physicians and about 40 teachers. This large group of intelligentsia played significant role in transformation of Shusha into the cultural center. In houses a special attention was paid to interior. Life of citizens was influenced by holiday decorations. Since palacei were regarded as

et alons, the halls in houses were large and walls and ceilings were painted. Decorative painting was distinguished by refined lines and combination of colors. Frequently, the painting used floristic ornaments, images of garden and birds in paradise. In almost every house people were involved with carpet weaving, the traditional ancient craft. In each there were several weaving looms. Carpets were weaved for personal use and for dowry. Carpets were used as expensive presents for ambassadors and kings. Largest carpets were weaved in Shusha. Namely large spaces in houses dictated such large sized carpets. The carpet sets for an entrance hall were weaved in Shusha only. Carpet set "DestKhali-Gebe" consisted of three, four and five parts. The largest was named "Khali", on the right and left there were narrow sideway carpets "yanlyg". This group was headed by "bashlyg". All these parts were collected into a huge rectangular, which length reached about forty meters and totally covered the floor. But sometimes the hall was very large and the carpets were added by another one "ayaklyg", the carpe, by the threshold. This was the constructive solution of a complex task. Practical mind of Garabagh women-weavers (only women weaved in Garabagh in distinction to South Azerbaijan) made possible the creation of carpet sets as a single carpet divided into portions. This allowed easily remote and clean them.

In Azerbaijan Carpet Museum and in Arts Museum of Azerbaijan there are samples of carpet sets weaved in Shusha such as "Lempe", "Godja" (old), "Balyk" (fish) and "Bulud" (cloud), which is distinguished by originality of composition style, brightness of colors and complexity of decorative motifs. For example, composition of carpet sets "Lempe" (inhabitants of Shusha called ceiling by word lempe) is based on painting on ceilings of houses in Shusha. Frequently, they were so identical that it seemed that carpet and ceiling are reflected in each other, the effect of mirror emerged in empty space where almost was no furniture.

The middle part of "Lempe" carpet usually was filled by large floristic medallion embraced on both sides by prolonged medallion and element, which is called "Gubpa", i.e. dome. Composition is enriched by small floristic decorations "Buta" and images of pairs of birds-nightingales, which symbolize birds in paradise. Carpet "Godja" is featured by complex floristic ornaments, where large flowers are neighboring with small buds.

Shusha traded with Turkey, Iran, Georgia and Russia and merchants brought here a lot of goods from those countries. That is why in Garabagh carpets together with ancient ornaments there were decorations of carpets from Tabriz, or decorations of khokhloma products and jest trays. Decorations of these products fell into ornaments of Shusha carpets. Background of these beautiful carpets in distinction to other regions of Azerbaijan were dark-blue - indigo or black, which was received from fruits of tree "mazy", planted only in Shusha. Ornaments were of bright-red, yellow, white and green and were very expressive and many-colored.

It is already over the decade that there is no Shusha. Shusha is captured by

Armenian aggressors. Population of Shusha now spread across the whole Azerbaijan with most of them in capital. But inhabitants of Shusha are joined together by one aim - feeling of beauty. Each of them is filled by remembrances about this city-fairy-tale, about peopb, nightingales, creatures of nature existed side-by-side with ocreations of Shusha masters and craftsmen.

Meshidikhanym Neymet EPIGRAPHIC MONUMENTS OF GARABAGH

Engravings on monuments of XIII-XIX centuries of Garabagh-Shusha, Agdam, Barda, Fizuli, Zangelan, Jebraill, Lachin and Kel-badjar regions contain names of scientists, architects, sculptors, calligraphers and carvers.

Tombs of XIV-XIX centuries with Arabian-Persian-Azerbaijani engravings and relief reflect diverse facets of everyday life, toponymy, history of ethnomedicine and ethnogenesis of Azerbaijani. According to epigraphic data of Garabagh monuments it is possible to trace migration of Turkic tribes to Caucasus.

Engravings ihform about construction works in Garabagh and about cultural-educational activity of Garabagh khans. They show process of generation in the region of political-economic base, which was necessary for creation of an integral Azerbaijani culture and reflect heroic struggle of population against aggress.' ors.

Mausoleum of Yahya ibn Mohammed al-Khadja is situated on hill in Mamedbeyli village of Zangelan region on the Silk route. Arabian engravings on the tomb says: "I am the owner of this building (i.e. buried in mausoleum - M.N.) the weak slave, who needs the mercy of Most High Allah, Yahya Ibn Muhammed Al-Hadj constructed (by architect - M.N.) AH Madjd ad-Din in the month of Ramadan in 704" (28.III-27.IV. 1305). At the start of engraving there are Surah from Koran -111-16-18:61-13: 65-35 (17, 20, 21).

Barda was one of the largest cities on the trade route East-West. According to descriptions of historians and geographers there were a lot of beautiful palaces, mosques, caravan-sarays, bazaars, mausoleums, baths and other buildings. Up to now the Mausoleum is preserved there and ruins of foundation of other mausoleum Akh-sadanbaba, creations of Nakhchyvan architect Ahmed, the son of Ayub al-Hafiz. Facing covered cylindrical body of mausoleum from lower belt with Kufic engraving up to upper coating, consists of green-blue lacquered bricks in combination with ordinary red burnt brick, creating the word "Allah", which is repeated over 200 times. Facings of red unlaequered bricks were laid horizontally and grey-blue lacquered - vertically. Thus, the engraving is in four different directions under the angle of 45° to horizon. Freeze engraving and other engraving along the belt of Mausoleum over socle and embracing both portals contain Surah of Koran: 2-256; 78. Engravings over stalacktite arches in upper

portion of northern and southern portals contain name of architect Ahmed, son of Ayub al-Hafiz an-Nakhchivany and the date of construction -shavval in 722 year of Hijra/13.XI.1322. Names "Osman" and "Ali" are repeated many times.

In village Shykhlar of Jebrazil region located on Silk road there is Stony mausoleum. The yard of Mausoleum is surrounded by brick walling behind which is the huge medieval necropolis. Mausoleum had double cover - inside as cupola and outside tabernacu-lar. At the entrance into Mausoleum - the stone with engraving: "Holy month of Rajab, seven hundred seventh year" (27. XII. 1307-26.1.1308). In the niche near the walling from the yard there is a marble tombstone: "Drunk from spring of knowledge. This grave of noble Sheikhzadeh Sheikh Abd as-Salam b. Sheikh Giyas ad-Din, died on 20 Ramadan of the year 759" (27.VIII.1358).

According to legends, the sheikh buried in Mausoleum belonged to order "Kadiriyya". Founder of this order was Abdulkadir al-Jilani (Gilani) (1077-1166). His students and sons in aim to disseminate doctrine "Kadiriyya" were traveling to Arab countries, Africa, India and Turkestan. Creation of orders in Azerbaijan can be referred to XIII century.

Two-row engraving is carved over the entrance into round mausoleum into village Shykhlar of Jebrazil region. The text is as following:

1. "Its owner and possessor (i.e. mausoleum) the late
2. Forgiven Khalil ibn Mirzadjan. May Allah give his mercy... year".

According to paleographic peculiarities of engravings and architectural style of mausoleum this building may be dated back to the start of XIV century.

The following is the engraving in Azerbaijan-Persian over the entrance in mausoleum in village Khubyarly of Jebrazil region: "May always these passages be populated by possessors of the world, which seek mercy. Be aware that the one who restored this tomb was that highly ranked inhabitant of paradise, highest Abd al-Ali Ikhvan. Date of construction is the year thousand two hundred and two" (1787-1788).

In Agdnrrj in 'architectural monuments "Imaraty" there were gathered tombstones of necropolis of XVI century. Two coffer-shaped monuments with engraving in Arabic belong to S-a-t-l-m-s-h-y, son of may (Iana) Ahmad ad-Din (died in 965 year of Hijra/1557-1558); Mohammad, son of Karam (died in 945 year of Hijra/1538-1539). On other tombstones there were carved images reflecting crafts and everyday life - horseman, rosaces - symbol of sun, jug for water, mace, dagger, bow and arrow, shoes. On one of the tombstones there is bas-relief of the cow without head. Between legs of the animal there are images of bow and arrow, sledge-hammer, zindan for blacksmithing of metal workpieces and scissors for metal.

Scenes of everyday life, reflecting professions of buried people and most widely displayed in memorials of foreground regions, bring to nowadays the

ancient traditions reflected in applied art. Realistic motifs of local art dominate in these images.

In Lachin region, in valley of Shalva to left from the road to temple Agaoglan there are tombstones of XVI century made in shape of horse figure and coffer made of stones. On the left facet of one of tombstones the relief of weaving loom is carved. On the right there is the figure of standing woman. Woman's arms stretched to opposite directions, in one hand she holds beetle, in the other the scissors. At the head level the ball of wool is carved while under her hand there is multipronged beetle. Two similar monuments can be found in cemetery of Uruds in Zangezur. Indicated tombstones SLA other monuments in shape of horse and sheep figures made of stone (XIV-XVII centuries) by paleography, engravings in form of poems in Azerbaijani, relief images reflecting everyday life represent a single style of school of art of carving over stone and calligraphy, traditional for masters of foremountain regions of Azerbaijan.

Sheep raising played an important role in farming of fore -mountain regions. That is why sheep turned into totem. Horses were also regarded as sacred animals, which served as a single mean of transport in mountains. This explains making tombstones in form of horse and sheep figures.

In Malybeyli village of Lachin region there are three monuments in form of stony horse. Mane, saddle, stirrup and leash on one of them are distinctly carved. On blade-bone of horse there is the image of bird and on the left side of neck there is the date: "year of 977" (1569-1570). Technique of carving of the second figure is very similar to the first figure. Fore and back legs of both figures are made from a whole stone piece but divided from each other by line. On the left side of horse of the third monument there are images of rosace- symbol of sun and figure of a man, who holds bird in his right hand. It is known that ancient Turks had the cult of idol Umay, which protects children. Traditional image of a man with bird in his hands on monuments was regarded probably as a sign which protects them from destruction and damage. Mane of the horse is accurately combed to the right side. Near the saddle the round rosace is carved. All three monuments are made by one sculptor. They can be attributed to the XVI century. All horse figures have the image of the same tamga. Such tamga we can see on the figure of horse (XIV century) now kept in Mskheti affiliate of lapidary of State museum of Georgia in Armaziskhevi.

In Gulebird village of Lachin region there are figures of horses made of stone. On the left side of one of them there is a note: "Koran 55-26, 27. Muharram b. Kordji 1022" (1613-1614). To the left of note there is the image of a man with rifle. On the other - figure of horse is decorated. On its forehead and around the horsecloth there are pendants. Long combed tail is ended with node. Back and fore legs are carved from a whole piece of stone but divided by a line. On the left side there were carved relief images of a man, which holds in his right hand the bird

(Umay) and the axe. The horseman takes an aim.

In cemeteries of villages Zar, Zeylik, Keshdek and others in Kelbadjar region the tombstones in forms of sheep and horse (XIX century) made of stone are preserved with notes in Arabian-Azerbaijani and various scenes of everyday life. These monuments made for Khudaverdi b. Mohammed (died in 1228/1813), Rasul b. Bayram (died in 1253/1837-1838), Abbas b. Ismail Farahkanly (died in 1305/1887-1888), Illaz bin Shakh Valu from shilany community of Farahkanly tribe (died in 1260/1844), Sheikh Far-man; monuments in form of horse - Muhammed Bakir b.Mashkhadi Iskandar from community of shilanny, hasanly tribe (died in 1266/1849-1850), Alishakh b.Mashkhadi Iskandar from community of shilanny (died in 1226/! 849-1850), Kerbalai Orudju b.Kerbalai... from Farahkanly tribe (died in 1228/1869-1870); Kerbalai Husayn b.Baba (died in 1291/1874-1875). Engraved name of architect is Tahmaz son of Kerbalai Muhammad. On other figure of a horse the short poem in Azerbaijani: "This grave is a mansion of one delicate young man. Time has evened his delicate body with soil, 1297" (1880). The other version of poem is engraved on tombstones of XVI century in cemetery of Uruds in Zangezur. This engraving is the first part of tetrastich which carved in epitaph to Sheikh Safi in Pir Vahid village of Guba region of Azerbaijan (1054/1644-1645). Persian version of the first part of this tetrastich can be seen in tombstones belonged to XVI-XVII century made by masters of Shirvan-Absheron school of stone carving art.

Chronology of monuments of Uruds embraces 883-1015 year of Hidjra (1478-1610-1611). Epigraphic and relief images on them evidence Turkic (Azerbaijani) influence over Alban tribes populated Syunik - one of historic regions of Alban state.

In Kargabazar village of Fizuli region on the high cliff the mosque of Giyas ad-Din is built. Population call this the "mosque of Shakh Abbas". On two pieces of limestone there is engraving in Arabic: "O, Allah! O, Mohammed! O, Ali! This mosque-is built by Khadji Giyas ad-Din, who believes in mercy of the Most High Allah. 1095". (1683-1684).

Marble stela - the monument devoted to founder of Azerbaijan's Garabagh khanate has the engraving: Panah-khan Jevanshir, who possess the greatness of the sun, which is kept in stone and glass (i.e. stony fortress named as Shusha - M.N.), and situated in mountains. 1172" (1758-1759).

In mosque of Shusha there are several engravings. One of them says: "Said the envoy of Allah, May Allah bless him and greet him - bow Allah as if you can see Him. But if you do not see Him, He sees you. There are three letters of A in the word "abd" (slave): "ayn", "ba" and "dal". In respect of letter "ayn", it is comprehension (ilm) of Allah by him (slave); "ba" - his distinction from others; "dal" - its vicinity to Allah without questioning and without cover. And there is no larger punishment than putting on the shirt of Allah's servant without true belief

and without need. 1202" (1787-1788).

On the main facade the engraving in Arabic: "Indeed Allah desires for his slaves, needing, turning to His Generosity. Based on will the place in paradise for Govhar-aga is prepared (the mosque renovation is finished). 1302/1884-1885".

Within rosecas located higher there is a relief carving in Arabic: "Allah, Muhammad, Ali, Fatima, Hasan and Huseyn. H[^] (Allah) is eternal. Hand of Allah is over their hands"; Before the mosque there is a phonton divided into two halves. Withm the roseca on partition there is an engraving in Arabic: "It is made by Kerbalai Safi khan, architect from Garabagh. 1301" (1883-1884).

Name of the architect is also found on the mosque of Gevhar-aga, situated in lower portion of Shusha and on mosque in Fizuli: "It is made by Kerbalai safi-khan- architect from Garabagh. 1307" (1889-1890).

According to the project of Safi khan the mosques were built in Barda (1868), Agdam (1870), "Tatar mosque" (1870) in Odessa, mosque Garabaglar (1880) in Ashgabad (27, 2004), several district mosques in town Shusha and other civil buildings in Garabagh.

It can be inferred that Safi khan was the outstanding architect of Garabagh khanate at the end of XIX century. Names of other famous masters of Garabagh - artists Gambar and Ali (1302/1884-1885) are preserved in paintings of imarat of Shekhi khan Mushta-ga in city Sheki.

Construction of large buildings in XVIII century, especially buildings of social, cultural and defense purposes, evidences important role of Garabagh khanate in political and economic life of Azerbaijan and its dominance over other khanates.

Let us consider testimonial of Gevhar-aga on the mosque in Shusha. This mosque was built according to note of historian Mir-za Jamal, author of "Garabagname", due to order of Ibrahim khan in 1182 by Hijra (1663-1769). By his order there were built other constructions, including Shusha fortress in 1198 (1783-1784); fortress Askeran - in 1203 (1788-1789). The father of Ibrahim khan - Panah khan also was involved with construction. He built famous forts Bayat, Shahbulag, mosques, baths and bazaar. According to Mirza Jamal, the mosque was reconstructed by daughter of Ibrahim khan - Gevhar aga and became more beautiful, which confirmed by engravings. According to the engraving- text of vagfname of Gevhar-aga, construction of upper and lower mosques and two madrasa in Shusha had to be completed by the time of compiling of text, i.e. by 1282 (1865-1866). Dimensions of each stone on which vagfname is engraved constitute approximately 1.60 x 0.70m. Placement of a large number of words in small area evidences high skills of carver and distinction of chosen style. Name of master-calligrapher is not displayed in engraving. Engraving is embraced by a simple decoration in form of plant. Engravings said about vagf- will of Gevhar-aga to two mosques and two madrasa and about conditions of spending of their

benefits. The original vagfname is not found. Its copy is kept at the Institute of Manuscripts of Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences. It has no date. However, the text carved over the stone has the date and the carver indicated that he has seen the original document and all its copies.

Engraving listed all property, including shops, gardens and lands, which according to will have to be used for charity.

In Shusha, near to mosque of Gevhar-aga there is a large two-storey caravan-saray. High over its portal there are four stone plates, on which the text of gift testimonial is engraved (vagfname) of Mashadi Husayn Inb Mashadi Mir Sayyaf. The text reflects convey of indicated mosque of Aksa (far) attached to caravan-saray to the vagf. Vagfname on the stone was engraved by Ali, son of Hadji Abbas in 1306 year of Hijra (1888-1889).

In the cemetery of village Ashagy Aybasanly of Fizuli region on the tombstones the poems of famous Garabagh poet of Vidadi are preserved, which were unknown from other sources. On the front of one of stelas there is a note made in Azerbaijani: "1209 (deceased, forgiven Ahmad Sultan Kazzak). O, Vidadi, do not believe that you will make a new way in constant (i.e. in perishable world). (No one passes away from this oppressor with satisfied heart). Be aware that the owner of this grave was a good person. Known in the world by his piety. (He was a philanthropist, generous man). When the death came, he left the perishable world and passed away (with hundreds of wounds, grief, pain in his soul, ...)". The digital hemistich corresponds to date of his death: "accept to the walk to paradise of Ahmad Sultan Kazzak / 1202" (1794-1795).

On the other stela there is engraving in Azerbaijani: "This is the grave of Peri, daughter of Ahmad Sultan Kazzak (At the death of Peri khanum this hemistich was agreeable) date Vidadi! Paradise became the mansion of this fairy (Peri) (22, 400).

The last hemistich by abdjada (digital value) corresponds to 1206 (1791-1792), i.e. the year of Peri's death.

According to epigraphic data and other motifs over described earlier monuments of Garabagh, as well as on tombstones of Uruds in Zangezur, which represent a school of art of carving over stone and calligrapher, it is possible to trace process of falling under Turkic influence and later - converting to Islam of tribes populated Zangezur (Syunik). They assist to outline places of dense population of Turkic tribes, which played the important role in forming of Azerbaijan nation. Engravings evidence that Garabagh by its geographic position, military-strategic value, riches, beaut/, magnificence of nature always attracted attention of foreign aggressors and greedy neighbors. The region always was in the center of trade and caravan routes, which connected countries of West and East in political, economic and cultural sense. Garabagh was the favorite place for rest and meetings of political activists and statesman, including foreigners.

Studied engravings display names of architects, builders, sculptors, calligraphers, carvers, including name of founder of architectural school of XIII-XIV centuries Ali Madjd ad-Din, architect of Garabagh - Safi khan, architect - builders Ibrahim Khalil, Alidjan, calligrapher Veli, sculptors Takhmaz ibn Kerbalai Muhammad. Their creations are evidences of high level of national culture of Azerbaijani nation.

Mubariz Khalilov **ABOUT KURGANS OF GARABAGH**

The V Congress of archaeologists of Russia held in Tiflis set the basis for wide-scale archaeological researches in South Caucasus. During the period of preparing for Congress archaeologists led researches in many areas of the region. But they did not pay attention to Daglyg Garabagh. S.Ter-Avetisyan studied monuments of material culture in Daglyg Garabagh in 1924 as a member of scientific expedition of Association for studies of East attached to Caucasian Central Committee. He wrote: "Albania, to which Garabagh is historically tied, has more remarkable centers of ancient culture than Partav (town Barda - M.Kh.), but archaeological congress considered the latter as more noteworthy, since most scientists expressed more interest to historic centers of the region during feudal era than to monuments of primary society" (S.Ter-Avetisyan. Monuments of ancient Garabagh and skiffs problem. Tiflis, 1934, p.4). But, German teacher E.Resler, founder of archaeology of Daglyg Garabagh, taught from 1891 at the school in Shusha, started his archaeological researches. According to S.Ter-Avetisyan, while his researches E.Resler met "group of Armenians interested in history of the country" (S.Ter-Avetisyan. Monuments of ancient Garabagh and skiffs problem. Tiflis, 1934, p.4). In 1895 without official permission the priest Vagan Dadyan also started researches in Daglyg Garabagh. S.Ter-Avetisyan wrote about these researches the following: "As I already indicated, in regions where I went digging was carried out by two people: deacon Vagan Dadyan (archimandrite Khachik) and German Emil Resler. We have no any published information about researches of the former, so we are unable to evaluate their scientific value. However, it would not be a mistake to say that Vagan Dadyan digging kurgans of Arachadzor aimed to collect kurgan inventory. E.Resler fulfilled researches with permission of Petersburg archaeological commission and had to submit reports about his work to that commission." (S.Ter-Avetisyan, Monuments of ancient Garabagh and skiffs problem. Tiflis, 1934, P-12). All this reminds bishop from city of Marg (V century), who came to the land of Huns and dug the royal tombs and according to expression of Prisk Paniyskiy, author lived in V century, he "stole treasures hidden there" (Prisk Paniyskiy. Gothic history, III, 2). This occasion, which Huns "did not want to convey to judges" became one of the major causes of Hun-

Byzantine war (Prisk Paniyskiy. Gothic history, 111,2). However, let us go back to our theme.

The certain part of inventory found by E.Resler from kurgans in Daglyg Garbagh was transferred to Germany, where they were studied by famous anthropologist Rudolf Virkhov (1821-1902). Being very attentive and possessed by a strong intuition S.Ter-Avetisyan wrote: "Opinion of Virkhov that Garabagh kurgans are not the product of culture of Armenians populated mountain areas, or more correctly. South Caucasus, and the idea that these kurgans belong to other culture, which is not researched up to now, do not cause any doubts". (S.Ter-Avetisyan. Monuments of ancient Gara-bagh and skiffs problem. Tiflis, 1934, p. 19). Namely S.Ter-Avetisyan was the first who by mentioning influence of northern culture onto Garbagh kurgans attempted to clarify ethnic belonging of Daglyg Garbagh kurgans, attributing them to culture of skiffs or saks (S.Ter-Avetisyan. Monuments of ancient Garabagh and skiffs problem. Tiflis, 1934, p. 19-26). S.Ter-Avetisyan considered saks not as the ethnicity arrived from north, but as autochthonous population of South Caucasus, including Daglyg Garabagh (S.Ter-Avetisyan. Monuments of ancient Garabagh and skiffs problem. Tiflis, 1934, p.24-25).

After 40 years, this conception of S.Ter-Avetisyan was confirmed to a some extent by researches of one of leading experts in skiff archaeology M.Pogrebova. Among tombstones of South Caucasus of Late Bronze and Early Iron ages she identified group of kurgans, which have characteristic features as wood constructions in grave, burial of horses together with his owner and traces of fire, which played a definite role in a ritual (M.Pogrebova. Iran and Caucasus in Early Iron Age. Moscow, 1977, p. 114-140). 11 kurgans were included to this group, located in steppe in vicinity of Gandja, 3 kurgans nearby to town Khanlar, 5 kurgans of Minge-chevir and kurgans of Daglyg Garabagh nearby villages of Ballii-kay and Sirkhavend and kurgan N2 of tomb in Khodjaly. Bones of horse also were found in partially destroyed kurgan in Daglyg Garabagh in surroundings of Khankendi, where they were mixed with bones of human (M.Pogrebova. Iran and Caucasus in Early Iron Age. Moscow, 1977, p.115, 120, 122).

Kurgan N2 in Khodjaly researched by E.Resler had a height of 11 meters and contained two-meters layer of soil with traces of fire. Within that layer the derricks of wooden platform are found, mixed with human and horse bones, as well as with bones of other animals and burial inventory.

Height of hill with kurgan between Ballukaya and Sirkhavend, which also was studied by E.Resler is 9 m. At the depth of 5 m there was discovered a large amount of ashy wood, obviously the residuals of woody cover. In the north-west part under the cover there was a stone, which probably served as a basis for one of columns. Under the platform the researcher found human skeleton without skull, as well as bones of horse, ox, dog and burial inventory. Approximately in the same

way the skiff kurgans were described by Herodotus in the V century B.C. According to his data, skiffs descended body of deceased to a large rectangular hole and in spare space of the hole they placed burial inventory, horses, other domestic animals, etc.. Over these they layered wood boards and then all skiffs together made a hill over the grave (Herodotus. History, IV, 71). Described peculiarities of skiff kurgan totally coincide with features of construction and ritual of described above kurgans of Daglyg Garbagh. Kurgan nearby Ballukaya and Sirkhavend dated back to XII-XI centuries B.C. and kurgan N2 in Khodjaly by XI-X centuries B.C. (M.Pogrebova. Iran and Caucasus in Early Iron Age. Moscow, 1977, p. 126). Similar kurgans in other regions of Azerbaijan indicated earlier in this paper are attributed to the period from XIII to VIII centuries B.C. (M.Pogrebova. Iran and Caucasus in Early Iron Age. Moscow, 1977, p. 126). But what about skiffs, being known from vritten sources only starting from VII century B.C.? In this respect it must be noted, that according to some sources the formation of the core of skiff ethnicity took place in XVI-XV centuries B.C. (Herodotus. History, IV,7). Researchers consider that namely during that period in Volga region the culture of Srubna was formed. At the end of its existence there were separate things, which later were developed by skiffs. According to experts, this indicates that there was no serious distinction between Srubna and skiff cultures. Descendants of Srubna culture during the early-skiff period might put the basis of skiffs culture. Moreover, kurgans with holes, which have woody covers, with woody frameworks (srubs) and traces of fire and buried horses are characteristic for skiffs lived in VII-V centuries B.C. (Steppes of European part of USSR during skiff-sarmatian period. Moscow, 1989. p.55-56, 217-221).

In sfcSppes of Low Volga researched kurgans are close to those of Garabagh by wopden constructions, burial of horses, rituals, including those relat d to fire and by their date. According to experts, these monuments were predecessors of burials of skiff-sarmatian aristocracy in this region (M.Pogrebova. Iran and Caucasus in Early Iron Age. Moscow, 1977, p. 132-133). In viewpoint of M.Pogrebova, at the end of II millennium B.C. tl e ethnicity, which had relations with skiffs may migrate from Low Volga region to South Caucasus, including Daglyg Garabagh. fM.Pogrebova. Iran and Caucasus in Early Iron Age. Moscow, 1977. p.133-134, 173).

At the end of XX century the data about some other kurgans with woody construction and horse burials were published. These include kurgan dug in 1941 by Y.Gummel (1893-1946) nearby to Khanlar (Y.Gummel. Archaeological studies to south-west from Khanlar in 194! - Journal "Vestnik drevney istorii", 1992, N4, p. 5-12) and also kurgan Borsunlu (XII-XI centuries B.C.), Beyima-sarov (X-IX centuries B.C.) in Terter region and Sarychoban (XI-X centuries B.C.) in Agdam region of Azerbaijan, founded through 1892-1986 by G.Jafarov (G.Jafarov. Borsunlu -- burial of tribe leader. Baku, 1986; G.Jafarov, F.Mahudov. Results of

work of the second team of Mil-Garabagh archaeological expedition - Archaeological researches in Azerbaijan (1985). Paper abstracts. Baku, 1986, p. 14-15; G.Jafarov. Sarychoban - newly founded burial of tribe leader - Paper abstracts of the conference "Great October and development of archaeological and ethnographic sciences in Azerbaijan". Baku, 1988, p.21-23). Among them of special interest is Borsunlu kurgan, which was looted at ancient times. Its grave hole was of huge extensions - 256 m². Even nails hammered into wooden things were made of gold (G.Jafarov. Borsunly..., p.4). Researches of G.Jafarov confirmed another notion of S.Ter-Avetiyan that kurgans were spread into Daglyg Garabagh from Garabagh plain through the passages along rivers Terter, Khachin, Gargar (S.Ter-Avetisyan. Indicated work, p.7-8). In these kurgans in plain area of Garabagh G.Jafarov detected skeletons of people, including women - concubines attending the leader to the other world, as well as a layer of cane over wooden cover, indicated by Herodotus in V century B.C. while description of kurgans of skiff kings (Herodotus. History, IV, 71). Comparing wooden beds from kurgan of Borsunlu and from kurgans with srubs and horse burials belonged to Tagar culture of skiff era in Siberia, G.Jafarov identifies similarity in them (G.'afarov. Borsunlu..., p.4). In srubna burial nearby to Khanlar a cart with two deer was discovered. Such cart was also found in kurgan with wooden framewok of skiff-saks origin in Pazyrka in Altay, where buried cart-horse had a mask of deer on its head. (B.Piotrovskiy. Appendix to the paper of Y.Gummel - Journal "Vestnik of drevney istorii", 1992, N4, p.12). These parallels between two monuments of various epochs once more indicate that skiff culture, probably, constituted a new stage in generation of culture of "organs with srubs and horses". Srubna Burial nearby to Khanlar was dated by B.Piotrovskiy (1908-1990) approximately back to XV-XIV centuries B.C. (B.Piotrovskiy. Indicated work, p. 15). This makes it possible to infer that the first group belonged to Srubna culture may emerge in South Caucasus before the date known earlier.

According to G.Jafarov, tribe leaders buried in kurgans of Ga-rabagh plain, focused in their hands civil, military and religious power during the era of "military democracy" (G.Jafarov. Sary-choban..., p.23). According to similar kurgans of Daglyg Garbagh, their power was spread not only over Garabagh plain area, but also over Daglyg Garabagh.

In viewpoint of M.Pogrebova, in VII century B.C. during the outstanding march of skiffs through Caucasus they met here relative ethnicities (M.Pogrebova. Indicated work. P. 173). It is interesting that saks, which had common origin with skiffs, were located in area btween rivers Kur and Araz namely in the zone of allocation of kurgans with wooden constructions and horse burials. In VI-V centuries B.C. they populated in historic Saksene on the right band of Kur in area where Mingechevir, Gandja and Khanlar groups of kurgans were found. S.Ter-Avetisyan indicates that "among population of Ganja region there are oral legends

about saks is reserved" (S.Ter-Avetisyan. Indicated work. p.23). but he did not writes it. S.Tel-Avetisyan developing a concept about links of Garabagh kurgans to northern culture, let "the final decision to the future, when these kurgans 'vere systematically dug and studied" (S.Ter-Avetisyan. Indicated work, p. 19). This far-sighted message to next generations obliges population of Daglyg Garabagh to preserve archaeological monuments, including kurgans of this region and stop attempts of dilettantes and treasure-hunters to destroy them.

Musa MARDjanly
ARMENIAN EXPANSIONISM - THE
SOURCE OF DANGER TO STABILITY IN THE REGION

Each nation made its own contribution into development of common cultural heritage of humanity. The issue of the nation leading in the world culture was always the subject of discussions and contradictions. In fact, all nations to some extent participated in creation of monuments of material and spiritual culture of humanity.

At the same time, history knows a number of personalities, political blocks, event states, which played negative role in historic processes, which damaged cultural heritage of a mankind. Undoubtedly, in each case such behavior grounds on some ideology, which formed for a long period of time and ultimately catches into its net the most part of society. In such case it is possible to talk about serious danger to that society, its moral health, and frequently about the danger to neighbor states and societies. It is known that Armenians migrated to Caucasus in XIX century under protection of Russian empire, later created their own state on historic lands of Azerbaijan. As a result of nationalistic policy, Armenians occupied Zangezur, Irevan, Geyche and finally Garabagh. But it seems, as if they have no intention to be satisfied with these. Experience of recent history evidences that Armenian aggressive nationalism started a total war against Azerbaijan, which has centuries-long history of statehood and made invaluable contribution into development of civilization and world-wide cultural heritage. Terror backed by ideological war along with open armed aggression, ruthless ethnic cleansing are the major components of policy of Armenian nationalists.

So, we may infer that Armenian expansionism log time ago became the source of danger to stability in world scale. At the same time, Azerbaijan as the most suffered from Armenian aggression, at least, has the moral right for adequate defense by international community. For this international community has to learn the truth about Armenian aggressive nationalism, its historic roots, scale and consequences of its destructive activity in the region and international arena in a whole. Today, when everywhere in the world the necessity to fight international terrorism is the crucial issue, the problem of neutralization of Armenian extremism

gain a special value.

Azerbaijan nation: from ancient times tried to build good relations with its neighbors, was far from hostility and attempts to occupy territories. On the hand, it frequently was forced to defend its territory from foreign aggressors. This is observed nowadays: one fifth of territory of Azerbaijan is occupied. The aggressor violates all norms of international law and ignores existed international documents, which regulate humanitarian and environmental issues. On territories occupied by Armenia, which are outside of control of international community, narcotics are produced and people are trained for various extremist groups. Monuments of Turkic-Alban and Alban-Christian culture are deliberately destroyed, including monuments of international value, flora and fauna of this region are damaged. For the last years in Armenia and other countries new absurd things were published to prove Armenians being extraordinary nation and justify their huge territorial appetite. However, it is not new, since various Armenian groups implement propaganda war for many decades. The old motto is the major thing in this war: the more absurd the lie, more easily it will be believed. However, despite the scale of lie and falsifications, despite cynical thrusting of absurd ideas, pretending that it is the truth, it must be remembered that lie has short legs. Today muddy flow of disinformation is more frequently smashed by wave of true data and there are already the fruits of dissemination of true information about so-called "Armenian issue" and the society starts to understand who is right and who is not. I would like to hope that sensible part of Armenian society will influence politicians, which play with destiny of own nation. The history of Armenian-Azerbaijan conflict starts from time of migration of Armenians to Caucasus in the first half of XIX century. Armenians came to Caucasus with assistance of powerful supporters, lies and false tears, they had no any significant historic-geographic roots in the region. That is why, Armenians-hays which arrive here, always desired to capture territories of indigenous population. Another twist of this "traditional" aggression policy of Armenians towards Azerbaijan's lands took place in 1988 initiating series of ethnic conflicts on territory of former USSR. In this case Armenian aggression targeted Garabagh, which they "selected" 200 years ago during their move into the region. Starting from 1989, Armenians with support of their protectors succeeded to occupy this historic land of Azerbaijan. History shows us a number of examples when in the end occupants were defeated, but Armenians never learned from history. If this was not true, then "Armenia would not swung between Eastern and Western states, like ping-pong ball...", because "it never acted as a host to itself, never firmly supported any party and always was the battlefield for diplomats and armies" (Ayzek Azimov. "Middle East: history often thousand years"). As a result, Garabagh being an ancient territory of Azerbaijan, at the end of XX century was occupied by Armenians, which withdrawn local Azerbaijani and undertake unrestrained destruction and looting of material and cultural monuments. Military

aggression of Armenia against Azerbaijan led to death of tens of thousands people, many innocent people were imprisoned and underwent atrocities and tortures, many wounded. Tragedy of Garabagh town Khodjaly is one of the most ruthless crimes against humanity in XX century. At night in February of 1992 hundreds of civil population - elderly, women and children - were killed, their corpses were disfigured and desecrated. This is a moral image of supporters of idea of "Great Armenia". To drive away the attention from their own bloody acts, they pretend to be nation-"sufferer", and by any means try to thrust on fabricated thesis of so-called "genocide of Armenians". Unfortunately, sometimes they reach their goal. With assistance of influential lobby and their organizations, Armenians lead ideological struggle against Azerbaijan. Their long-term propagandistic campaign in Garabagh issue brought their "fruits" - great powers do not show any resolution towards aggressor and apply policy of double standards and thus justify occupation of Azerbaijani lands.

Azerbaijan has not only lost its territories, sons and daughters in Garabagh. Losses also do not limit by riches on the earth's surface and that underground. Azerbaijan has lost here the most part of history, culture, arts, in other words, spiritual heritage. Aggression of Armenia damaged Azerbaijan in a way, which can not be measured ordinarily: over vast area there were destroyed historic, cultural and environmental monuments, mosques and ancient settlements. The people fled from their own lands were forced to change their lifestyle and traditions. However, Armenians themselves already understand that aggression policy has no future. For the last period emigration from Armenia took intensive nature. One of reasons is social-economic problems, while the other undoubtedly relates to fear of waiting of "hour X" - time of liberation of occupied territories. With approaching of "hour X" we have to raise our voice of truth and make it known to a whole world.

Nigar Geozalova
STUDIES OF GARABAGH AND
IREVAN KHANATES HISTORY REFLECTED
IN HISTORIOGRAPHY WRITTEN IN ENGLISH

In this paper we will consider most important works of authors who wrote in English and were involved with studies of history of Garabagh and Ire van khanates. These are the works of Atkin Murel and J.Bornotyan.

The paper "Strange death of Ibragimkhalil khan of Garabagh" authored by A.Murel is the serious historic investigation of English author, which is devoted to one of Azerbaijan's khanates and personality of outstanding Azerbaijani khan. In this paper the author very objectively estimates historic processes of the second half of XVIII century, intentions of Russia and Gadjar's Iran to establish their

dominance in this region, inevitability of khanates rulers appeal to neighbor countries for assistance in order to preserve internal order and independence.

According to A.Murel, Ibrahimkhalil khan became one of the powerful ruler in South Caucasus. By diplomatic means, sometimes by use of armed operations he established his power over the largest portion of territory governed by Moslem rulers. The author states that Ibrahimkhalil khan fiercely struggled for political survival and applied all means in this harsh struggle for power in South Caucasus.

In his other publication "Russia and Iran, 1780-1828" issued later, the author studied the struggle between Russia and Iran over the power in South Caucasus. In general, it can be noted that this is the last and one of the thorough researches on Russian-Iran wars in the world historiography. A.Murel underlines aggressive and expansionist nature of policy implemented by Russia and desire of Iran to restore its dominance over the territories once belonged to it. Independence of khanates he considers, as legal, objective, however temporary phenomena, because countries which fought for dominance in this region were not interested in existence of independent states here. In addition, the author gives short information about economic situation, administrative structure of khanates, etc.

It must be noted that conceptual viewpoint of representatives of historiography in English in regard of Russia's policy in South Caucasus consists in notion that policy of Petersburg is shown as attacking, aggressive and colonial, however policy of England, France, Iran and Turkey as "defensive and peaceful", etc. It can be seen that these authors correctly evaluating aggressive policy of Russia in the region, left expansionist policy of Iran, Turkey and their own countries in the shade.

English authors while writing about independence of khanates, recognize this only in respect of khanates of northern Azerbaijan. However, despite this, they consider these lands as territories of Iran, which rulers are temporarily separated from central power. Simultaneously they give correct evaluation for struggle between Russia, Gadjar Iran and Turkey over the influence in the region and regard this policy as outspokenly aggressive and expansionist one. A.Murel noted that Russian invasion into South Caucasus was not the part of "liberation of Caucasian nations from foreign yoke" as stated Soviet historians. For South Caucasian khanates the Russian suzerainty was at least the lesser evil than "foreign yoke" of neighboring countries dominated in the region until that period. Divided political power in Iran in XVIII century and weakness of Ottoman empire made possible the emerging of generation of Caucasian rulers, which attempted to develop their own states without interference of large states. During the period of struggle between neighbor countries the local rulers tried to keep and deepen their power by the union most favorable for the period. But khanates almost had not any space for political maneuvers. According to A.Murel, Russia clearly understanding

advantages which it will gain interfering into Caucasian affairs, did not take into account that interests of local rulers may distinguish from that of Russians.

The special group consists of works in English devoted to history of Azerbaijan and written by Armenian scientists. Among these a special interest draw researches of J. Bornotyan it must be noted that he is the author of a large number of papers and books on history of the region; his works as works of all Armenian historians are penetrated by the only goal: prove the concept of existence of Armenian state in Caucasus on the expense of distortion of Azerbaijan history. In general all Armenian historiography tries to inculcate in historic science the idea about existence of Armenian state in Caucasus since ancient times, which is nothing else than illusion and fabrication of Armenian false historians. Until XIX century in the whole South Caucasus there was not Armenian state, not even dense settlement of Armenians. It should be noted that Armenian propagandistic machine became more active since start of Armenian-Azerbaijan conflict.

Our attention draws his work "Irevan khanate while the rule of Gadjars (1795-1828), as well as his research devoted to Azerbaijani khan Huseyn Gulu khan Irevani, etc.

We have already indicated tendentious approach and distortion of historic truth in works of Armenian "scientists" and in this respect, researches of Bornotyan are not the exception. However, in his works Bornotyan could not object historic realities. In particular, he is one of a few Armenian historians who recognize that Armenian population of Irevan khanate does not exceed 20% prior to Russian invasion. Besides, Bornotyan indicates migration of a large number of Armenian population into Irevan khanate after Russian invasion, as well as changes made in toponymy of Azerbaijani settlements into Armenian on territory of Irevan khanate, etc. The author also wrote that in Irevan khanate "There are no evidences on dominating or even equal number of Armenian population with that of Moslems during Persian rule...". The author notes that immediately after the annexation of region by Russia some of "Armenians, who supported Russia were disappointed, during the first decades the Russian rule did not distinguish from the last years of Persian rule in the region, however Russian rule has brought more benefits to Armenians than to Moslems of khanate".

Bornotyan is also the author of translation of the most valuable and important sources of history of Azerbaijan in XVIII-XIX centuries, that is "Garabagh Tarikhi" (History of Garabagh) by author Mirza Jamal. Pro-Armenian positions of the author serve as initial point while researching history of region (which is briefly expounded in foreword to the translation). Bornotyan proceeds from preconception that Azerbaijani researchers deliberately decreased the value of some parts of the book where there are indications about Armenian population of Garabagh. Even he did not give any proofs of this. Bornotyan had to be praised for his "excellent" manipulations by historic realities. Such skillful "historic method"

(many incorrect, almost absurd comments to the text) may embarrass the reader, which did not acknowledged with true historic realities. Thus, in the light of all said above there is a certain necessity in publication of this and other Azerbaijani sources in English with authentic comments of Azerbaijani researchers, which undoubtedly will assist to restoration of historic truth.

I would like to specially note the issue as if there were Armenian "lands" in south Caucasus from ancient times. It is known that such tendency set in almost all western historiography. It must be underlined that there was no "Armenian state" on the territory of South Caucasus, because Armenians did not have their own state until the XX century. Delusion of many authors, which write in English, including A.Murel, consists in indication of existence of so-called "Iranian Armenia" or "Eastern Armenia" (In Armenian, as in all western historiography to "Eastern Armenia" they refer lands of Nakhchivan, Gandja, Garabagh and also Irevan khanates). We explain this, firstly by "successful" falsification by Armenians of historic facts according to their interests; secondly, by insufficient knowledge by those authors of all sources and as a consequence in their works there are gaps while researching of some historic processes undergone on the territory of Azerbaijan. This leads to mistakenly made conclusions while critical description of these problems. First of all, it must be noted that there was no "Iranian Armenia" or "Eastern Armenia" and all lands in fact were Azerbaijani territories. Our arguments are confirmed by researches of famous American scientist Jastin Makkarti. He noted that despite persistent use of these terms by Europeans there never was "Ottoman Armenia" or "Iranian Armenia" both demographically and territorially.

Characterizing books written in English it should be noted that methodological approach of these historians in distinction to that of Soviet period is more objective and true. Despite some incorrect statements and subjectivity in description of events in those books it is possible to derive some interesting facts, which allow better comprehension of some characteristic features of international struggle in South Caucasus in XVIII century.

Despite some shortages these researches are frequently useful for substantiation of some scientific issues, because they contain a lot of facts from valuable sources which absent in archives of our country.

Niyazi Mehdi
RESOLUTION OF CONFLICTS IN THE CAUCASUS
ACCORDING TO THE PRINCIPLE OF 'SEMIOTIC ANOMALIES'

In the present phase of the conflict over Mountainous Karabakh, the deadlock in the peace process is due to symbolism. There is no solution through standard methods: the Armenians are not ready to give away the symbol of an independent republic, while the Azeris refuse the alteration of their borders. Similar situations exist in the conflicts between Chechnia and Russia, and between Abkhazia and Georgia. In order to resolve this deadlock, we are proposing a new autonomy model ('nomy' is law in Greek, 'autonomy' means 'ruling oneself according to one's own laws').

Although the model we propose is thought of in the context of the Caucasus, it may be applied in other places, for example in Cyprus, or in Southern Azerbaijan which is tied to Iran, after the necessary transformations there.

The autonomy we are proposing solve the conflicts with the principle of semiotic (related with the system of signs) anomalies. First the model of anomalous autonomy is examined in the face of the facts of the Mountainous Karabakh case.

To give the context of the proposal, it is needed to present the current situation: Factors obstacles to a solution from the Armenian perspective: the Armenian army has succeeded in factually removing Mountainous Karabakh from the Azerbaijani state system. However, international law prevents this 'fact' from entering into force. There seems to be no way out from this problem. Naturally, the Mountainous Karabakh Armenians have the opportunity of conceding some political symbols to Azerbaijan while de facto continuing to live as an independent state. But the Armenians are worried of such a prospect.

Their first worry is that in case Azerbaijan is strengthened on the military-economic-mental level, and international attention on the Caucasus is reduced, Azerbaijan would take advantage of its symbolic sovereignty over Mountainous Karabakh to remove the factual independent situation of Mountainous Karabakh. That means that in the absence of totally reliable guarantees, the Armenians be very cautious with regard to symbols that would connect them symbolically to Azerbaijan.

Secondly, in a paralyzed situation, the Armenians are worried of migration and the Azeri demographic dynamic. They argue that the 'Nakhcivan version' could be repeated in Mountainous Karabakh, implying that in Mountainous Karabakh, Azerbaijani demographic increase could pressurize the Armenians by peaceful means; that is, victory could be achieved through peaceful means. (This is the Armenian version and the Azerbaijani side has an answer 10 it.)

Third, the acceptance of Azerbaijani state symbols over Mountainous

Karabakh is related to the show of strength of Armenia and the Mountainous Karabakh Armenians. Officials on the Armenian side note that after the efforts spent, the society refuses to return to the past and accept Mountainous Karabakh's previous status.

Factors obstacles to a solution from the Azerbaijani perspective: First of all, according to the Azerbaijani civil, national and state consciousness, Karabakh, together with its mountainous part, is a part of the nation's geography. To separate out Mountainous Karabakh from the rest of the country would be a national disaster, close to a cosmic catastrophe, for the national consciousness.

Secondly, the system and logic of international law (for example, the inviolability of borders, the recognition by the UN of Azerbaijan in its present borders, etc.) is in Azerbaijan's favour. Giving in from this favorable position would be absurd.

Thirdly, the prospect of the strengthening of the state should not be forgotten, that is, there is a possibility to reclaim the losses in the future.

Fourthly, international law has its own automatism. Accordingly, a small compromise in political symbolism carries the risk of a 'Japanese domino', leading to the full loss of Mountainous Karabakh. For example, to carry out negotiations with the Karabakh Armenians as a party to the conflict, with the automatism of international law, immediately implies an important step towards the recognition of Mountainous Karabakh's independence.

Hence, the vector of the motives of both parties takes the Mountainous Karabakh conflict into a corner, a deadlock.

The civilization order of the present international powers is in the pathos of creating stability; as such, the chance of removing the peace process from the deadlock is zero. If, as in the case of countries like Armenia and Azerbaijan, where there is a frightening degree of corruption at the leadership level with large bank accounts abroad, then the fear of this being discovered or the danger of 'losing the bank accounts' makes the leadership of these countries weak to foreign blackmail. This is the only serious method to exert pressure on the leadership of countries like Azerbaijan.

Section 907 enacted by the US congress, Russia's longtime lowering of trade with Azerbaijan with the intention to inflict damage, and certain analogical measures from the Iranian side showed that the country can survive this kind of actions. In this sense, the elementary show of honor by Azerbaijan can keep the conflict in its present blind alley.

Nevertheless, most people know that a solution that can solve the conflict and satisfy all sides to it (that is Azerbaijan, Armenia, and Mountainous Karabakh Armenians) would be beneficial. All sides approaching the problem agree that the Armenians of Mountainous Karabakh should live with maximum demographic, economic, and military security, whereas Azerbaijanis of Mountainous Karabakh

would be able to live in their former lands, cities, and villages with maximum security. Naturally, after military victories the Mountainous Karabakh Armenians have a wish, that their place of residence should be a state of their own. Azerbaijan's Armenian minority want Mountainous Karabakh to be factually a part of their national statehood consciousness. This wish creates severe difficulties.

In this context, we give the Mountainous Karabakh model for resolving the conflict peacefully. The methodology that permits this model is the following: first, the model acknowledges Mountainous Karabakh as an Azerbaijani anomaly. (Anomaly in Greek means something in law standing out of the norm.) This means, the status of Mountainous Karabakh is built on certain principles that do not fit squarely with the principles of international law, and becomes legally the Mountainous Karabakh anomaly. Secondly, it uses the procedures that lead to the situation, that we metaphorically term as stalemate situation. The situation of stalemate emerges in the game of chess, when it becomes impossible to create any new situation or development.

The Stalemate situation created in this model gives to Azerbaijan that Mountainous Karabakh Armenians through some principal concessions and through the automatism of international law do not secede from Azerbaijan. For the Armenian side, the procedures leading to the Stalemate situation provide the opportunity of protection from a threat from Azerbaijan.

In this model the stalemate procedure leads to one concession in return of another, thereby securitizing and neutralizing the situation. Hence, the model creates a path for the fulfillment of the ambitions of both parties and as a result enables the two ethnoses of Mountainous Karabakh to live with their national consciousness.

The model we propose, if the tendencies of the 20th century are converted into grounds of resolution, may work. Events like Kosovo or Bosnia elucidates the tendencies:

- It is not possible to suppress a national, ethnic minority; there is no perspective in succumbing to the wish to oust them from their place of inhabitancy;
- The civilized world will not allow anyone to realize a wish to annihilate its ethnic or religious enemy;
- The world will not allow that one party emerges winning of an ethnic conflict. On the level of ethnic and other minorities, progress and development is managed;
- At the same time these minorities will not be given the opportunity to alter state borders through separatism.
- Controversies that do arise must be solved through the coordinates of civilized relations.

From the Azerbaijani perspective, if this so-called world system is weakened, and the Mountainous Karabakh Armenians take the below-given autonomy model as a basis for separating from Azerbaijan, Azerbaijan must be

ready to use force to counter that process. In this model, the ability of perpetual motion, and the inability to exit from this perpetual motion and create a new situation, paradoxically unite. This is what we intend by the term stalemate.

Below, the key principles of Mountainous Karabakh anomalous autonomy are given; the details and aspects can be elucidated by the work of experts. We here draw the conceptual lines as follows: **1)** Azerbaijan, Armenia, and the Armenian and Azerbaijani communities of Mountainous Karabakh agree to Mountainous Karabakh being an anomaly within Azerbaijan, and as such the problem is to be solved in an anomalous way.

Having accepted this, a stalemate situation is created in order to solve the Mountainous Karabakh anomaly through the logic of new principles of international law; this situation is achieved through the following:

2) Azerbaijan accepts Mountainous Karabakh as the 'Mountainous Karabakh Republic' - although this could mean the recognition of MKR's independence; however, without a referendum in Azerbaijan, the MKR cannot change its name to exit from Azerbaijan's borders (for example, the Armenians cannot unilaterally change the name to Artsakh or some other name, and this is a compensation for the recognition by Azerbaijan of the MKR. It is also possible that the MKR is permanently written into the documents of Azerbaijan.)

3) MKR will nominally keep an army, however the institution known as its army will be under the inspection of Azerbaijan and functions as a police force, and is not converted into an army with heavy weaponry, (it cannot through the automatism of international law turn into a real army, as it is locked by the stalemate principle). Armenians and Azerbaijanis serve in this army in a proportion suitable with Mountainous Karabakh's demography.

4) MKR has a parliament of its own, and the Azerbaijani minority is represented through quotation. The parliament modifies the rules of the Milli Maclis of Azerbaijan, however it has legislative power on matters previously agreed upon.

5) MKR is represented in the Azerbaijani Milli Maclis through a quota system, has the right to propose legislation, and participate in voting.

6) Every five years the Azerbaijani parliament raises the issue of annulling the MKR, however in this matter (other symbolic matters could be added) the MKR representatives veto this proposition. As the matter comes up, the representatives of MKR automatically put a veto in the base of the official document. (The reason is that it would interrupt the possible action of representatives who would not want to put the veto, due to corruption or accidents). Every five years the MKR parliament legislates to secede from Azerbaijan (create its own currency etc.) and the Azerbaijani minority vetoes this through documents given by Baku.

7) This veto procedure follows the stalemate principle insofar as it is

managed to guide highly loaded matters to a symbolic value. As time passes, anomalies through stalemate procedures lose their rhythm and strength, and transform into original rituals. Such rituals remain in certain English political actions. We call this semi-otic anomalies: Their significance and importance in reality may have been annihilated, and although they may be pointless or discredited, their psychological value and cultural importance rises. That Elizabeth II is the head of state of Australia is one of such semi-otic anomalies. The therapeutic and psychological factors that may serve as stalemate functions in the Azerbaijani-Armenian controversy may be further researched.

8) If Armenia declares war on Azerbaijan or any other country, MKR would not through the automatism of its status as a republic have the right to enter into an alliance with Armenia.

If Azerbaijan declares war on Armenia or another country, MKR will not need to take part in this war. Hence the ambitions of both sides are controlled through symbols. Thanks to the stalemate procedure, an imitation of the painful acts that would be understood as threatening to the other side is created. However, these acts have no chance of being realized, and are halted.

The given anomalous autonomy model should be guaranteed by the UN. Any party which tries to alter the agreed situation will be considered to have declared war on the UN and should be subjected to adequate responses.

As we have said, the paradigm of the anomalous autonomy is given as a key, introductory model. Beyond this model there must be agreements on Shusha, Lachin, Kelbajar, and Agdere (Marda-kert). Here other anomalies or stalemate situations may be considered. (All examples given above are intended to open the principles. If all four sides are ready to solve the problem through the anomalous autonomy and stalemate model, keeping the principles outlined above, our examples of application may be altered or alternatives may be given.)

Nurani

HISTORY OF ARMENIAN TERRORISM

On March 11, 2005 the world paid tribute to those killed in bloody terrorist attacks in Madrid, which victims reached 200 people. Memorial services also were accompanied by anti-terrorist summit in Madrid. Spain has invited more than a hundred and a half of experts in the sphere of anti-terror and heads of 14 countries, which citizens became the victims of terrorist attack on March 11.

However, despite that in capital of Spain on the remembrance day of tragedy in Madrid railway stations, which journalist named as "European September 11", there were a lot of talks about terror and ways to combat it, no one due to ethic considerations said that if September 11 is the day of a total war with terror, then tragedy in Spain, happened in thousand days after terrorist attack in the

USA, has shown that state machine may be defeated in a fight with terrorists: after blasts in mined trains authorities in Spain informed that they withdraw their troops from Iraq and namely this was demanded by terrorists. And no one remember other date - March 15 of 1921. It was when European community for the first time demonstrated its readiness to "cave in" to terrorists.

First blood: On March 15 of 1921 on desert street Gardenbergsstrasse in quiet district of Berlin shots were heard. Later just a few eyewitnesses will retell that a young man shot into the elderly, well-dressed man and tried to run away, but he was captured barehanded. Policemen, who captured the "shooter" considered the case as very simple and "firm" and the verdict caused doubts not more than tomorrow's sunrise. The case was conveyed to court in only in June of the same year. At this moment, authorities of Germany made it clear that the case which seemed as "clear and simple" in fact is political, and consequently, the unexpected twists are quite possible. Murdered person was Talat pasha, former interior minister in government of Young Turks. And the killer was Armenian student Sogomon Tey-leryan, who immediately declared that he took a revenge for "extermination of Armenians" in Ottoman empire - according to Armenian "researchers" the mythic order on extermination of Armenians was given namely by Talat pasha. Legal proceedings lasted for three days and became almost a classic case proving that if the politics starts to dictate to law, proceedings turn into a farce. Germany did not regained yet from shock of Versailles treaty, which became the clear illustration to known postulate "Sorry for those defeated!". Negotiations "settling" post-war order in Europe were underway in the international arena and it was not profitable to "tense" relations with winner-countries and the trial of Sogomon Teyleryan gave a unique chance to "gain favor" of winners on the expense of Turkey. Besides Armenian activists made titanic efforts to turn the process into show-trial. Immediately the fund of Sogomon Teyleryan was created into which the "gold streams" of donations were flown. Lawyers and "public activists" widely speculated the theme of "genocide". They displayed, in particular, "original" telegrams and stated as if they contain the order on "extermination of Armenians" signed by Talat pasha.

History of these "telegrams" was repeatedly described later in media, including our newspaper. At first, some telegrams as if proving the fact of "genocide" of Armenians were published in British newspaper Daily Telegraph in 1919, and it was stated that they were discovered by occupation forces of General Allenby in the same town of Aleppo. However, when Great Britain's Foreign Office held own investigation, it turned out that these documents were fabricated by one of Armenian groups in Paris. Documents related to investigations of 1919 are kept in Great Britain archives up to now. However, failure in London did not chill the heat of falsifiers. In a year period, in 1920, Armenian historian Aram Andonyan, who lived in Paris **since** 1915, published in France a book "Me moirs of Nairn bey.

Official Turkish documents about migration and massacre of Armenians". In the book he displays another "documental evidences", which as if prove the fact of existence of order by the Talat pasha, internal affairs minister in government of Young Turks, about extermination of Armenians. Andonyan stated that he had received those documents from Ottoman state person from town Aleppo (at present Khaleb in Syria), who acquired them by official channels. Photo copies of these "documents" are shown in museum of "genocide of Armenians" in Yerevan. Later he declared that he had "lost" originals of those telegrams. In any case, according to opinion of historians "proofs" shown in the book are beneath any criticism. In another year these "telegrams" are shown in trial of Teyleryan and following to the opinion of British Foreign Office experts, the court experts in Berlin came to the conclusion disappointing for Armenians: neither paper on which "documents" are written, nor writing style can be considered as characteristic for Ottoman empire.

Later apologists of the theory "Ay data" - "Armenian trial over the Turkey" - will describe in detail as court in Berlin declared Teyleryan not guilty upon hearing his stories about "horrors of genocide", while other researchers will oppose, stating that in fact, the court in Berlin did not justified Teleyryan, but judged him as mentally incompetent taking into account that he suffered nervous fit. In addition, judges in Berlin tried not to pay attention to emerged proofs that "mentally incompetent" Teyleryan was not alone in his actions.

Dashnaks "Nemesis": Details of those events became known later, and what is most surprising, they became known from memoirs of participants, more precisely, of culpable participants, which soon after convinced that they will not face judicial responsibility and started to paint their "feats". In the autumn of 1919 in Yerevan "Dashnakt-syutun" party held its ninth congress. Shagen Natali, who entered into ARFD ten years earlier, was among attendants of the congress. He insists to create a special organization "Nemesis" with its special mission: "to take revenge for sufferings of Armenians". They formed responsible body (head - Armen Garo) and a special fund (head - Shagen Satchaklyan), supervision and financial provision were governed to Shagen Natali and Grigor Merjanov. As headquarters they used offices of two newspapers: "Chakatamart", published in Istanbul occupied by Britons and ""Droshak" of Boston. There was considered the list of those "subject to extermination" consisted of 650 names, of which 41 were urgent. Later, in accordance with "t chnologies" of international terrorism the preparation of "bloody" actions started. Information was collected by Grach Papazyan, shown himself as "Turkish student".

In May of 1920 Armenian terrorist-dashnak shot Nasib bey Yu-sifbeyli-prominent political and public activist of Azerbaijan Democratic Republic (ADR). In a period less than a month, on June 19 of 1920 one more bloody action was fulfilled by Aram Erkamyan and Misak Grigoryan: in Yerevan square in Tiflis, terrorists shot to death Fatali khan Khoyskiy, one of founder of ADR and heavily

wounded Khalil bey Khosmamedov. In a month, on July 19 of 1920 Armenian bullets reached Hasan bey Agayev.

On this background the killing of Talat pasha in Berlin represented some sort of "probing action", check of reaction of European justice on Armenian ravings about "genocide". When Sogomon Teyleryan was freed after short proceeding, his "partners" in "Nemesis" evaluated this as a command "Fire!". On July 18 of 1921 in Istanbul occupied by Britain's troops, in front of hotel "Pera Palas" Armenian terrorist Torlakyan shot to death Beh-bud khan Jevanshir, former minister of internal affairs of ADR. The case was considered in Britain's court-martial, which almost repeated scenario of trial in Berlin: the court-martial a few months later decided that he had committed a crime, but pleaded him as not guilty stating as if in 1918 in Baku the relatives of Torlakyan were killed and he had shot B.Jevanshir being mentally unfit. Several months later in Rome another Dashnak terrorist- Arshavir Shirakyan- killed Said Khalim pasha, former minister of foreign affairs of Ottoman empire. Only in four months period, on April 17, 1922, Shirakyan takes Aram Erganyan as a partner, shot to death Baheddin Shakir Bey and Kemal Azmi Bey in one of streets of Berlin. Several months later in Tiflis two Armenians killed another Turkish official - Kemal pasha. Kemal pasha, who according to Doctor Joan Lepsius (named as "fierce Turcophobe and friend of Armenians" by Austrian scientist Erik Faygl) regarded Armenians with sympathy: "Kemal pasha, head of the fourth army in Syria, hold a certain distance to those who were in power in Konstantinopol. He warned about serious revolts in his district and helped refugees and forced migrants". On July 25 of 1922 Jemal pasha, former defense ministry of Ottoman empire was shot to death in Tiflis. "Operation" was fulfilled by two dashnak fighters: Zare Melik-Shahnazaryan and Stepan Tsagikyan. The other fact is less known: among victims of "Nemesis" there were a certain number of Armenians, which were blamed by dashnaks in excessive loyalty to Turkish authorities: Amayak Ara-myants, Arshavir Yesayan, Vage Yesayan, Artin Mkrtychyan...

But there was another fact during Bacchanalias of Armenian terror. On August 4 of 1922 Enver pasha was killed in surroundings of Bukhara. According to official version Enver-pasha was killed in the battle with Red army soldiers. Unofficial version becomes known only now.

"Dashnak trace" in holy Bukhara: Contemporary history of Central Asia still waits for objective and unprejudiced researcher. This mainly concerns period of establishment of "soviet rule" in this region, in which soviet Russia was forced to be the rival of Turkey. For example, in Bukhara emirate by that moment there was influential organization of "Young Bukharians" or jadidists supported proclaiming of democratic republic in Bukhara. Besides in Central Asia, except for Tadjiks the nationalism was severely mixed with panturkism - that was the period of "non-traditional Islam", however Wahhabi preachers did not come yet.

It is not known who was struck by "excellent idea" to rely on dashnaks while struggling with "Basmachi", or calling things by their proper names - with rebel war for independence of Central Asia. But dashnak squadrons frequently just renamed as Red Army units.

In 1922 Semen Budennyi headed Turkestan front, was replaced by Gaspar Voskanov, who with understandable eagerness started "liquidation" of Enver-pasha - undisputable leader of armed struggle for independence in Central Asia.

During the Soviet period official historiography named Enver-pasha as "head of Basmachi" and "spy of international imperialism". And they even do not bother to remember that prior to his leave to Central Asia, Enver-pasha, fleeing from Turkey through Germany, lived for some period in Moscow, took part in Congress of Eastern nations in Baku and supported "Lenin's national policy" while severely opposing Kemal pasha Ataturk - new leader of Turkey.

Now, it would be expedient to decline from a subject. According to historians, any state is a "black case" and no one could know intentions of its authorities: details of adopting of crucial decisions, deep motives stay behind the closed doors, and if later someone publishes memoirs, events there will be probably described taking into account "requirements of the moment". However, many facts indicate that rendering assistance to Mustafa Kemal and his supporters, Moscow was not driven by sympathy to Turkish revolution. Historians, especially those in countries with authoritarian regimes, due to certain reasons, try not to remember this, but de-jure up to 1922, unless the Turkish Parliament adopted a law about dethronement of sultan and abolishment of caliphate, the Ottoman Porte was the government of Turkey. No one believed that the Turkish army, after heavy defeat in the World War I, might resist Entente and their own government. On this background, assistance rendered by Russia to those whom sultan Vaheddin named as "rebels" and conclusion of beneficial agreements, such as Kars and Moscow, most probably was dictated by desire to maximally weaken positions of Turkey. For the same goal, those in Moscow showed warm attitude to Enver pasha - in order to have "an ace behind the sleeve" against Kemal pasha Ataturk. Even after Enver pasha went to Central Asia to initiate rebellion among Moslems of Britain's India, Lenin, Trotskiy and Dzerjinsky "bombarded" armed units deployed in Turkestan front by telegrams: "Enver must be taken alive".

But soon after, Voskanov sent a noteworthy telegram to Akop (Yakov) Melkumyan, commander of the I Turkestan cavalry brigade: "I need dead Enver. Read. Think. Immediately burn it." Then Yakov Melkumyan outspokenly talked to Armenian journalists: "I killed Enver" - According to Melkumyan, death of Enver pasha is continuation of terror by dashnak "Nemesis".

"Revenge in order to assist to diplomacy": According to official version, Armenian terrorists of 20-ies and 30-ies were impelled only by feeling of revenge. However, even brief analysis of the situation left no doubts: similar to the

end of XIX - start of XX century, reasons of Armenian terror were purely political.

In fact, for Armenia the period of twenties-thirties was the period of ups and downs of their hopes. On August 10, 1920 in Sevres of France the Serves agreement was signed between 10 countries of Entente, representatives of Armenia and Khidjaz, future Saudi Arabia as a one party and the Ottoman empire as the other party, which envisaged to turn over to Armenia of those "six provinces" of Eastern Anatolia. To say, that Armenia was embraced by euphoria, it means to say nothing - a little bit more and on the map will emerge "Western Armenia", the west would help us and it seems easy not to pay attention to the fact tha" in April of the same year in deserted railway station Ankara the hero of battle near Chanagala - Mustafa Kemal pasha convened alternative parliament - Great National Assembly of Turkey and proclaimed Turkish Republic.

However, negotiations were prolonged and the process did not give Armenians a basis for optimism. At first, two-year Paris peace conference, then start of negotiation process in Lausanne...

Situation speedily changed: Serves treaty, which promised creation of "Western Armenia" on lands of Eastern Turkey was thrown into the rubbish-bin of history and hope of "grab-it-isation" of Turkish lands, which seemed so close, had suddenly vanished. It is just the rhetoric question whether Armenians would attempt to "remind the world" about their "tragedy" by use of terror. Moreover, terroristic methods of Armenians were not just used by Armenian politicians - due to various reasons, which detailed analysis could not be fulfilled within the framework of one newspaper article, terror became one of the major method of struggle for interests of Armenian political elite from the end of XIX century. Choose of victims is also meaningful: bullets of "avengers" reach members of governments, which were removed from power. Azerbaijan Democratic Republic was annexed by Soviet Russia, the government of Young Turks also was thrown aside... It is impossible to find better victims of "demonstrative terror" - on the one hand "response measures" of the state would be, is any, not so severe as for "acting" official, on the other hand, victims were famous and "promoted" persons in order to attract attention of media by demonstrative murder.

"Cult of terror": Whether the terror unleashed by dashnaks in twenties of the last century allowed to reach their goals in diplomatic arena is the theme of separate study. In any case they failed to reanimate Serves treaty. Besides there were a lot of "unsolved problems" between Entente countries and Turkey - and absolutely unexpectedly for European diplomacy! - now they had to negotiate with Turkey, not dictate their conditions. In Europeans capitals they were more concerned by issues of maritime traffic in Bosphorus and Darda-nelle straits than by "historic rights of long-suffering Armenian nation". Armenians caused the interest until they could be used as a mean of pressure over the Turkey, but later, when the war was lost, they turned into "poor relative" to which no one wanted to mess

about. But political murders of twenties played more ominous role in the history. That is because namely those events ultimately led to generation of cult of terror in Armenian community. Sogomon Teyleryan like his many "crime-partners" from "Nemesis" rested on laurels as "national hero" until his death in San-Francisco in 1960. Many newspaper articles, literary works were devoted to "Avengers", the people literally kissed their hands. Right-minded people in western countries just sniggled: any nation has its own history...

"Political technologies" of twenties were turn to be useful after tens of years - at the start of seventies, when Middle Eastern Armenians, who better than their neighbors-Arabs knew why Sogomon Teyleryan and Shagen Natali were "canonized", entered Palestinian terroristic organizations of "Black September" type. Arab leaders started to express opinions that company of terror forced the world to remember about "tragedy of Palestinian people". In the middle of 70-ies "Group of Gurgen Yanikyan" emerged, which later became "Armenian Secret Army of Liberation of Armenia" - ASALA. More than fifty Turkish diplomats in many countries around the world became the victims of Armenian terrorists, among them citizens of the USA, France, Switzerland and other countries... Later, when independent Armenia emerge i on map, terroristic methods became more needed and here, irrespective of whether these are attempts to "pressure" over Azerbaijan (Armenian secret services organized tens terroristic acts on the territory of our republic) or internal political "shootout" - in practice almost each internal "shake" in Armenia starts with a series of political murders and "parliamentary shooting" on October 27 of 1999 was considered as most high-profile scandal on post-Soviet territory until the start of Chechen terror. But in September of 2003, after shock of October 27 in Armenia and world-wide distress after September 11, 2001 terrorist attack in the USA, the monument devoted to Sogomon Teyleryan has been opened. And similar to the events of March 15 of 1921, the world played blind to this.

Rauf Huseyn-zadeh
CHARACTERISTICS OF ARMENIANS BY
THEIR COMPATRIOTS AND CONTEMPORARIES

Migration of Armenians' ancestors from their historic motherland into the region of Frakia (i.e.in Europe, in Balkans) into the Minor Asia and further to the East, up to Caucasus inclusively, and accompanied perturbations influenced many facets of history and life of Armenian nation.

Armenians and other nations populated in Fore Asia were influenced by Antic Greeks and Romans, Persians and Syrians. A lot of things were taken including vocabulary, many elements of culture, social-political, trade and economy and confessional life, traditions. This was objective process, which confirmed known notion that there are no pure races or ethnoses, languages and cultures.

The final accord in process of influence onto Armenians was probably done by Russians started from XIX century. Thus, for formation of Armenian and Russian collective memory the grounding on historic and historiography narrations is characteristic: "Russians and Armenians once formed narration patterns, which permanently penetrated and also deliberately inserted into collective memory of these nations... If Russian historic narratives made an accent on "Russian nation being selected by God", the Armenian narratives accents were oriented to restoration of "Great Armenia" and memory about "former power". However, there are nuances allowing to speak about specific peculiarities of Armenians and this were noted by their compatriots and contemporaries. In geopolitics there are such terms as "consumer of safety" and "producer of safety". To the latter the great powers and large states do belong. The former includes average, small and tiny states. Besides there are "sources of danger", which may be any countries and various states, known by their "non-traditional" orientation and activity, which did not fall into common norms of international community.

In Caucasus the "consumers of safety" and simultaneously "sources of danger" are several local political and administrative subjects. Due to these definitions it is noteworthy to pay attention to Armenian ethnos -allochthon (migrated) and how it is characterized by compatriots and contemporaries. This is very important since the image of Armenians is unambiguous due to their ability to acclimatize and adapt to the environment of their inhabitation, where they are thrown by fate, more precisely by military and political realities. This was the situation in the past, and it is similar today. At the same time, Armenians are so dissimilar that even living in the same country they adhere to traditions and rules of initial "starting ground". As a result, "Western" Armenians do not understand, even do not accept "Eastern", "Russian" that of "Caucasian", "European" do not accept those "American", etc.

Most early detailed characteristic of Armenians belong to Armenian author of XVII century Simeon Lekhatsi, who had opportunity to observe lifestyle and activity of his compatriots in Ottoman empire. He spent several years there and through that period had seen and heard many things, being in Istanbul, Bursa, Izmir, Jerusalem, Cairo, Damascus and Ankara. At this "Simeon naturally was interested first of all in Armenians, their population number, activities and positions in all towns and villages, where he had went".

Simeon Lekhatsi thoroughly describes favorable conditions under which Armenians-Christians lived under the rule of Ottoman Sultans-Moslems. Thus, he indicated that almost in all towns and many villages of Minor Asia populated by Armenians they had their churches, monasteries, bishops and monks. He finishes his appeal by phrase: "I do not know for what, all nations, believers or unbelievers, all love us, except for Greeks, although our nation have no unanimity and [Armenians] do not like each other, for which they became famous".

After occupation of Caucasus by Russian empire in the first half of XIX century Russian experts studying Caucasus paid attention to behavior of Armenians, moved to the region from Ottoman empire and Iran state: "Due to historically developed conditions Armenians allocated around the globe. That is why, the Motherland for Armenians is a country, where they may use their tricky minds with a most profit and safety...They dominated in trading in Tiflis and all Caucasus... They are translators, presenters, factors, i.e. Armenians are everywhere there the profit is. Profit is the first motive of all their thoughts and actions".

Paradox, to which it is hard to find something similar and which is stated always by Armenians themselves, consists in duality of Armenian ethnos. Paradox also in definition "various nations" - as now Armenian intelligentsia say about Armenians of Diaspora and republic of Armenia. That is why, according to modern Armenian intellectual "in my opinion we are various nations. Armenia is the country of Caucasus. Diaspora by its Constantinopol roots and various influences is quite the other world. Independently from us, two various nations were formed. Similar by blood, almost similar by language, they are almost antipodes by their world-view".

At the end of XIX century Russian General N.Dubrovin noted: "Being under subordination of various states and spread all over the globe, Armenian tribe had lost its common features under the influence of various climate, lifestyle and activity". This expression confirms that for a long period of time interrelations of Armenians in Republic of Armenia and Armenian Diaspora undergo deep crisis. Many centuries of "separation" led to creation of almost insurmountable "Chinese wall" between them. Such situation resembles recent problems of western and eastern Germans united in a single FRG, when after first few weeks of euphoria, both started to comprehend based on their own experience what is the "soviet mentality" and how it may influence to members of any nation.

That is why "money sacks" of Armenian Diaspora, seized by "nationalistic" feelings may render "humanitarian aid" to their compatriots in Republic of Armenia. But investments will be made to sphere where the payoff is possible, because tribal feelings are good but they do not bring dividends. That is why considerations of writer and linguist Ervand Azatyan, cited above are not groundless. The fact is, that the Diaspora was formed starting from IV century. Armenians themselves give information describing allocation of Armenians through various periods of the history. Naturally, such disperse allocation could not and did not create a single mentality, and sometimes self-identification, despite of preserving of religious, linguistic, cultural and ethnic community. This is quite understandable and logical: living for centuries in various countries, under various conditions Armenians were the subject of various influences. And when they succeeded to join together, the rule of "attraction-repulsion" came into the force. At the same time, there were conditions for their influence to various important

spheres of life and activity in countries of their location. However, this caused unambiguous reaction. Thus, characterizing nations of Caucasus, the Russian philosopher N.Trubetskoy wrote in 1925: "Putting stake on Armenians would be a mistake. Being powerful economically, keeping in their hands the governing by a whole economic life in Caucasus, they have at the same time all features of nation-parasite and slave and gain common antipathy, which reach almost to hatred in its neighbors".

The same was noted by M.Menshikov at the start of XX century: "Armenians gradually turn into hosts of Caucasus, capturing lands, capitals, fields, trade and almost commanding influence onto local administration. When peaceful occupation of Caucasus by Armenians will be completed, do agree that this will significantly move Armenian patriots toward their final goal".

Namely this happened in 1918, when Armenians created Armenian statehood in area of Caucasus there previously was no Armenian statehood, which lost its statehood in IV, and then in XI centuries in Minor Asia.

Consequently, if the major reason of "duality" of Armenians consists in centuries of absence of their own statehood and migration from West (from Europe) to East (to Caucasus), which led to development of Diaspora, then their settlement on any territory leads to accumulation of economic levers in their hands.

Thus, definition "various nations" in respect of Armenians has centuries-long history. And this is noted by Armenians themselves. Thus, in the North Caucasus there was noted the internal tension related to mass migration of Armenians from Caucasus Armenia to Stavropol: "As a result of a large number of entrants the tension is emerged within Armenian Diaspora between representatives of "old" and "new" parts and also between representatives of various regions. Such situation is observed in Stavropol, Budennovsk, Pyatogorsk, Kislovodsk, Georgievsk, settlements of Kursk and Predgorniy regions".

The attention must be drawn also to attitude of Ottoman Turks to "their own" Armenians. During Russian-Ottoman war through 1877-1878, when Russian army was in eastern part of Minor Asia, Russian General I.Amiokhvari paid attention to position of Armenians under Ottoman rule: "Up to now I used to hear from all sides and read in all our newspapers, that Turks severely oppress Armenians and brought them to poor plight. But, immediately after we cross the border, the first village, populated by Christians to our extreme surprise, makes us doubt in correctness of such ordinary attitude we have to Turks. In fact, inhabitants here have not such oppressed appearance as we expected. Women do not hide here, as our Armenians do. They are cheerful, communicative and well-dressed. Arable farming and cattle-breeding are in a huge amount, lands are vast. In other words, the life is free and not oppressed."

R.Ivanov, who gives this citation in his book, decided it necessary to comment it: "General Amilokhvari noted with wonder that on territory of Turkish

Armenia the Armenian population is less oppressed than in Irevan province. In economical and cultural sense Turkish Armenians, according to his opinion, even dominate over local Kurds and Turks".

In 1923 in Tbilisi there were published "Notes" translated from English into Russian and authored by high rank military and statesman of Ottoman empire Jemal-pasha, one of the activists of party "Unification and progress". Nuance of his memoirs is that they had been written after 1915. The chapter IX is devoted to "Armenian issue" and it starts with characteristics of Armenians: "We, Young Turks, undoubtedly prefer Armenians, Armenian revolutioners in particular, to Greeks and Bulgarians. Armenians are better and more courageous than those two nations; this is an open and honest nation, faithful in their friendship and hatred. We are firmly convinced that responsibility for Turkish-Armenian dispute rests only with politics of Russia. Sixty years ago, more precisely ten years before Russian-Turkish war of 1877-78 there were no any clashes between these two nations based on their religions. In Anatolia, Rumelia and in Konstantinopol, across the whole Turkish empire, Armenians and Turks lived together as good neighbors and in history of Turkey for that period there is no indication of such issue as "Armenian problem". In our life the Turkish-Armenian friendship was unlimited. When Turks of Minor Asia left their villages for several days, they trusted to Armenians-neighbors to care about their families, property and rights; Armenians regarded similarly to their neighbors-Turks. In all Anatolia and Rumelia and also in Konstantinopol there was no Armenian, who spoke only in Armenian. Turkish language was taught in all Armenian schools and Church services were in Turkish. There was access to all high state positions for Armenians and they were considered as most loyal subjects of Ottoman empire.

...since forming of Turkish empire and speedy distribution of Turkish power was grounded on justice and tolerance, similarly by generosity and friendship shown by Turks to Armenians, was gained their gratitude to Turkey. That is why, there were not a single conflict between these two nations for along five hundred years and there was not a single Armenian, which refused to accept Turkish language and our traditions.

...until the end of Crimea war, up to 1856, Turks and Armenians preserved best relations with each other.

When Russia diverted its stingy gaze onto Ottoman empire, it understood that it would be a huge political effect to turn Christian elements of Rumelia into the weapon of its intentions...

In 1863 Armenians received Constitution. Constitution gave them a right for election of their own supreme council in Konstantinopol. The council consisted of four hundred members and of these a hundred and twenty deputies were elected by Armenian population.

Even president Wilson might not think about better way for satisfaction of

rights of ethnic minorities". Thus, in 1895 even 176 Armenian missionaries accompanied by 878 assistants preached in Anatolia, i.e. in central provinces of Ottoman empire. They put the basis for 125 Armenian churches, in which there were 13 thousand worshippers and other 400 schools with more than 20 thousand pupils.

"Father of Armenian history" Moisei Khorenskiy in the V century said about his compatriots: "I would like to note the hardness of heart, as well as arrogance of our nation... which refutes good and betrays the truth... obstinate and criminal ...who's spirit does not believe to God! ... Why do you love the fuss and godiessness? You have done enragement and in your lodges you did not bring remorse; you made immolation of lawlessness and hop ,d for God were disdained. That is why, you will be captured in nets of the one, whom you do not find out and prey for which you strived, will make its own prey and you will be captured in the same nets".

These are words said by Armenian 1500 years ago. But even today his words are actual, besides these characteristics may be significantly added and widened: "Today each forth Armenian is subjected to stress, various psychic disorders and mental deficiency to some extent. Tens of thousands of mentally sick people can be met down the street and no one of them is registered", - such sensational statement was made by Samvel Torosyan, senior psychologist of Ministry of Health of Republic of Armenia. In report based on results of studies held by Yerevan representation of UN was underlined that "catastrophic increase of people with psychic disorders in Republic is mainly explained by the following: extremely low quality of life, unsolved Daglyg Garabagh problem and also by pseudo-national imperatives".

Rena Bakhlyshova

DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATION IN GARABAGH AT THE END OF XIX CENTURY

At the end of the XIX century due to growth of capitalism the changes happened in different spheres have seriously influenced Azerbaijan culture and created an opportunity for the cultural development of nation. In spite of tsarizm's hypocritical policy, educational activities have been developing under influence of representatives of Russian culture. As a result of such development the transition from religious to secular education system became wider.

In the XIX century new type of schools appeared in Azerbaijan and made their first steps in the way of progress. Due to influence of schools and efforts for education the region of Garabagh took the first place in Azerbaijan, as well as in South Caucasus. This tendency strengthened by the end of XIX century.

Besides the new schools, religious and other religious schools of Moslems known as madrasa were still remaining. There were being taught the Persian,

Azerbaijani languages and Shariat (principles of Moslem religion). But after forced adjoining of Azerbaijan to Russia there was a need for Russian and this resulted in parents desire to educate their children in state schools. Changes happened after liquidation of serfdom in Russia on February 19, 1961 have been shown also in educational sphere.

Town schools were established as a consequence of reforms of 60-ies in Russia. Prof. Huseyn Ahmadov underlines that schools opened by individuals, communities and state according to Bylaws of schools of 1872, were established on the basis of district schools. Let us confirm the fact that the first town school in Azerbaijan and a whole Caucasus established in Shusha in 1874. Thus, Shusha district school had three classes in 1830, later, in 1878 it had four classes.

An education term in three-classed town school was two years in each class. Since 1878-79 (since education became four-classes) at the third and fourth classes the education term became a year. Shusha town school had left far behind district schools and there had been taught Shariat, reading, writing, Russian, algebra, geometry, geography, history, physics, drawing, music, gymnastics and so on. But, in Shusha district school mainly prevailed education of the native. Russian and French languages. Citizen of Shusha paid special attention to studying of native language in schools. From this point of view, teachers at Shusha school Mirza Hasan and Asian bey Amirovs were very successful in teaching of the mother tongue. French was one of the main factors required by district merchants for their trading relations with France and was taught on the expense of people's additional payments.

Education was on a paid basis. If the yearly tuition fee was 5 manats for every pupil while the town school was opening in Shusha, in 1876 this sum has been 8, and in 1878 it reached 12 manats. In spite of decision of teachers council to free the poor people from tuition fee a great deal of pupils were paying it. However, number of pupils was increasing each year. For the initial period 375 pupils were studying in Shusha town school. In was the highest number of pupils in Russia for that period.

On May 6 of 1875 there was organized a special school for poor aristocrats and other rich levels of population. They studied on a state expense.

Libraries attached to town schools were also established. Shusha school is distinguished by its school library and had a plenty of textbooks and necessary class-rooms.

In 1880 special music classes were opened at Shusha town school. These classes have played an important role in growing up generation of professional.

The same year silkworm breeding profession took special place in curriculum.

To provide merchants and craftsmen desires, which looked enviously at those who improved their lifestyle and widened political and world views due to

education, special professional trainings were organized as Sunday schools at school of Shusha.

Always being in the centre of attention Shusha school began to lose its position by the end of the century. On September 20, 1881 at the urgent requests of population, which was not satisfied with the quality of education the 6 classed real school was established in Shusha.

In 80-ies of XIX century eagerness of rural children for education necessitated creation of village schools attached to Shusha school. Lessons in village schools were taught by students graduated from pedagogical courses and Azerbaijani section of Caucasus Seminary of Teachers. The first village school in Garabagh was opened in 1876, in Jabrail village of Jabrail district. In 1882 village schools in Garakilsa, Arsevan and Gubadly (12.IX) villages of Zangazur were opened.

Since 1883 more village schools were established in the area. This was related to increasing number of students graduated from Gory Teachers Seminary. In 1883 there were opened schools in villages of Aghdam (12.IX), Lambaran (18.IX), Aghjabady of Shusha district; in Garghabazar of Jabrail district (17.X); in Alpout (25.X), Barda (25.X), Kasapet (26.X) of Javanshir district; in 1884 in Hindarkh of Shusha district; in 1885 in Hadrud of Jabrail district, in Tugh and Gulably of Shusha district, in Sarov of Javanshir district; in 1890 in Minkand of Zangazur district; in 1891 in Vang of Javanshir district (15.XII); in 1897 in Khankandy and Tagh of Shusha district, in Garabulag of Jabrail district and in Digh village of Zangazur district. Aghdam school with 10, Lambaran school with 20, Garghabazar school with 12, Alpout with 6, Barda school with 4, Kasapet school with 17 pupils began their primary school-year.

Touching the problems of provision in Garabagh village schools it can be said that Sadig bey Malik Aslanov and teacher Hashimbey Narimanbayov supplied Gubadly school with textbooks and also helped financially, as well as, Mehdi bey Malik Aslanov helped Tugh and Gubadly schools, Shukur Lambaranski to Lambaran village school.

By the end of the century an increased number of Russian-Azeri schools is observed in Shusha. By initiative of J. Fatalibeyov, graduate of Shusha school, 25 pupils started to study at the third rate Russian-Azeri school opened in Shusha in 1893. One of them was future educationalist and pedagogue F.Aghazade. In 1896 the number of pupils reached 70. According to official sources, elementary school teacher Mukhtar Mammadov made efforts to establish such a school and received permission to open Russian-Azeri school in Shusha in 1893. On September 19, 1895 Hussyna-libey Rustambeyov graduated from Irevan Teachers Seminary opened the third rate special school, however it functioned only a year. Pupils studying in the schools, consisted of two classes were fluently learning Azerbaijani and Russian languages. Pupils of these schools were basically composed of poor

and middle section of population.

At the end of XIX century being inspired by Russian-Azeri schools, intelligentsia in Shusha endeavored to open new type of schools. It can be said, that Shusha community for the first time in Azerbaijan proposed an idea to open Russian-Azeri school attached to mosque and this was approved by population. As a result, on the October 6, 1896 two-classed Russian-Azeri school was opened under supervision of Hashim bey Vazirov and admitted 210 pupils.

Taking into account that a great number of pupils desired to study at school, tuition fee was defined as 10 manats for every pupil, but only 20% of them were free from payment. Four member staff - director H.Vazirov, teachers Rasim bey Tahirov and Mirza Pakhish Yusifzade, teacher of Shariat - Molla Mehdi Sancalinsky decided to include into curriculum Azerbaijani and Russian languages, algebra and also the native language with new methods. In 1898 the teachers were given the status of state official at request of the town's Moslem society and on occasion of coronation of tsar the school was named as "Shusha-Nikolayevsk Russian-Tatar School". In 70-ies of XIX century there were efforts to open school for girls. These efforts were stronger in Shusha. Until then, girls were only taught by their parents and at religious schools. In Shusha where a great importance was given to woman education a special school for girls was founded by charity society on October 26, 1875 year. The school was situated at Amanevs' two storey house. School curriculum included subjects as the Russian, reading and writing in the native language, algebra, drawing, geography, history, music and so on. Since 1894 it became four-classed Marinski maiden school. At the last year of the century (1900) population were able to study in two languages at night courses for adults. It can be seen that after reforms of 60-ies schools ruled by regulations, but educational system was not agreed with local condition, only with Russian Empire system.

Rena Mirzazadeh
GENDER HISTORY OF GARABAGH:
SOCIAL-POLITICAL IMAGE

While studying historic past of Garabagh it becomes clear that this ancient territory of Azerbaijan has encyclopedic gender history. History of Garabagh distinctly shows that in deep distinction while identification of man-woman relations there were women with exceptional role in history. These women are gained respect and influence for their activities in the spheres of charity, education and even attempts to unify men.

There were several factors which influenced this process. First of all, it is Azerbaijani-Turk culture generated long time ago in Garabagh. Secondly, in point of view of men from Garabagh intelligentsia, who have studied in Europe, it was

very important to integrate into the Western culture. Finally, Garabagh was known as a cultural center of Azerbaijan.

Who are these women? What does the history write about them? Historic sources show that sometimes namely due to the efforts of these women the wars and conflicts were stopped. "Marriage diplomacy" known in history is underlined as one of major causes. Ibrahim khan surrounded by separatist meliks in order to take thorough power in Garabagh and continue activity of his father Panah khan sought for allies. As a first step he married the sister of Umma khan who ruled in Jar-Balaken. Later this "marriage diplomacy" was very useful to him. This prevented conflicts and attempts to distance from the central power after end of rule of Panah khan. Ahmed bey Jevanshir wrote: "Fatalikhan Afshar from Urmia, being one of viceroys of Nadir shah, gathered a large number of troops from Azerbaijan, Urmia and other provinces and in aim to remove Panah khan went to fort Shusha where he made his camp at a length of tree distance from fort... In this attack about two thousand infantrymen and cavalry-men from Fatali khan Af-shar's troops were killed and taken as war-prisoners... After this event due to defeat of his troops, Fatali khan Afshar requested for peace and proposed: if Panah khan will give back war-prisoners, I will give my permission for marriage of my daughter with his elder son Ibrahimkhalil aga and we will be relatives and friends forever. Providing, that he will send here his son, who will stay here for two or three days (as a guest) and return back after celebration of marriage" (History of Azerbaijan, 1996, p.515). What is the interesting matter here? Through traditions preserved by ages it is known that marriage proposal is made by a man's family. Paradoxically, here we see the opposite case. In any case, circumstances and relations, sometimes dictate to break old "traditions" and create new ones.

Let us consider other historic fact. After assassination of Aga Mohammed Shah Gadjjar in 1797 in Shusha the throne goes to Fatali shah. Fatali shah for "assurance of both parties" proposes to Ibrahim khan to send his daughter Agabeyim aga (aunt of Khur-shud Banu Natavan) to his harem. Ibrahim khan agrees with that marriage. Agabeyim aga, along with being skilled and beautiful woman, was also the patriot of her country. Agabeyim aga succeeded to free prisoners from zindans and pardon those pleaded guilty and sentenced to death. Carefully considering these facts and looking at them through the prism of modern world, could not we say that Agabeyim aga was the human rights activist?! This is history of women in Azerbaijan.

The sources show that Agabeyim aga was taught by vizier of her father - Molla Panah Vagif. Later, she had learned French and spoke fluently to Europeans and communicated through sending letters with renown personalities of that period. In 1811 she met with a spouse of emperor of France and sent a letter to Napoleon Bonaparte. There was a certain role of Agabeyim aga in establishment of peace between Russia and Iran. Queen of Russia in her letter to Agabeyim aga wrote: "Beyim,

You due to your wisdom became the second Venus and star for the shah" (Woman, beauty and sanctity". B. 2001, p.46). We may say that Agabeyim aga was activist.who devotedly loved and missed Garabagh and hated betrayal of Armenians. According to other source she helped to free Hasan khan, khan of Irevan, nicknamed "Sary Asian" from Russian prison.

Touching the gender history of Garabagh we have to remember a special role of Khurshud Banu Natavan known as Khan qyzy (khan's daughter) in social life of Azerbaijan. Who was Natavan? She was an intelligent and noble woman, famous by her social activity. Rza Aladdin ibn Fahraddin wrote the following about Natavan in his book "Renown women" devoted to his daughter Zeyneb and published in 1904: "Active and clever, speaks Turkish, Persian and Arabic, she spent all her life reading. Being merciful to poor, she enjoyed spending her wealth for the benefit of community. Spending thousand roubles she brought spring, fresh water to Shu-sha (Garabagh)".

Azerbaijani historian S.Gandjali wrote: "Spending her life for charity, culture and education, this poetess and woman-painter, possessing of a sensitive heart, participated at the World Exhibition in Paris in 1867, and agricultural exhibitions in Moscow in 1869 and in Tiflis in 1882. There were exhibited famous Garabagh horses belonged to Natavan, her handicrafts and kinds of corn yielded in Garabagh. She had been awarded by the I Prize and gold medal. Information about this can be found in the 2nd and 11th issues of "Konnozavodstva" journal published in Russia.

Why we considered it is important to write about Natavan while studying gender history? According to professor Aziza Jafarzadeh, in 1872 Natavan established a literary association titled "Majlisi-uns" in order to bring together litterateurs in Shusha, and she headed that majlis for a long period of time. Despite that there were no publications in Azerbaijan at that period, works of Natavan speedily distributed and were discussed. As Natavan said "Because there are lot of wanderers in this garden" - or "times are not going by my desire, ah!". A.Duma senior also wrote well about Natavan. A.Duma wrote about the East, which was traditionally described as a place of darkness, obsolete and fanaticism: "In the place where I have been invited there were two noble women". This was Khan gyzy Natavan, poetess who disseminated progress and culture and whose social and cultural activity may play an example not only for the East but for the West also. Naturally, for Natavan with her free thoughts and her courage there w^a,s no need to demand her rights. Being a woman she v[^]as an active citizen, intelligent and known public figure.

Nigar Rafibeyli, poetess of the XX century correctly indicates: "Azerbaijani poetesses mourn for misfortunes of the nation -earthquakes, war bloodshed, looting, those killed and lost. Poetesses cry for tragic destiny of eastern women - lack of rights, inequality and obedience. At the same time, each poetess

had her own pain, grief and loss". Activity of eastern poetess, artist woman living in Islamic country along with double efforts also required fivefold, tenfold courage. They answered lack of women rights by poems, bayaty (shot poems), while in the West M.Uolstounkraft struggled by her essays, Natavan by her social and cultural activity, while Olympia by execution of Gudj. One aspect draws attention in these parallels. Despite these women were unaware of each other, lived at various periods and were representatives of various nations and religions, we can see similarity of their thoughts and views. To a certain extent this is the real reflection of destiny of women. In "Tesnifi-Gulshad" - the only available work of Gulshad khanum, who lived in the I half of XVII century, she wrote: We have been taken to Tatar khan, they give a fitva to the blood of Ye-sir, I sent a message to Meshed Kanyan". In these words there is a call for justice written as a poem, which also contains a protest of woman's courage and perfection against injustice of society.

Studying gender history of Garabagh we have to mention name of other renowned woman - Fatma khanym Kemir; She wrote about 500 poems and gazelles. Detailed information about her is given in the book "Historic sources of Azerbaijan literature" authored by Firudin bey Kocharly. Fatma khanym Kemine was known by social value in literary-cultural history and her activity in "Majlis-Faramushan" established in Shusha.

Among women who glorified gender history through that period was the other daughter of Ibrahim khan - Govhar aga. This noble woman distinguished by her charity work totally renovated and gave her property to Juma mosque built in town Shusha by her father. Namely at the expense of this wealth in Shusha the madrasa "Darrus-Shafa" had been opened as a gift for all population. Known by her charity mission, she also financially supported a bridge known as "Aga bridge" on the way to Agdam. She also rendered two schools, two baths, two bridges and a hospital for poor people.

One of supporters of progress in XIX century and those who wrote the history of Garabagh was Hamida khanym Jevanshir (spouse of Jalil Mammedguluzadeh). She opened school for girls in village where she lived and actively participated in establishment of Charity Society of Caucasian Moslem Women. It should be also noted that Hamida Jevanshir is one of the leading personalities in history of women's movement in Azerbaijan. Her social, political, literary and cultural activity may be the subject of separate studies. This respectful and clever woman also played a certain role in life and work of Jalil Mamedguluzadeh. Hamida khanym made a speech at the 13 Congress of cotton-growers held in Caucasus in 1912. It must be also taken into account that she was the first Azerbaijani woman who delivered a speech from such high tribune.

It should be noted that despite scientific literature of Azerbaijan did not mention feminism, it always progressively approached women's problems and

liberty of women. Of course, the society does not devoid of negative cases. Those beaten, insulted, exploited and with violated rights included both men and women. Despite this, most of cultural and journalistic works are devoted namely to problems of women.

Summarizing, it can be inferred the following: it is very important to learn and propagate Women known in history of Garabagh as philanthropists, educators, social and cultural activists and those who reach the highest level of intelligentsia. These women, who were all a life school by themselves, showed equality with men by the role they played in society. This is the history of Garabagh Woman and Gender issue in Azerbaijan.

Rizvan Garabagly **MONUMENTS OF WESTERN AZERBAIJAN**

According to famous Turkish traveler Evliyya Chelebi (915 by Hijra) in 1509-1510 AC Shah Ismail Sefevi gave an order to his vizier Re van Gulu khan to built a fort (on sit' of present Yerevan-along the right band of Zengi river). Revan Gulu khan completed building of a fort in 7 years.

The fort had three gates: "Tebriz gate", "Shirvan gate", "Kerpu gate" and 4 districts "Gala", "Sheher", "Tepebashy" and "Demirbulag". Starting from 1864 the walls of the fort were totally destroyed. Most characteristic buildings of the town were now skyscraping minarets of Yerevan mosques. 4 of these mosques situated in "Sheher" district: "Novruzeli khan", "Huseynali khan" (Geuy mesjid), "Khoja Seferbey" and "Mohammed Sertibkhan" mosques.

After liberation of Irevan from Ottomans in 1604 by Shah Abbas I the magnificent mosque was constructed on the eastern side of Serdar palace. The architect of this mosque constructed in 1606 was renowned Sheikh Baheddin.

Irevan Jame which was similar to Ganja Jame consisted of madrasa, library, hotel and various facilities. Until 1918 the Jame and surrounding buildings were preserved, even dilapidated. Later it was totally demolished.

In 1725 in Irevan fort a new mosque was constructed by Redjeb Pasha. The other mosque built by Abbas Mirza in XVIII century was extraordinarily beautiful by its architectural style.

After occupation of Irevan fort by Russia: ;s (1827) the mosque constructed by Abbas Mirza was totally destroyed and instead of the mosque constructed by Redjeb Pasha the Russian church was built. Huseynali khan mosque known as Geuy mosque at first had four minarets. After World War II three minarets of the mosque were destroyed. Until recently despite being with one minaret Geuy mosque was one of the monuments which attracted attention as symbols of Islam. In general, until the beginning of XX century there were 8 mosques in Irevan. Now there is even no trace of it. The most ancient mosque in

Irevan was built by the order of Shah Ismail in 1510. In 1918 Armenians gathered Moslems to that mosque and put them on fire. The mosque with a lot of people inside it was burnt to ashes.

In total until 1912 on the territory of Western Azerbaijan (present Armenia) there were 42 mosques in Irevan district, 33 in Echmiadzin and 35 mosques in Zangezour. At present none of these mosques exist, all of them were destroyed by Armenians.

Serdar palace (Khan palace) located in Irevan fort once fascinated travelers which came here. The Palace was built almost at the edge of frightful precipice of Zengi river. Along the other band of the river Khan garden was cultivated with a lot of various flowers and fruit trees and through most part of the year they were green. During the rule of Sefevi and Turk shahs this Palace was restored and enlarged. In XVIII century by the order of Huseynali Khan Khoylu intensive restoration works have been implemented in Palace by architect Mirza Jafar. In 1791 Mohammed Khan added hall with mirrors and summer mansion. In 1798 Mahmud Khan in his turn held restoration works in the Palace and ordered to build various facilities. Final decoration of the Palace was fulfilled by famous Azerbaijani painter Mirza Gadim Irevani in 1850.

Featured by beautiful architectural style and its decoration the Palace resembled Hasht-behisht in Isfahan and Chinili Koshk in Istanbul. However, the Palace was totally destroyed through 1913-1918 by Russian and Armenian armed groups. As a result, a beautiful sample of palace architecture belonged to the period of Sefevi and Gadjar rule had vanished forever.

There were a large number of caravan-sarays in Irevan fort. These included Sardar, Sheykhulislam, Taghly, Sulu, Susuz, Haji Ali, Kemurchi, Gurdju, Julfa, Haji' Ilyas and other caravan-sarays. Evidently, none of those caravan-sarays, which even by their name resembled Moslem world, left no traces today.

Researches show that liquidation of any historic or cultural heritage belonged to Moslems became an ordinary task for Armenians. For example, in Jafarabad village (territory of present Armenia) a high tomb made of red tuff was preserved until recently. In general resembling to Mominekhatun tomb in Nakhchivan, the dome of this tomb was kept safe until 1956.

According to M.Nemet, correspondent member of Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences, along the whole eaves the writings of suls elements by naskh inscriptions in Arabic mentioned names of emir Pir Huseyn and his father Emir Saadi from Saadlu tribe of Sed province. According to inscription this monument attributed to period of rule of Garagoyunlu and Aghgoyunlu (XV), and there were several ancient cemeteries and tombs in its surroundings. Today there is no any trace of them. Destiny of caravan-saray in the Salim passage is also unknown. Built in 1328 by use of local stones, Salim caravan-saray had double coverage.

The first hall of caravan-saray, which consisted of two large halls, was of 15x7 arshin extensions, while the second was of 45x21 arshin. On sides of portal made of stalactite there were figures of animals, in the center there were stony inscriptions (1.87x0.76 m) framed by nebati decorations (inscription was read by M.Nemet). Armenians taking into account that this is not the religious monument, made inscriptions in Armenian on internal walls of the caravan-saray in order to display it as their own monument.

I would like to remind, that until 1988 in Western Azerbaijan more than 1870 historic-cultural monuments of Turkic-Azeri origin, villages, settlements and geographic locations were renamed to made them Armenian or were absolutely liquidated.

It seems that to wipe out any nation from the earth it is not suffice to occupy its territory. In turns out, that it is necessary to liquidate historic and cultural monuments of the nation. Armenians clearly understanding this, implemented this against Azerbaijan. And the world still in silence!

Sh. Fatullayev-Figarov, E.Avalov, R.Garabaghly **ARCHITECTURE OF GARABAGH**

On the territory of Garabagh there are a lot of monuments of architecture and urbanization reflecting various epochs and periods. Many of these monuments are in form of ruins, however most of them to some extent preserved their initial shape.

Through the history of Garabagh various world religions flourished here (Zoroastrianism, Christianity, Islam), which set a deep trace in social and economic development, as well as on architecture and urbanization in the region.

The mountain area due to its geographic location and climatic features, as well as, due to peculiarities of constructions stipulated development of mountain settlements in the form of terraces, similar to other regions of Azerbaijan.

Distributed across the whole region the buildings, such as settlements, ancient towers, rich monasteries, religious buildings (chapels, temples, mosques and madrasah), dwellings, palaces, memorial buildings, caravan-sarays, bridges and springs created a special artistic world of architecture.

Architecture here is represented by various volumetric-spatial and compositional solutions and constitutes inseparable part of history. Various architectural-planning and constructive techniques developed definite system while interpretation of artistic image of any building.

Masters and architects, brought up with traditions of local architecture, skillfully and masterly used experience of the past and simultaneously fostered the feeling of modernity and connection to their epoch.

This is the material, which characterizes the trend of architectural

development in this region of Azerbaijan and possesses by its own specific and individual peculiarities reflected architectural heritage of Caucasus Albania. Specific features of art are preserved here through the whole history of this country. Mardakert (Agdere) region is abundant by architectural monuments. In 43 villages of the region and its surroundings there are forts such as Shah-bulaq, Soltan-put, Shikarar, Ulu-papa, Tarkhan-gala, Natarin-gala, Khatra, Lachin-gaya, etc.

These forts are situated in beautiful places and previously were excellently reinforced covering quite large areas. Built of rock-faced stones and excellently engraved into local relief, they dominate over the surrounding landscape and are valuable heritage of ancient Garabagh.

Martuni (Khodjavend) region is represented by medieval forts as Gyz-gala in village of Gyz-gala, Gali-Khut in village of Mush-kapet, in village of Low Tagovert; by monasteries: tower-temple in village Nagatak, in uplifts Small Kirs, Bogar-khan, Ag-oglan, churches, chapels, cemeteries, etc.

The most ancient monastery of Garabagh is Ag-oglan. Its foundation is attributed to the IV century. Archaeologists suppose that of this monument only the underground part of chapel is preserved, which could be reached by descending 18 steps down. Length of chapel is 3 m 70 cm and width is 1 m 90 cm.

Existed building of monastery was built in 1858 and surrounded by high walls and reinforced by battle pikes at angles of the monument. The church is in the middle of the yard, which contains auxiliary facilities.

Among magnificent monuments of Albania the Gandzasar monastery is one of the most significant. It was built by Alban knyaz Hasan Jalal-doloy from 1216 to 1238 and sanctified in 1240 in "Patriarchate of Nerses - Katalikos of Agvan".

But where are Christian monuments of indigenous population - Albans?

S.Yeremyan, Armenian researcher of the East, wrote in 1958: "A huge number of Christian monuments, most of which belong to pre-Arabian period, are preserved in Armeniated part of ancient Albania, on the territory of ancient Albanian regions - Artsakh (Autonomous area of Daglyg Garabagh and neighboring north-east spurs of Small Caucasus, including Shamshaddin and Idjivan regions of Armenian SSR) and Utik, where at present mainly Armenians live" (Documentary of history of USSR. IIMX c. 1958, p.326).

According to this citation the answer is clear -today they describe monuments as Armenian monuments. After subjection of Alban church to Armenian Church in 704 the worship and spiritual services were fulfilled in Armenian. This known fact is ignored at present and because notes on Christian monuments of Garabagh are in Armenian, authors state that they are all Armenian monuments. Famous monument - Gandzasar monastery, in which in XIII century Armenian Katalikos was located, is also among these monuments. But what about

notes of S.Eremyan mentioned earlier about presence in A^{tsakh} - ancient Albanian territory of a huge number of Christian monuments, most of which relate to pre-Arabian period, i.e. to period of existence of independent Albanian church?...

Khankendi region similar to other regions of Garabagh is abundant by architectural monuments reflecting tendencies of stylistic trends honed for many centuries. In this area monumental buildings of military architecture are located such as Aslan-kala in Anabert village (IX c), village of Chanakhchi and fort Askeran (1788/89). Many hieratic buildings as churches, chapels, memorials such as mausoleums in village Khodjaly (XIV c.) and others are located here.

Mausoleum in village Khodjaly (XIV) is situated on the territory of historic cemetery with ancient stelae and is very important element of architectural heritage. Octagonal in plane, traditional for memorial constructions of Azerbaijan's architecture of medieval period the mausoleum is circular inside. Along the axis of entrance - on opposite side - the plain niche of mikhrab type. Cylindrical structure inside is in form of elongated camera with double cover - half-circular arch and tented roof in cone shape. External cylinder faced by large stone blocks has small rectangular entrance decorated by arch of ogival shape with Seldjuk chain. The upper part of mausoleum is finished by tent, which is also faced by stone. Transfer from lower to upper part is in form of cornice of simple but distinctly shown profile. At the same time, architectural and spatial-volumetric composition of mausoleum reflects high esthetical functions and broad historic information.

To the mid XVIII century the strong Garabagh khanate was created by Panah-khan from Jevanshir clan. His name is related to building of forts Bayat, Shakh-bulag and town-fort Shusha. Famous poet, diplomat and vizier of Garabagh khanate Molla Panah Vagif took an active part while initial period of building of Shusha. He defined major strategic and defense sites for the fort, citadel, castle, khan's palace and other buildings for khan's attendants.

Planned structure of the fort was constructed in two stages: initial period - foundation of fort and next one, when construction finished in relatively quiet eastern part and started in western part of complicated relief.

Choose of major planning and compositional axes of town were closely related to topographic features. Within the major streets of town there were blocks of houses of various sizes and sketch, which was influenced by topography of the area. Free and picturesque rendering is not the result of chaotic construction but a consequence of settlement of people according to social-economic and territorial features; people came from various parts of Garabagh organized independent mahalle similar to modern micro-regions. In eastern part of Shusha there were 17 mahalle: nine lower - "ashagy mahalle" and eight upper - "yukhary mahalle". In the second half of XIX century all mahalle are formed within the structure of town as integral units with developed social centers -mosques, baths, fountains and shops.

Center of mahalle serve as major planning nodes, which jointly expressed common idea of general plan - its picturesque and conformity with relief, free distribution of basic buildings and delineation of city center. In western part of Shusha there were 12 blocks with their planning centers. Eastern and western portions of the town constituted a unity in architectural and construction plane.

Outstanding architect of Garabagh lived in the second half of XIX century was Kcrbalai-Sefi-khan Garabagy (1817-1910), the founder of architectural school, which built almost all cult buildings (mosques, madrasah, imam-zadeh). He changed stylistic trend of architecture, creatively used peculiarities of traditions and developed new compositional and constructive techniques. It is possible to note Juma-mosque of Govhar-aga, Ashagy-mosque, mosque "Saatly" and other buildings associated with that epoch. They can not be attributed to architecture of other regions or zones of Azerbaijan. These buildings have individuality: they constitute the gallery of architectural images of Garabagh school of architecture because they hold vitality of traditions under new social-economic conditions and displays perspectives of further development of local architecture. Renowned architect of Azerbaijan Kerbalai Sefi-khan Garabaghi devoted his whole life to development of local architecture at turn of the XIX and XX centuries.

At present, when works of famous architects of Garabagh are subjects of thorough studies and propaganda, his masterpieces are destroyed and outraged by Armenian aggressors. According to resolution of UNESCO cultural monuments are protected and are under the aegis of UN, but unfortunately this resolution is deliberately ignored by aggressors.

Tevekkul Aliyev
GARABAGH AS A CENTER OF
ANCIENT CIVILIZATION OF AZERBAIJAN

INSTEAD PROLOGUE. They were beautiful times... Worms created by decaying brains were immobile. Dark clouds without touching peaks of great Garabagh mountains moved away. Green slopes, springs of limpid water, quietly flowing rivers fondled eyes, silver rocks which touch the blue sky glittered in bright sunlight. Herds, traditionally ascending the hill along the used paths went blindfold to summer pastures in Lachin and Kelbadjar.

The year was droughty. . Green cover of mountains became yellow and withered, flowers bended to earth, thorny bushes spread. Routs became impassable, it wasn't raining, it wasn't snowing, old worms crept and spread over slopes. Black clouds started to rush. Pus and mud flowed out of dried springs and flowed into the rivers and made them turbid. Songs of love, devotion and happiness became unheard in storms of groans.

1989. Ten days as the fall entered. It's came heavily, leafs already fell.

Today I went from Gubadly to Lachyn and returned. Gubadly-Lachyn road is not the same. Along the whole way the speed of car was not higher than speed of pedestrian: cars were stretched along a road as unaccountable carriages of a train. People went back from mountain to valley, herds succeeded each other as if after the heavy rain by the side of turbid waters of Hekeri another Hekeri flown twisting. Narrow, endless roads were small for inexperienced frocks. Rock had not been familiar with this road along Hekeri. To reach winter camp in Mil these humble and silent people had to overcome the distance of 180-200 km instead of 50-60 km because of those lost their minds. Newly born lamb rocked in the saddle of shepherd's horse. I wonder, how many days this tiny lamb will be rocked on these unknown roads?!

How does Gubadly-Lavhyn road withstand this flow, this strike? People, cars and herds lost their way. The flow twisted around Alem tree- Garabagh mountains. While I looked at this picture I went back to far past, to holy root. I looked at Azygh cave, which is the beauty of Guruchay valley, of million years old Tug trough. Azygh is my window to the world. For the first time I burned fire here, seen the magic and power of fire flames, which rush to sky, felt the heat resembling to that of sun. In order not to allow this fire, this hearth to went out I guarded it for centuries. I was helpless facing unlimited miracles of the world surrounded me. Now I face events, which meaning and reasons I do not know. Sunlight, clouds, rain, snow, flooded rivers, fire, the ground which sometimes put on it the grey, green and yellow colors and sometimes run away under my feet with a horrible roar... Each of them was my belief, the supporter of my faith. I carved the special niches in walls of my Azygh. I believed into heads of bears-totems placed into those niches. First knowledge about digits and numbering was expressed by notches made over these heads of bears. Placing stones side-by-side I built the first shelter, the first house for one person, for one family, for one village - Azeri community. Despite that tools made by breaking stones collected in Guruchay were rough, they were useful for me. Once I went out of Azygh and looked around, I went to unknown places smelled as cradle. Wandering on this land I found that the world consists not only of mountains and valleys, it has also vast plains: my cradle Garabagh is turned out to be precious stone.

Years and centuries passed. Number of my consanguineous sheltered in native land increased. The fire stoke up on four sides of my cradle. Yells were heard from valleys of Guruchay and Kondelen-chay. Generations of those lived in Azygh and Tagh settled in new places: Toraghaytepe, Garakopektepe, Leylatepe, Gunesh-tepe, Khan-tepe, Zergertepe, Kultepe, Uzerliktepe, Govurgala...

MONUMENTS PRESERVING OUR HISTORY. Garakopektepe is one of magnificent monuments of Garabagh and it is located on the right bank of Kondelenchay, at the entrance into Fizu-li city. Archaeological researches led by Professor Gudret Ismayilov for along fifteen years give complete information

about this ancient land.

Garakopektepe is the ruins of settlement embraced the period of 10 thousand years. By variety and thickness of its cultural stages it is one of exclusive cultural monuments in our country. Storms of centuries wiped out a number of states, cities, settlements from historic scene, however Garakopektepe had not lost the flow of life. Due to its location at cross-roads to the East it evidenced major social and political events for thousands of years. Labor tools and arms, utensils, cloths and knick-knacks, construction and architectural elements found here while researches allow to turn the pages of our historic past and trace development of manufacturing, adherence to sedentary life, farming and cattle-breeding, discover and manufacture of the first metal - copper and, later the bronze, cultural and economic relations with Eastern countries and formation of new, social relations and religious views. At the start of the II millennium BC, Garakopektepe was surrounded by huge walls of 3 meter width made of large rocks and this had turned it into impregnable fort. The interesting fact is that the other settlement in Garabagh - Uzerliktepe was also strengthened by walls.

Arrows with three wing heads made of copper frequently met in Garakopektepe evidence that in VII century BC the skiff tribes, which played an important role in political life of Fore Asia, also attacked this settlement while their marches to the East. For some period after attacks of skiffs - up to the mid IV century BC there was a peace in Garakopektepe. The peace was unexpectedly broken in the second half of the same century, the settlement was totally burned to ashes and left under the layer of coal. According to G.Ismaylov, who compared notes of antic authors with archaeological researches, during that period Garakopektepe was plundered by Greek-Macedonian soldiers.

In III-IV centuries Garakopektepe had turned into strategic post of Sassani shahs, through the period of rule of Eldegiz it became the economic and cultural center, the large feudal castle with a large number of population. This settlement subjected to heavy attacks of Mongolians underwent some period of recession and then strengthened again during the rule of Hulakies. Through the period of rules of Teymuri, Garagoyunlu and Aghgoyunlu dynasties the busy life in Garakopektepe continued. The ancient cemetery of Khodjaly had a special value among tombstones found in Garabagh. These monuments were known to scientific world due to efforts of Emil Resler, the German scientist, teacher and archaeologist, who taught at school in Shusha through 1891-1899. Researches on most of archaeological monuments (Khodjaly, Ballygaya, Balchyly, Gushchu, etc.) of Khodjaly-Gedebey are related to his name. Over the period of 1893-1894 E.Resler researched a huge kurgan in Khachynchay valley. He had found a grave of stone with 4 skeletons in this kurgan. One of skeletons lied with its head towards the east, while the other three were in sitting position. There were a lot of things in grave: bronze sword, arrow heads, dagger, axe, helmet and various plates.

In 1895 E.Resler held archaeological researches in ancient cemetery in Khodjaly. The grave number 11 draws attention. A lot of samples of our culture invaluable for our history, were found in this stony grave of an elderly man. Among things recovered from grave there were pottery, bronze figure of bird, knife, a couple of rings, gold beads, plate with ornaments and beads made of agate. Over these beads the name of Assyrian king Adadnirari was engraved by cuneiform. At the first sight E.Resler decided that it is not the writing over beads, it is just signs resembling Moabite and nebatite writings. But later, academician I.Meshaninov showed that the opinion is not correct and devoted several papers to that cuneiform. Khodjaly beads were researched by other scientists, including R.Vikhrov, T.Passek, B.Latinin, I. Jafarzadeh and I.Dyakonov. There were 4 rulers with name Adadnirari in Assyria from end of XIV century to mid VIII century BC: Adadnirari I, II, III and IV. How those beads were brought to Khodjaly and to which Adadnirari was it belong? Scientists have no definite answer to this question. Most of them insist that beads belonged to Adadnirari I or Adadnirari IV. However, I.Dyanokov is of opinion that Khodjaly beads belonged to Adadnirari III, who came to throne in his childhood. During his rule (811-781 BC) Assyrian troops attacked Mamiya and Medians lived in surroundings of Urmia and reached even the "sea of sunrise", i.e the Caspian sea. Most probably, namely while these attacks the beads were brought to ancient Khodjaly.

E.Resler, who researched about 20 kurgans in Khodjaly came to conclusion that ancient cemetery of Khodjaly was used for about 600 years (XIV-VIII centuries BC). He divided Khodjaly kurgans into five groups and I.Meshaninov and I.Jafarzadeh, who researched several kurgans in the same area in 1926, agreed with this division. Studies conducted here by archaeologist H.Jafarov several years prior to occupation of Khodjaly by Armenian-Russian forces also proved this and revealed new evidences of cultural and economic relations of Azerbaijan with Far East countries. Arms frequently found in kurgans of Khodjaly, i.e dagger, knife, lance heads, etc. show that through the? indicated period one of the major activities of population of Garabagh was martial arts, along with farming, cattle-breeding and crafts. Favorable geographic position and natural riches of Garabagh always tempted neighboring tribes and due to this, local people were forced to defend their lands for along centuries.

One of largest settlements of town type in Garabagh through the Middle Ages was Govurgala, which ruins are preserved in Boyahmedli village of Aghdam region. Magnificent architectural works have been found here. Researches recovered Christian temple built of white stone and it was defined that brother of Alban ruler Hamaman was buried within stone grave in the temple. In part of Govurgala, which named as "Thrashing-floor" the temple with a large hall was discovered and it was attributed to the end of Antic period. Archaeological findings (fine plates of glass, jewelry, coins, etc.) evidenced relations of population of

ancient town with Syria, Bizance, Iran and other neighbor countries. Due to opinion that this cemetery belonged to dynasty of rulers and based on some historic sources prof. Geoyushov is of opinion that Govurga ly was a summer residence of Alban rulers and the ruins of town Aluen situated over trade route Barda-Dabil (Dvin). It must be noted that several Christian temples (Amaras, holy Yelisey, etc.) in mountain part of Garabagh were studied by R.Geoyushov for a long period of time. The last page of "Atlas of Azerbaijan SSR" published in Moscow in 1979 showed archaeological map which displayed territories of Jebrail, Zangilan, Gubadly and Lachin regions as "white spot". But, archaeological researches conducted in these regions ten years later discovered tens historic monuments here. In Jebrail region ancient settlements of cave type (Palace of Ogres) were found. Similar to other western regions in Jebrail also the monuments attributed to various historic periods were discovered. Kark-hulu, Toraghaytepe, Gishlag, Abbaskhalken settlements, Niftaly kurgans, Sirik and Gyz forts, Khub-yarly and Chelebiler are the monuments of Middle Ages. Tombstones made in form of ram figures are frequently met in Garabagh and West Azerbaijan (now "Armenia"). Meshadikhany Nemet, the outstanding researcher of epigraphic monuments and correspondent member of Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences, considers those figures belonged to XIV-XV century due to their paleographic properties and applied technique. Ram figures, which were found on the territory from south-west shore of Caspian sea to Goyche lake belong only to our nation and are clear examples of culture of nomad Azerbaijani tribes. Each ram figure made of stone being the original sculptural work, in fact, is eternal passport which prove the right of Azerbaijani to live on these lands. The note "Ibrahim from dynasty of Agvan" engraved over the ram figure made of stone in cemetery of Urud village in Sisyan region and attributed to the second half of XV century is very valuable for our history. Armenian vandals undertake enormous efforts to destroy these pieces of art - our historic roots spread over the territory from Turkmenchay, from Urmia to Goyche. Some Armenian "intelligentsia", fed by absurd ideas, express nonsensical notions just in order to hide history and falsify truths. The history of building of 11 span and 15 span Khudafarin bridges over Araz river in south of Garabagh and the fact of Azeri Turks settling on both sides of these bridges for last thousand years are known even to those, who are not historians. In spring of 1989 S.Khazadyan on pages of "Communist" newspaper expressed nonsense idea about "the most ancient and magnificent sample of Armenian art of building bridges is Khudferin bridge, which connects northern Armenia with Atropat province of south Armenia".

Hundreds of monuments found in Garabagh and West Azerbaijan, including those described above and those have not been mentioned in this paper, thousands stones with inscriptions of phrases from Holy Koran in Arabic script embraced the whole II millennium, examples of writing attributed to Middle Ages

display tradition and inheritance of cultural, economic and everyday life of our nation. Life started from Azygh in Garabagh and continued through ancient and Middle Ages show that this region is one of ancient civilization centers of Azerbaijan.

INSTEAD EPILOGUE. Our monuments suffered from vandals in occupied Garabagh together with our territories, trampled by sworn enemy, wait for day of liberation. Millions of our compatriots, who foster love to Motherland in their hearts, never will refuse of idea to liberate Garabagh. The fog over Garabagh will be dissipated soon, worms over the hills will dissolve, smile will return to the pressed lips and peace will be established in ancient Cradle of God.

Tofiq Najafly **GARABAGH IN XV CENTURY**

One of the crucial problems of historic science consists in detailed studies of Garabagh of ancient times and through the Middle ages. Garabagh, which covered a large area in Azerbaijan in most cases was named as "Arran Garabagh". The term "Arran Garabagh" for the first time was mentioned in book "Came et-tevarix" authored by Fezlullah Reshidaddin while his descriptions of events of 1284 (Reshid ad-din Fezullah. Djami at-tavarix. Vol.III. Sostaviteli nauchno-kriticheskogo teksta na persidskom yazike - A.Ali-zade. Perevod s persidskogo yazika A.Arends. Baku, 1957, p.170; V. Piriyeu. Azerbaijan in XVIII-XIV centuries. Baku, 2003, p.98). Historians of that period named this region as "Arran Garabagh" in order to distinguish it from other Garabaghs, first of all to distinguish from "Bagdis Garabagh" existed in southeast of Turkmenistan and south-west of Afganistan. (V.Piriyeu. Indicated source, p.98). Mountain and plain areas of Garabagh, which historically had close economic and cultural ties with each other, geographically was part of Arran. In some cases in historic sources Garabagh and Arran were shown as the same entity. Being greater administrative-geographic unit, the Arran was considered as part of Azerbaijan. According to Azerbaijani historian Aby Bakr al-Gutbu al-Ahri, Garabagh was regarded as "capital of Arran", more precisely as its center (Aby Bakr al-Gutbu al-Ahri. Tarix-e Sheikh Uveys. Translation and introduction from Persian, comments of M.Kazymov and V.Piriyeu. Baku, 1984, p.87). "Garabagh" was used together with term "Arran" at the end of XIV century -start of XV century, in some cases replaced it and administratively embraced central portions of Arran. Garabagh consisted of a territory comprised of mountain and foothill areas. Garabagh as a part of Arran was the center of social and political events taking place in Azerbaijan in XIV-XV centuries. Since Elkhans always spent winter time in Garabagh, some state level events happened here. Three Elkhani rulers - Gazan khan, Arpa khan and Anushiravan came to throne in Garabagh, two others -Argun and Abu Said died in

Garabagh (V.Piriyev. Indicated source, p. 101-102.).

After the death of Elkhani ruler sultan Abu Said in 1335 the state of Elkhanies underwent regression and later collapsed. This also influenced Garabagh. Ruler of Garabagh Emir Surghan and his mother Satybey Khatun turned into active participants of feudal war occurred in Hulakiler state. Feudal groups struggling for power in 1338, on the basis of agreement signed between Chobaniler and Jelaliler as a part of Arran had stayed under the rule of Satybey Khatun and Emir Surghan. In a short period of time the ruler of Garabagh Satybey Khatun_ı became the shah of Hulakuler and from that period Garabagh was the center of historic events related to activity of Chobanies. (Hamdullah Mustofi Gazvini. Zeyl-e Tarix-e gozide. Introduction, translation, comments are made by M.Kazymov and V.Piriverdiyev, Baku, 1986, p.32; V.Piriverdiyev. Indicated source, p. 103).

In the second half of XIV century when Azerbaijan entered Jalaliler state the territory of Garabagh also went under the control of this state. At the beginning of Sultan Ahmed rule the territory of Garabagh was ruled by Jalairi emirs. After attacks of Emir Teymur to Azerbaijan, Garabagh almost totally was under the subordination of his representatives. Garabagh became the place of winter residence of Emir Teymur. In sources of that period there were a large number of facts mentioning Garabagh as a winter residence of Emir Teymur and preceding him rulers of Hulaki and Jelairi dynasties. Emir Teymur used Garabagh as a starting point for his attacks to the west.

In the beginning of XV century Jelairi state, which also contained Garabagh, collapsed as a result of attacks of Emir Teymur. Since Sultan Ahmed fled to Bagdad, Azerbaijan was ruled by Miranshah, son of Emir Teymur.

In March of 1404 when Emir Teymur went from Garabagh winter residence back to Samarkand, he assigned his grandson Omar Mirza as a ruler of territories in Hulaky area (F. S timer. Kara Koyunlular. Vol.1, Ankara, 1967, p.70). Death of Teymur in 1405 caused discords between dynasty members in his empire and continuous struggle for power between his children. Azerbaijan has turned into the arena of new wars. Local rulers taking advantage from political situation started the fight for independence with a support of population. (History of Azerbaijan. Seven volumes. Vol.III, Baku, 1999, p.78). This struggle was headed by Shirvanshah Ibrahim (1382-1417). Ibrahim I, who took advantage from struggle, which started in various provinces of the country against ruling of strangers, crossed Kur river in 1406 and established his control over large portion of Gandja and Garabagh. According to data shown in various sources, through that period the ruler of Garabagh was Yar Ahmed from Garamanly tribe (A.Ali-zadeh).

Ruler of Gandja and Yar Ahmed Garaman, Shirvanshah I Ibrahim, Bistam Jagir- ruler of Ardebil, Seid Ahmed Teymiri -ruler of Sheki joined their efforts against Omar Mirza. Omar Mirza refrained from fight with joined forces and went back. Thus, northern territories of Azerbaijan were free from rule of Teymuries. In

May of 1406 Shirvanshah Ibrahim I captured Tabriz. However when he became aware that Sultan Ahmed started attack from Bagdad, Ibrahim I was forced to return. Attempt of Shirvanshah I Ibrahim to unite territories of Azerbaijan had failed.

Through that period the South Azerbaijan territories were under the rule of Teymuri Abu Bakir. Gara Yusif Garagoyunlu in battle in Nakhchivan in 1406 and in Sardrud in 1408 defeated Teymuri Abu Bakir and brought to the end the rule of Teymuries in Azerbaijan. In 1410 Gara Yusif defeated former ally Sultan Ahmed in vicinity of Tabriz and thus ended the rule of Jelairi state and established Azerbaijan state of Garagoyunlu with center in Tabriz. The state included Garabagh, South Azerbaijan, part of Eastern Anadolu, Arabic Iraq and Adjem Iraq (History of Azerbaijan, Vol.111, p.81; T.Najafli. History of Garagoyunlu and Aghgoyunlu states in Turkic historic sciences. Baku, 2000. p.56; O.Efendiyev. Garabagh within states of Garagoyunlu, Aghgoyunlu and Sefevis. (XV-XVII cc.)// Garabagh. Stories on history and culture. Baku, 2004, p.62-63). Garamanly tribe of Garabagh joined Garagoyunlu tribe and played a significant role in history of this state. In December of 1412 in fight of Gara Yusif against joined troops of Shirvanshah I Ibrahim, ruler of Sheki - Seyid Ahmed and Georgian king Konstantin the "soldiers of Garaman" under supervision of Yar Ahmed also participated. In this battle on the bank of Kur river Gara Yusif won with support of Garabagh units. (I.Petrushevsky. States of Azerbaijan in XV century. Collection of papers on history of Azerbaijan. Issue 1, Baku, 1949, p. 160; T.Nadjafli. Indicated source, p.58-59; O.Efendiyev. Garabagh within.. .p.62). After death of Gara Yusif in 1420 Teymuri Sultan Shahrukh occupied Azerbaijan.

Among neighbor rulers who came to meet Sultarr Shahrukh spending winter in Arran Garabagh, was the ruler of Garabagh -Yar Ahmed Garamanly and his brother Shirzad (Xavari Fasix. Mudjmali Fasixi. Translation, foreword and notes of D.Osupuvoy, Tashkent, 1980, p.188). In April of 1421 Sultan. Shahrukh left Garabagh and this gave a start to revolt of Yar Ahmed Garamanly in Gandja and Barda. Teymuries historian Fasih Xavafi wrote that at that period Sultan Shahrukh sent his son Baysungur Bahadur against Yar Ahmed (F.Xavafi. Indicated source, p. 190). Faruk Sumer wrote that Yar Ahmed Garamanly attacked those who collected taxes from Cagatay district nearby to Gandja-Garabagh and took away everything they had. Due to this, Shahrukh sent Baysungur to attack Yar Ahmed. Despite that Yar Ahmed left Gandja and found a shelter in Esferzen fort in Georgia, he was captured brought to Shahrukh, who forgave him. (F. Sumer. Indicated source, p. 118; O.Efendiyev "Vseobshoe istorie Hafiza Abru kak istochnik po istorii Zagafkaziya pervoy chetverti XV c"// istochnikovedcheskie raziskanie 1979. Tbilisi, 1984, p.226-227). Xevafi wrote that when Sultan Shahrukh fought with Karakoyuniu Isgender nearby to Aleshgerd, Yar Ahmed Garamanly was brought from Barda fort and executed (F.Xevafi. Indicated source,

p. 19).

Garagoyunlu Isgender seriously resisted strengthening of Sultan Shahrukh's position in Azerbaijan. In spite of struggle between Garagoyunlular, Isgender succeeded to preserve integrity of the state. During his second attack to Azerbaijan in 1429, Sultan Shahrukh defeated Isgender in battle nearby to Selmas and took Azerbaijan under the control. While leaving the country he assigned Abu Said, the brother of Isgender, as a ruler of the country, however later Isgender took back the power. In 1435 Sultan Sh ihrukh again attacked Azerbaijan and spent winter in Garabagh. In spring of 1436 he assigned Cahanshah, the other brother of Isgender, who agreed to be the subject of Teymuri, as a ruler of Azerbaijan. Isgender disagreed with this and started the fight against his brother. However, in 1438 Piri bey Garamanly, who was one of "major emirs" of the state, took a side of Cahanshah and due to this, Isgender did not fight with his brother nearby Heft-Cheshme and went to Elindje fort, where he was killed (E.Tehrani. *Kitab-Diyarbekriyye*. Translation from Persian, foreword, comments and notes by Rahile Shukurova, Baku, 1998, p.90; F.Sumer. Indicated source, p. 139; O.Efendiyeu. *Karabax v sostave...*,p.62).

It may be supposed that Piri bey Garamanly became the ruler of Gandja and Barda and replaced Yar Ahmed Garamanly. During the rule of Cahanshah also Garabagh was part of Garagoyunlu state. In 1467 Cahanshah was killed in the battle with Uzun Hasan and after this, Garabagh like other territories of Garagoyunlu went under the control of Aghgoyunlu. Hasan Ali, son of Cahanshah, after death of his father gathered his own troops. But defeated by Uzun Hasan in 1468 in vicinity of Marand, he fled to Garabagh and settled in Barda. Abubekr Tehrani wrote that after the death of Cahansnah, sons of Piri bey Garamanly intended to capture him and sent to meet Uzun Hasan, however later they changed their mind and. allowed dm to go to Ardebil (A.Tehrani. Indicated source, p.250; O.Efendiyeu. *Karabagh v sostave...*, p.62).

In historic sources of that period Garabagh was mentioned as traditional winter residence of troops of Sultan, Shahrukh, however, the amount of distinct data is small. Through the period of rule of Sultan Yagub (1478-1490), who was the son of Uzun Hasan, the districts of Gandja and Barda were ruled by heads of local tribes assigned by the central power. According to notes of Fezlullah ibn Ruzbehan Xunci, historian of Aghgoyunlu, Gandja and Barda provinces were ruled by Baysungur, son of Sultan Yagub (F.Xindci. *Tarix-I alam-ara-yi Amini*. *Perevod s anqliyskoqo na ruskiy T.A.Minorskoy*. Baku, 1987, p.87; O.Efendiyeu. *Karabax v sostave...*, p.63). F.Xunci gives information about Garabagh while describing marches of Sefevi Sheikh Heydar in 1488 to Shirvan and Dagestan. The author wrote that Sheikh Heydar "when approached Chalabert district of Barda province, the property of head gazi, he looted this area and confiscated possessions of zimmi community. These zimmi (i.e. Christian Albans - T.N.) during the peace period

paid such taxes as cizye and ushr, and were free from torments and oppression" (F.Xunci, Indicated source, p.86). While depicting period of rule of Sultan Yagub, F.Xunci indicates that he had spent winter time in Tabriz or in Garaagach area of Garabagh (F.Xunci, Indicated source, p. 119; O.Efendiyev. Karabax v sostave...,p.63). According to historian of Aghgoyunlu, Garaagach was situated on "Laps of Tall Sultan and its peak directed towards the stars from the center of the camp. It is surprising that such a peak located in surrounding of a plain area in the middle of a forest" (F.Xunci, Indicated source, p. 101; O.Efendiyev. Karabax v sostave...,p.63). It can be derived from descriptions of Aghgoyunlu historian F.Xunci that this area was located on territory of Sultanbud. That is because, the ruler arrived at Garaagach "was greeted by newly blossoming flowers of Sultanbud lands" (F. Xunci. Indicated source, p. 101; O.Efendiyev. Karabax v sostave...,p.63). It must be noted that Sultanbud lands indicated by historian of Aghgoyunlu were situated to the east from Barda-Agdam route. Garabagh mentioned again in sources of that period while describing events during the short period of rule of Baysungur, the son of Sultan Yagub. In 1492 the battle between Eybe Sultan Bayandur and Baysungur took place between Gandja and Barda. According to the information given in sources Eybe Sultan succeeded to unite Gadjars of Garabagh under his banner. That is why, Baysungur was defeated in the battle and was killed in the second battle in surroundings of Barda in August of 1493 (F.Xunci. Indicated source, p. 143-144). This fact once again proves that during that period Gadjars already lived in Garabagh. There are various versions in historic researches in respect of origin and history of settling in Azerbaijan of Gadjars, which were one of Gyzylbash kins and played a major role while development of Azerbaijan Sefevi state. According to opinion of Turkish historian Z.Toghan, Gadjars arrived at Azerbaijan while travels of Oghuz khan to Iran and during the period of Mongolian attacks to Azerbaijan they settled in surroundings of Khalkhal. Gadjars assisted Hulaku troops and went together with them to Sham, however they returned during the rule of Emir Teymur and Garagoyunlu. (Z.Toghan. About ethnography of Azerbaijan. "Azerbaijan Yurt Bilgisi", vol.H, issue 14, Istanbul, 1933, p.56. For detailed information refer to: T.Nadjafli, G.Nadjafli. Role of Gadjars in political life in XVI-XVII centuries.//Azerbaijan and Azerbaijani. Baku, 2006, 1-4, p.137-138). The author of "History of Gyzylbashes" confirmed that Gadjars lived in Gandja and Barda from ancient times and part of them came from Sham ("History of Gyzylbashes". Translation and comments of M.Mahammadi, Baku, 1993, p.36).

These facts prove once again Gadjars being from Oghuz tribes lived in Azerbaijan even prior to Mongolian attacks and due to attacks of Mongolians were forced to go back to Eastern Anadolu along with other Turkmen. In XV century Gadjars joined the Aghgoyunlu. Historic sources reflect that Gadjars lived in Garabagh were actively involved with fierce struggle over the throne of Aghgoyunlu in 90-ies of XV century. According to F.Sumer and sources of that

period Gadjars settled in surroundings of Gandja played a major role in liberation of Rustam Mirza, the grandson of Uzun Hasan, from Elindje fort and bringing him to throne. (F.Sumer. Role of Anadolu Turks in establishment and development of Sefevi state. Ankara, 1976, p.53). When in 1497 Rustam shah was defeated by Gyodek Ahmed, he again found a shelter nearby to bey of Gadjars in surroundings of Gandja and requested his support. Despite that Gadjars bey supported Rustam, he defeated in the battle in 1497 and was killed. According to F.Sumer, during that period Gadjars dynasty was headed by Ziyad bey. (F.Sumer. Indicated source, p.54). In the last quarter of XV century Gyzylbash tribes gathered besides of sheikh Heydar also involved Gadjars. According to I.Petrushevsky, at the end of XV century Gadjar Turk tribes (Aghgoyunlu Gadjar), which once entered the Aghgoyunlu tribes union, joined Gyzylbash tribes (I.Petrushevsky. About feudal relations history in Azerbaijan and Armenia in XVI centuries, L.1949, p.91). At the end of XV century the internal contradictions in Azerbaijan Aghgoyunlu state, became deeper and in 1500 the state divided between emirs of Aghgoyunlu. South Azerbaijan, Garabagh, Nakhchyvan and Diyarbakr were under the rule of Sultan Elvend, while Arab Iraq, Fars and Kirman went under the rule of Sultan Murad. (I.Petrushevsky. States of Azerbaijan in XV century, p. 179; O.Efendiyev. Establishment of Azerbaijan state of Sefevi at the start XVI century. Baku, 1961, p.84). In 1499, when Ismayil left Lahidja and moved toward Ardebil he was followed by loyal to him Gara Piri bey Gadjar. Zeynalabdin AH in his book "Tekmiletul-exbar" wrote that Gara Piri bey Gadjar, who gained the title "Tozogoparan" for his courage, was assigned by Ismayil as a head of forces sent against Aghgoyunlu Elvend in 1501 (O.Efendiyev. Establishment of Azerbaijan state of Sefevi..., p. 146). At the start of XVI century Garabagh was included into Azerbaijan Sefevi state as Garabagh beylerbeylik with its center in Gandja.

Thus, in XV century Garabagh was inseparable part of Azerbaijan and stayed as a part of Azerbaijan states. Through that period the major part of population in Garabagh were Azerbaijani Turkic tribes belonged to dynasties of Garagoyunlu and Aghgoyunlu. Important information about population of Garabagh and its ethnic composition was given in 1593 by Ottoman finance official Mehmed Imamzadeh in his work "Gandja-Garabagh icmal defteri" (F.Kirziogly. 1593 (H.1001) Osmanli vilayet Tahrir defterinde anilan Gence-Karabag sancaqlari "Ulus" ve "Oymaklari" - Edebiyyat fakultesi Arashtirma Dergisi ahmet Sfaroglu Ozel sayisi, sayi 10, Ankara, 1979). According to this source, there were such Turkic kin in Garabagh as Garamanly, Gadjars, Baharly, Hadjly, Iyirmidordly, Otuzikili, Shamsaddinli, Gapanly and others.

Ulviyya Hajiyeva
COMMEMORATIVE NOTES IN ALBAN
GOSPELS AS SOURCE OF HISTORY OF ALBANS IN XI-XVIII

In the book "Artsakh" authored by Makar Barkhudaryants and published in Baku in 1895 there is valuable information about New Testaments, preserved in Garabagh (Artshakh) at the end of XIX century. Some of them may be attributed to that of Albans.

I. For the IV-XIX centuries Alban Apostle Autocephalous Church played a role of organizer in the life of Alban Christian population of Artsakh (Garabagh). All monasteries of Garabagh subjected to Alban katalikosate according to M.Barkhudaryants "in 1828 were inhabited and flourished. After abolishment of Ag-van katalikosate. i.e. after the year 1828 the monasteries gradually weakened, devoid of monks and being without supervision, mostly destroyed (underlined by author) (Barkhudaryants, I, p.5). After liquidation of Alban katalikosate by the decree of monarchy, Alban churches of Artsakh stopped to be the centers of spiritual-cult union of Alban Christian population. These monasteries being subjected since 1836 to Armenian Church of Echmiadzin by the end of XIX c. did not have any archives and libraries, everything had mystically vanished. This was because the fact that monasteries were destroyed, church services was not held and all ecclesiastical literature was liquidated. Although notes on the walls indicated that for centuries monasteries were presented by lands, holy books, various manuscripts, testaments and they had rooms specially constructed for libraries. For example, the note within Gandzasar monastery says: "... this note evidences that me, humble servant of God, Jalal Dola, son of Vakhtang, grandchild of great Asan, ruler of high and great country of Artsakh, king in multiscale world; my farther before his death and passing to the other world made a will to me and my mother Khorishakh to build this church over the graves of our fathers in Gandzasar, which we started in 665 (1216). In our stormy life the forethought event completed in 682 (1233), decorated by various forms, paintings and ornaments by our eagerness and good will... I gave with cross, books, sacred things, utensils, made from noble metals and beautiful decorations... This church was sanctified in 689 (1240) in patriarchate of ter Nerses - katalikos of Agvan" (Barkhudaryants, I, p. 155). Later it says: "...this amazing monastery is morally and physically destroying; gradually stones fall out and break, rooting is damaged, the fence in some places is destroyed and there are no gates, invaluable handwritings in a large amount are looted, handwritings which left became the victims of moisture and negligence, there are no services in monastery for several months, because there are no literate people, no schools, no monks, nor even simple readers" (underlined by author), (Barkhudaryants, I, p. 160). In this famous Alban monastery of XVIII century, according to M.Barkhudaryants, of a whole rich library only handwritten "lives of

saints" was preserved, which condition he described as following: "from the beginning and from the end the pages were lost, due to negligence it was covered by mould and became useless" (Barkhudaryants, I, p. 156). Except for monastery Targmanchats (in Gardman district), in which there was only one gospel of XVIII c. (Barkhudaryants, II, p.304-306), by the end of XIX c. in monasteries of Artsakh there were no gospels at all.

Thus Armenian Echmiadzin Church treated with religious heritage of Alban Apostolic Autocephalous Church, gaining it at the start of XIX c. in blooming state and totally destructing it by the end of the same century, also liquidated rich literature and archives, probably taking part of them to Echmiadzin.

According to studied source. Alban gospels (handwritten: parchment and paper) are preserved in separate churches in districts of Artsakh (Garabagh): in Shakashen, Varand, Khachen, Jerabert, Gardman, Parisos and Kusti. Characteristic feature of manuscripts is the existence of commemorative note - colophon, the note which indicates name of copyist, date and conditions of copying, name of client, etc. There is a certain canon of writing of colophon. Colophon is the documental source for exact dating of chapter, portion, manuscript (in which it is fixed) for studying of many historic problems. Although these gospels and notes on them are preserved by the end of XIX c. in Armenian, they reflect history of Alban ethnos, Alban church and its katalikosate, Alban ruling dynasty during XI-XVIII cc. and due to this they may be referred to Alban. II. From colophons it is possible to derive date (XI, XIII-XVIII cc) and places where these gospels were written. Part of Alban gospels were written in Artsakh during various periods with support of Alban rulers and Alban katalikos in its various regions: in Gandja (villages Artsangist, Karaat), in Varand district of Artsakh (Khachmaz settlement), Gayvush (Tavuz settlement), Dizak (village Tegaser), Dzegam (village Melikzate), in upper Dzegam (village Sultanetsik, Garamurat), in Megavuz district (village Baga-zun), Sunik, Nakhchb/van (village Gomer in Shabun district). For example we may indicate the following colophons:

1) "this holy gospel inscribed by God is written in state of Gandja. in village of Artsangist. in Church of saint Malaznabert" (Barkhudaryants, I, p.46,47,48)

2) "this gospel is completed in 1108 (1659) in state of Gandja. in village of Kara-at with favor of Holy Mother during the period of katalikos Agavanii of ruler Petros" (Barkhudaryants, I, p.89)

3) "it is written in Varand district of Artsakh. in village of Khachmaz by the hand of bishop Aleksander in 1018 (1569); was restored in 1145 (1696)... in the church of St Grigoriy in village Gomer of Shabun district in state of Nakhchwan (Barkhudaryants, I, p. 127)

4) "it is written in village of Pechgena Gomer fSvunikl in Church of St.Georgiy Conqueror" (Barkhudaryants, I, p.49). According to studies of Ziya

Buniyatov and Farida Mamedova the Syunik is the part of Alban kingdom, Alban lands and after decay of Alban kingdom Syunik was the inseparable part of all succeeding countries of historic Azerbaijan - states of Sadjids, Salarids, Sheddadids, Atabeks, Gara-goyunlu, Agh-goyunlu, Sefevi and Nakhchyvan khanate;

5) "it is written in Great Syunik Tatev monastery in 1034 (1585) by hand of bishop xOvannes"; "...this testament... in 1120 (1671)... in state of Upper-Dzegam, in village Sultanetsik under the favor of Holy Mother"; "in 1101 (1652) ... it is written in state of Dzegam in village of Melikzate, under the favor of Holy Mother and Saint Foma and other saint...; this gospel is copied at present time from good original in state of Upper Dzegam in skete Arants in Garamurat... in 1128 (1679)" (Barkhudaryants, II, p.295, 296, 298,299);

6) "it is written... under the favor of Saint Martyr in state Gawush in village of Tavuz..."; "this holy gospel is written in state of Agvan, in district of Dizak. in village of Tegaser.. in third year of shah Sefi";

7) "this holy gospel is copied during grievous and difficult period from good, selected original in state of Upper Dzegam in village of Shakar-bek...in 1082 (1633) during the rule of shah Abbas..." (Barkhudaryants, II, p.336, 337).

8) "This is written in state of Agvan in district of Megavuz in village named as Bagazun. in Church of Holy Brotherhood in 1091 (1642)" (from church of St. xOvanes XVII c. in village of Chora-tan, in district Kusti (or Kave); (Barkhudaryants, II, p.332, 333).

Other part of gospels had been brought to Artsakh from other places, but also was used by Alban clergy for commemorative descriptions of events taking place in Artsakh and adjacent countries of the same period, of simultaneous historic events.

III. Colophons of Alban gospels include notes evidencing independence of Alban Apostolic Autocephalous Church and there is no indication on its subjection to Armenian Church. Makar Barkhudaryants in his work "Artsakh" gives chronology of all locations of Alban katalikosate. He wrote: "Agvan katalikosate was located in: Derbent, Chola, Gis (according to legend), Partav ("which by the end of XIX c. was almost as a village, devoid of glory of former splendor and wealth") (Barkhudaryants, I, p.31,32), Ktlikosaran, monastery of Apostle Egishe or Jrevishtik, Gandja, Karagerts, Khamshivank-monastery, Akhbat, Gandzasar, Jalet, repeatedly Gandzasar, where the Agvan katalikosate stopped its existence and where the last katalikos Sarkis was buried in crypt of Jalalyants" (Barkhudaryants, I, p.6).

Let us now consider extractions from Alban gospels, which contain valuable information about Alban katalikosate, from which we learn names of Alban

katalikoses, which ruled Alban Apostolic Autocephalous Church in XVI-XVIII cc: xOvanes (1574-1586), Grigoriy (1645-1650), Petros (1653-1675), Yeremii Hasan-Jalal (yants) (1676-1700), Esai Hasan Jalal (yants) (1702-1728), Nerses (1742-1745).

About patriarchate of katalikos xOvanes (1574-1586) there is a note in a gospel located in district Parisos, in church, in village Barsum, which said: "Now this ...gospel is written in 1028 (1579) by hand of bishop xOvanes in famous brotherhood of saint apostle Evstafiy, 9800 hallows are collected here under the shelter of Holy Mother in patriarchate of ter xOvanes of Agvan katalikos" (Barkhudaryants, II, p.324,325).

Data about patriarchate of Alban katalikos Grigoriy (1645-1650) is preserved in two gospels, which colophons are given below:

1) "It is written in 1094 (1645) in patriarchate of ter Grigoriy under the shelter of St.Martyr in state of Gayvush in village of Ta-vuz, in a year when we are oppressed by evil lawlessness of Persian yoke... subjecting to atrocities" (from cathedral church of Holy Mother in Shusha, in district of Varanda; Barkhudaryants, I, p. 129).

2) "O, sons of Sion...in 1099 (1650) khan of Gandja send katalikos of Gandzasar to prison until he will pay out the debt to executors, freed and went to collect the debts... name of Gandzasar katalikos was Grigoriy" (from private house in village of Talysh, in district of Jrabert; (Barkhudaryants, II, p. 238-240).

It is important that colophons of these gospels allow to add to a list of Alban katalikoses the name of another katalikos - Grigoriy (1645-1650), which is absent in list of Alban katalikoses shown in "Orthodox encyclopedia".

About a certain period of patriarchy of Alban katalikos Petros (1653-1675) there are evidences in extractions of the following gospels:

1) "is completed by the Grace of God in 1112 (1663) in patriarchy of Agvan ruler Petros" (from Cathedral Church of St. John Baptist of XVII c. in Gandja, in district Shakashen; (Barkhudaryants, I, p.44);

2) "it is written... the gospel in state of Gandja, in village of Artsangist, in Church of St. Malaznabert in patriarchate of thrice blessed arch-priest from house of Agvan ruler Petros - reverent katalikos..." (from Cathedral Church of St. John Baptist of XVII c. in Gandja; in district Shakashen; Barkhudaryants, I, p. 46)

3) "This holy gospel is written in 1117 (1668) in patriarchy of thrice blessed

arch-priest from house of Agvan, ruler Petros, reverent katalikos and during the rule of Holy Table by ter Ovanes...in principdom of noble melik of country Simavon ..." (from church of St. Apostle, built in 1853-1869 in Gandja, in district Shakashen; Barkhudaryants, I, p.47,48);

4) "...under the patronage of Holy Mother during the rule of... katalikos of Agvanii ruler Petros" (from Church of XVII c. of Holy Mother in town of Avetaranots, in district Varand; Barkhudaryants, I, p.89);

5) "Now this holy gospel is written in 1118 (1669) in patriarchy of thrice blessed of archbishop of house Agvan of katalikos Petros in village Artskhakist in church of St.Mlyznabert..." (from church of St. xOvanes in village Gulali, in district Parisos; Barkhudaryants, II, p.328);

6) "...this testimonial...in 1120 (1671)... during patriarchy of ter Petros reverent katalikos of holy Gandzasar,.. .under the shelter of Holy Mother..." (from Church of St.Apostle, built in 1863 in village Mets-Banants, in district Gardman; Barkhudaryants, II, p.296);

About rule of other Alban katalikoses there are episodic data in some Alban gospels:

Eremii Hasan-Jalal(yants) (1676-1700): "Thisgospel is written in 1129 (1680)...in patriarchy of house of Agvøn ter Eremii reverent and newly elected katalikos, in state of Gandja in village of Kara-at under the shelter of Holy Mother". "Village Kara at in Gardman district" (from Cathedral church of Holy Mother in city Shusha, in district of Varand; Barkhudaryants, I, p. 130);

Esai Hasan Jalal(yants) (1702-1728): "...in patriarchy of ter Esai...katalikos of all agvans, is written in 1166 (1717)" (from church of St. Apostle, built in 1863 in village Mets-Banants, in district Gardman; Barkhudaryants, II, p.294);

Nersese (1742-1745): "...it is written in 1191 (1742) to arch-priest ter Nerses katalikos Agvan and head of the region Melik-Tamraz" (from private house in village Talysh, in district Jrabert; Barkhudaryants, II, p.238-240);

1) "In 1194 (1745) this gospel was bought by me, Melik Esai from Cherapert from village Mokhratag. Now, I heard voice of God and presented this to the monastery of St. Three infants to patriarchy of ruler Nerses katalikos of Agvan" (from Cathedral church of St. John Baptist of XVII c. in Gandja, in district Shaka-shen; Barkhudaryants, I, p.46);

Thus, due to colophons of Alban gospels it is possible to trace continuity of ruling of Alban katalikoses up to XVIII c, and according to data of

M.Barkhudaryants, Alban katalikosate ceased its existence after the year 1828.

IV. Historic tradition of writing of historic-literature chronicles was preserved by Albans-Christians along centuries until the beginning of XIX c: "History of Albans" by Moisey Kalankatuyskiy of VIII a, "Alban chronicles" by Mkhitar Gosha of XII-XIII cc, "Short history of Agvan state" by Esai Hasan Jalalyan of XVIII century. Alban gospels with their colophons from period of late Middle Ages up to start of XIX c. had continued historic chronicles. Commemorative notes in them represented continuation of Alban historic-literature traditions and were some sort of chronicles. Detailed studies of colophons of these gospels, indicate that Alban gospels were written not only through the periods of flourishing, renaissance, but also during hard years of epidemics, starvation, while ruling of cruel sovereigns. All historic events happened with Albans of various districts and Artsakh as a whole were described in gospels, dating synchronously with events in neighbor countries in order to make exact dating and to leave for descendants the history of their ethnos. Under circumstances of continuous attacks, wars, absence of their own Alban state, only Alban Apostle Autocephalous Church could keep manuscripts and gospels, since gospels were carriers of historic memory of their ethnos. Notes of Alban gospels indicate names of most prominent rulers in countries neighboring with Artsakh, both at the time when the gospel was written or due to description of any event. For example, some commemorative notes of Alban gospels evidence that they were written "during ruling of Persian minor shah Abbas" (Barkhudaryants, I, p.44-48) or "during the rule of Persian shah Suleyman" (Barkhudaryants, I,p.130).

Historic events of XVII c. are reflected in the following colophons of Alban gospels, found in:

1) In district Jrabert, in private house in village Talysh: "This...gospel was brought...from Kesariya... "O, sons of Sion...in 1099 (1650) khan of Gandja send katalikos of Gandzasar to prison until he will pay out the debt to executors, freed and went to collect the debts... I went with him up to Khachen.. .name of Gandzasar katalikos was Grigoriy" (Barkhudaryants, II, p. 238-240).

2) In district Parisos, in Church of St. xOvanes in village Gulali: "Now this holy gospel is written in 1118 (1669) during the rule of Persian shah Suleyman, we finished it in grievous times, when collecting of taxes were increased and men of Belail always treated arrogantly with Christian nation" (Barkhudaryants, II, p.328).

3) In district Varand, in cathedral church of Holy Mother in Shusha: "It is written in 1094 (1645) in which we were oppressed by evil lawlessness of Persian yoke... subjecting to atrocities" (Barkhudaryants, I, p. 129).

"This ...gospel is written in 1129 (1680) ...during the rule of Persian shah Suleyman and in patriarchy of house of Agvan ter Eremii reverent and newly elected katalikos, in state of Gandja in village Kara-at under the shelter of Holy Mother. Village Kara-at in Gardman district" (Barkhudaryants, I, p. 130).

4) In district Gardman, in church of St.Apostle, built in 1863 in village Mets-Banats: "...this testimonial...in 1120 (1671)...in this year there were a large number of deaths in state of Upper Dzegam, when in one day in one house 7 people died...in patriarchy ter Petros reverent katalikos of holy Gandzasar, under the rule of head of this province vardapet Minase and during the rule of Persian shah Suleyman in a state of Upper Dzegam in village Sultanetsik under the shelter of Holy Mother..." (Barkhudaryants, II, p.296).

Colophons of some Alban gospels characterize complicated historic situation in Garabagh as a whole and its Alban Christian population in XVIII and start of XIX centuries, including the period of arrival of Russian troops to Azerbaijan. In Varand district, in Shu-sha in Cathedral church of Saver there was gospel, which said: "it is written during the grievous and hard times, when lezgins came to Gandja, Partav, Khachen, Varand, Shaki, Shamakha, Georgia, Dzegam state, attacked people and looted them. Churches went busted, fall into the darkness and emptied. Secondly, Ottomans came repeatedly, there were large bloodshed, unlimited number of prisoners was taken by Ottomans, deep mourning had embraced our Christian nation...in 1117 (1722) in village of Artavan in Church of Holy Dukes" (Barkhudaryants, I, p.127,128).

In district of Gardman in church of St.Apostle in village Mets-Banants there were kept several gospels, which colophons said:

1) "Now...for sins flooding us...a large disaster came here, locusts and caterpillars in Dizak, Varand, Khachen, Chorabert, which continued for a long period in this country.. our country suffered severe starvation..., epidemics.. in patriarchy ter Esai.. katalikos of all Agvans, written in 1166 (1717). Then by other clerk the following was added: "Now during the tyranny in town Gandja of Ugurlukhan, son of Kalbali-khan and under the rule in Voskanapat canyon of owner ter Melik-Ovsep, son of Melik-Yavri from village of Voskanapat. ..." (Barkhudaryants, II, p.294).

2) "In 1101 (1652)... this is written in state of Dezegam in village of Melikzate, under the shelter of Holy Mother and Saint Fo ma and other Saint Martyr...", "it was in 1244 (1795), when Cha-vag/eunuch Aga-Mamag/ Persian shah came to Tiflis on Tuesday of fast of Holy Cross, captured, busted and spread everything, massacred more than 12000 people, men and women, everybody was taken into the prison and many holy hallows and church utensils were looted and they went back the same year. In 1245 (1796) during the great Fast the tsar Irakli of Georgia attacked Gandja together with Shamshadin troops and Ibrahim khan of Shusha along with lezgins, local ruler was Javad khan, who hardly slipped from Kala, they lead many wars, but were unable to defeat him, giving an order, he came to mountain village Sultan with his Shamshadin troops and false sword, imprisoned and killed by saber and we, which are stayed alive, we run to various directions and did not find a shelter for our feet. Then Georgian troops together

with Lezgins came and took into the prison the rest of us and burned to ashes village Banants. In 1246 (1797) starvation and death surrounded us: it was very difficult to find 18 pounds of flour for 9 abas and that is why, husband rejected his wife, wife rejected his husband, father rejected his son and son rejected his father, mother separated from daughter and daughter was separated from the mother, and we did not find rest for our feet, because we ate acorns and bark of acorn tree, and we taking this holy gospel with a great care and many torments, preserved it up to now by a Mercy of Holy Spirit. This was in 1260 (1811) when we were struck by plague, which at first touched Russians, leaving many of them dead, then emerged among Turks and then in Kilisa-kend (district in Gandja) and Norashen (district in Gandja), then mercilessly destroyed villages and village Banants, many husbands were left without wives, wives without husbands, many without sons, many without daughters, most were buried without a priest and many houses were destructed. All this happened due to our sins. During this time vardapet David, taking with him those alive, went to Kichik-Banans, i.e. Dampladzor, some went to cowhouse, some to gardens and epidemics calmed a bit. We thought that we get rid of epidemics, but God's wrath reached us and some animal made destructions and damage and some people died by a severe death... during this time we restarted our holy gospel for the memory of our parents, our grandfather Melik-Mattevos... it is written in this book in 1263 (1814) in village Banants under the shelter of Holy Mother church". "In 1252 (1803) the Russian came to Gandja, sat for a month and then for one hour captured and during an hour and a half killed 300 people" (Barkhudaryants, II, p.296-298). Thus, colophon of this last gospel includes detailed description of historic events of the end of XVIII- start of XIX cc. : march of Persian shah Aga-Mohammed Gadjar to Azerbaijan, Garabagh, struggle of Georgian tsar Irakliy II, Shuhsa khan Ibrahim-khan, Lezgins with Javad-khan of Gandja, capturing of Gandja by Russian forces, distress related to these wars and epidemics.

The writer's words are very remarkable: "at this time we resumed this holy gospel for our memory and memory of our parents". Considered colophons are the source, which characterizes the epoch, source about Alban toponyms informing us about settlements of Alban Christians and their living conditions; about political and economic situation in these settlements and Alban eparchies. Thus, gospels have value not only as religious attribute, but also as historic chronicles, compiled by Alban priesthood and conveyed to next generations by Alban Apostolic Autocephalous Church, which continued its existence and unified Christian Alban population up to 1828 inclusively. It can be stated, that being absolutely aware about features of Alban gospels of Artsakh, value of their colophons, Armenian Echmiadzin Church started to meticulously liquidate these gospels. M.Barkhudaryants, while his detailed researches and descriptions, does not indicated any gospel dated after 1828, when Alban Apostolic Autocephalous Church was abolished and subordinated to Armenian Church.

Liquidation of Alban monastery-church institutions by Armenian Echiadzin Church allowed to liquidate Alban ecclesiastical literature, Alban gospels, in pursue to eradicate even a thought about existence of such heritage.

Zahid Orudj

RESOLUTELY APPROACH TO NATIONAL INTERESTS

Peace and safety in South Caucasus region, resolution of Armenia-Azerbaijan dispute over Daglyg Garabagh , which seriously threatens global energy-communication projects, according to international law and interests of our nation are priority issues for official Baku.

Based on principles defined by nation's leader Heydar Aliyev, the head of state Ilham Aliyev applies new political mechanisms and succeeded in leading the process according to national interests of Azerbaijan. At the last meeting devoted to problems of our compatriots forced to flee from their homeland due to aggression of Armenia, President Ilham Aliyev made clear some aspects of negotiation process, and stopped groundless speculations of some tendentious forces. Profound speech of head of state once again proved that negotiations process is conducted within the framework of national interests of Azerbaijan.

Official Baku correctly evaluating real situation prefers the policy of strengthening of aspects influencing resolution of the conflict. Strengthening of efforts directed for conflict resolution at international level and keeping negotiations within the framework of Minsk group of OSCE draw attention as political-psychological advantage of official Baku. Mr. Ilham Aliyev resolutely stressing that settlement of the conflict is possible only according to principles of territorial integrity and sovereignty and emphasizing that peace negotiations can be continued only under these conditions, he showed his clear and firm position. "Our demand is that all occupied territories have to be liberated without any conditions. It is correct that previously proposals consisted in liberation of 5 regions with keeping Kelbadjar and Lachin regions in order to make them the theme of further negotiations. We have never agreed with this. Because we never may allow that return of Kelbadjar and Lachin to Azerbaijan may be subject of any conditions. That is why, at the present stage of negotiations there is a general agreement that 7 regions have to be liberated from aggressor and given back to Azerbaijan. Certainly, we do understand that we can do it stage-by-stage, but this stage must not be prolonged." - said President Ilham Aliyev and stated that if negotiations with Armenia will not give any results, other necessary means, namely use of armed operations will be discussed in order to restore territorial integrity of Azerbaijan. By this confident statement president Ilham Aliyev sent a harsh message to those who expect compromises from Azerbaijan, and once again underlined that the nation will never accept loss of territories.

As President Ilham Aliyev repeatedly stated the country-aggressor must be aware that Azerbaijan possesses of strong, mobile and professional army, and this aspect of psychological influence have to provide positive course of negotiations. Azerbaijan has to continue to defend its fair position at various international institutions, strive for unmasking of aggressor policy of Armenia at global scale, and undertake diplomatic efforts to gain psychological superiority in sphere of ideological propaganda. The essence of policy implemented by President Ilham Aliyev consists in proving groundless the position of Armenia from viewpoint of international law, isolate aggressor country from processes of dynamic development of South Caucasus and global energy-communication projects, and influence over position of other party by enhancing economic-military strength of Azerbaijan.

Head of state Ilham Aliyev did not excluded use of armed operations for resolution of the conflict: "We are absolutely ready in military sense to liberate our own territories. We will continue our preparation, will strengthen our military power and will make our army ten times stronger than army of Armenia. This is the challenge and we will reach this. History of our activity shows that if we set any goal we reach it. When once I said that our military expenses will be one million dollars, some did not believe this. However, this is a reality now and this

is not the limit. We enhance our professionalism, preparedness, widen our financial-technical bases and prepare."

Process of negotiations entered into a new stage on the background of economic strengthening of Azerbaijan and significant increase of military budget of the Republic. Despite traditional and populist statements of Armenian officials intended for public opinion, for the last 5 years visible diplomatic steps back are traced in position of country-aggressor. Due to serious diplomatic efforts through 2004-2008 official Yerevan was forced to accept negotiations for stage-by-stage resolution of the conflict. Continuation of participation of aggressor country in "Prague process", i.e. "stage-by-stage resolution" model is evaluated as one of important diplomatic achievements of official Baku. Azerbaijan has always insisted on stage-by -stage resolution of the conflict and this is supported by Minsk group of OSCE and negotiated parties -Armenia and Azerbaijan are participants of this process. Holding negotiations within the framework of principles of territorial integrity is fairly considered by President Ilham Aliyev as a success of Azerbaijan.

Azerbaijan's President stating once again his firm position in regard to resolution of conflict emphasized that the claims of Daglyg Garabagh Armenians for "self-determination" is absolutely ridiculous and inadequate to realities. After collapse of USSR the separatism has turned into the leading factor of policy in post-soviet area and in some cases even took a form of false "national liberation movement". In reality in roots of this conflict it is not the desire of nation to define

its own destiny, but intention to occupy territories. No doubt, self-determination - the principle of choosing of own destiny is the exceptional right which any nation has according to international law and government of Azerbaijan respects this right. However, according to international law, the nations which do not have an independent country may express claims for determination of their own destiny. Armenians have the independent country and from this viewpoint, separatist Armenian regime in Naglyg Garabagh has no legal and political bases to make such claims:

"Azerbaijan will never agree with creation of the second Armenian state. It is possible to give high self-regulation status to those people who live in Naglyg Garabagh, including Armenians and Azerbaijani who will return there. This was repeatedly stated by Azerbaijan government at all stages of negotiation process - in 1990-ies and at present. If there will be such version of agreement, certainly we are ready for this, we will agree with this and territorial integrity of Azerbaijan will be restored and finally, the peace will be established in the region and relations between two countries may normalize in the future."

Taking into account higher importance of economic interests at present it is not difficult to understand which party possesses by more influence power while resolution of the conflict. In addition, for the last years in Azerbaijan, which faced with Armenia's aggression, efforts for development of thoroughly equipped army are became more intensive. Successfully implemented reforms leads to strengthening of Republic's economy and allowed President Ilham Aliyev to take continuous measures and increase military expenses. Head of state always paid a special attention to such important problems as strengthening of military potential of the country and use of leading countries experience for this. The largest part of Azerbaijan's state budget in 2008 is intended for Azerbaijan's army and as President Ilham Aliyev promised the Republic's military budget only, equals to a whole budget of Armenia. All these are factors important for providing continuation of negotiation process according to interests of Azerbaijan.

Provision of national interests and benefit of the country at a high level by President Ilham Aliyev, as well as speedy development of Azerbaijan create confidence that positive results will be achieved in resolution of Armenian - Azerbaijan dispute over Naglyg Garabagh and the conflict will be settled on the bases of international law and principle of territorial integrity of Azerbaijan.

C O N T E N T S

Adalat Mustafayev, candidate of historical sciences

Armenian separatism and its supporters

Akif Naghi, candidate of historical sciences

Factor of force for resolution of the conflicts

Ali Abasov, doctorate in philosophy

Stages of Daglyg Garabagh conflict: Through local to international levels. Is the way back possible?

Araz Aslanly

Occupied Azerbaijan and the right for necessary defense

Arif Yunusov, candidate of historical sciences

Statistics of losses in Armenian-Azerbaijan war

Aydin Aslanov, candidate of historical sciences

To 200th anniversary of Kurekchay treaty once more about Garabagh melikhs

Elchin Ahmedov, candidate of political sciences

Historic, political and military-strategic value of Shusha

Eldar Saraby

Garabagh conflict and its roots (according to Iranian sources)

Faig Ismayilov

Armenian vandalism against monuments of Azerbaijan

Fazil Gazanfarogly, candidate of philosophy, member of parliament

Daglyg Garabagh: lost future

Feliks Tsertsvadze, political observer

Problem of "genocide of Armenians": history and falsifications

Firdovsiyya Ahmedova, candidate of historical sciences

The problem of status of Daglyg Garabagh: history and modernity

Gasym Hajiyev, doctorate in historical sciences

Material culture of Garabagh is inseparable part of material and spiritual

culture of Azerbaijan

Gorkhmaz Mustafayev, candidate of historical sciences

Administrative units and population of Garabagh and Gandja khanates at the beginning of XIX century

Guldane Najafli, candidate of historical sciences

Factors which triggered attempts of Armenians to establish state in Garabagh in the 1 half of XVIII century

Guntekin Najafli, candidate of historical sciences

Intentions of Russia to create Armenian state on the territory of Garabagh khanate

Gyulzade Akhundova: **Crafts in Garabagh**

Hadjar Gasymova, candidate of philosophy

Garabagh conflict as international problem

Ismayil Musa, doctorate in historical sciences

Diplomatic confrontation between Azerbaijan and Armenia (April-June 1920)

Jamil Hasanly, doctorate in historical sciences

200 years of Garabagh tragedy

Kerim Shukurov, doctorate in historical sciences

Kurekchay agreement: basic clauses, implementation and termination of the agreement

Kubra Aliyeva: **Shusha and Shusha carpets**

Meshidikhanym Neymet, doctorate in historical sciences

Epigraphic monuments of Garabagh

Mubariz Khalilov, candidate of historical sciences

About kurgans of Garabagh

Musa Mardjanly, political observer, editor-in-chief of journal "Irs-Naslediye "

Armenian expansionism - the source of danger to stability in the region

Nigar Geozalova, candidate of historical sciences

Studies of Garabagh and Irevan khanates history reflected in historiography written in English

Niyazi Mehdi, doctorate in philosophy

Resolution of Conflicts in the Caucasus according to the Principle of "Semiotic Anomalies"

Nurani, political observer

History of Armenian terrorism

Rauf Huseynzadeh, doctorate in historical sciences

Characteristics of Armenians by their compatriots and contemporaries

Rena Bakhshova

Development of education in Garabagh at the end of XIX century

Rena Mirzazadeh, doctorate in philosophy

Gender history of Garabagh: social-political image,

Rizvan Garabagly, candidate of architecture

Monuments of Western Azerbaijan

Sh. FatuUayev-Figarov, doctorate in architecture, academician of Azerbaijan Academy of Sciences; E.Avalov, doctorate in architecture, R.Garabagly, candidate of architecture: **Architecture of Garabagh**

Tevekkul Aliyev, candidate of historical sciences

Garabagh as a center of ancient civilization of Azerbaijan

Tofiq Najafly, candidate of historical sciences

Garabagh in XV century

Ulviyya Hajiyeva, candidate of historical sciences

Commemorative notes in Alban Gospels as source of history of Albans in XI-XVIII

Zahid Orudj, candidate of historical sciences, member of parliament

Resolutely approach to national interests. Due to firm position of official Baku aggressor Armenia set against "geopolitical side-street"

**Organization of Liberation of Garabagh
Proceedings of conferences held under the topic
"Garabagh yesterday, today and tomorrow"**

II volume

**Publisher: Namig Habibov
Technical editor: Rovshan
Design by: Irada Akhmedova, Ceyhun Aliyev**

**Signed for design: 12.01.2009
Signed for print: 25.01.2009
Number of copies: 400 Order JV®190
Conventional printed paper 15**

Publishing House of businessman Namig Habibov

Free distribution