

ORGANIZATION OF LIBERATION OF GARABAGH

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

**PROCEEDINGS
OF SCIENTIFIC-PRACTICAL
CONFERENCES**

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*

Translators: **Heyran Muradova**
Gulnar Mammedli

OLG (Organization of Liberation of Garabagh). *Proceedings of the conferences held under the topic "Garabagh yesterday, today and tomorrow". First volume. Baku, 2009, 208 pages.*

The book contains proceedings of the conferences held in 2002, 2003 and 2004 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 2002, 2003 and 2004 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.

SYSTEMATIZED APPROACH TO REGULATION OF GARABAGH CONFLICT

Systematized way of thinking is the one of the most important requirements of modern world. In process of speedy globalization the Earth itself transforms into the globally managed system. In such situation any process occurred around the world may be successfully studied and problems may be more quickly resolved by principles of systematized approach.

Modern science confirms that any process, problem or event may be analyzed as a certain system. Any thing existed in the world is the display of interrelations of certain factors. Naturally, Garabagh problem (shortly -GP) is not the exception.

In the context of proposed theme the system means *mechanism of activity of mutual relations for implementation of a certain function of several factors*. The theory of system existed today, systematized analysis, methods of systematized approach make possible in-depth analysis of such mechanism and display paths for more successful resolution of problems characterized the system.

Garabagh problem is also the system. This is a system which reflects a certain conflict. To resolve this conflict - delete that system it is required to clearly image and analyze several parameters characteristic for this system:

First of all causes of this system must be clearly displayed;

It is necessary to define the function of the system of GP and its structure;

Precisely define subsystems creating the environment for this system and playing the role of auxiliary systems;

Factors, which considered as energy sources for operation of system of GP have also to be defined;

Nature of this energy and degree of GP system integrity, strength and power must be made clear;

Interrelation principle of structures of the system and their composition, i.e. all factors important for this system must be defined;

Principles of structuring also have to be determined; Ways for resolution of this problem, i.e. ways to stop GP system functioning must be found, etc.

In general, it is required to acquire all information necessary for systematic analysis.

At the same time, the information must be acquired about version of GP system for Azerbaijan, Version for Armenia GPAr, version for international organizations GP-In and versions existed for some other foreign forces. Those interested in resolution of Garabagh problem may gain appropriate result by comparison of these systems.

Resolution of the problem must start from concretization of set goal. In case of uncertain goal there could be no clear tasks, no definite target and directions of management. Regretfully, those who are involved with resolution of Garabagh problem can not explain up to now what they mean when they promise *speedy resolution of the problem*. Everyone states that the problem should be resolved. But how? Then talking about resolution, Azerbaijan nation keeps in mind one thing, politicians the other thing, international organizations another, Armenians yet another thing and the third parties interested in the conflict mean quite different thing. Each foreign country stating its interest in resolution of Garabagh problem, first of all means interests of its own country. Our politicians when talking about resolution of Garabagh problem first of all underline the principle of "territorial integrity". Let us consider whether Garabagh problem will end only by gaining "territorial integrity"? Today, even if we will succeed in preserving territorial integrity of our country, we will face a number of problems related to Garabagh problem. If today we will gain integrity of our territories, have we any clear idea what we should do tomorrow? What are we doing to prepare a basis for future works? Who can develop an efficient program without scientific analysis? In medicine there is such an approach when the disease is forced to move from one part of the body into the other instead of curing the disease. To solve Garabagh problem we have to create such basis, which will make it possible to prevent any further deterioration of situation. To define which! measures are necessary for this the only correct way is systematic approach techniques.

First of all, let us consider issues related to emerging of Garabagh problem. Events of the last sixteen years allow thoroughly analyze causes of Garabagh problem. Anyone who is interested in politics knows that these causes do not consist only of those stated by Armenian leaders of Daglyg Garabagh, Armenian politicians and representatives of international organizations. Obviously, among the causes there are such factors as: "Some nations around the globe, especially some European countries tend to fear of Turcism", "Attitude of the West and some other countries to Islamic world", "Interest of some international organizations in this conflict", "International community opinion", "Interest of any neighbor country in this conflict", "Interest of Armenia", "Interest of Armenians of Daglyg Garabagh", "Steps forward from Azerbaijan", etc. These factors may be more accurately defined by experts. All these factors being related to each other and formed as a certain system have led to GP and currently play the role of its energy source. Now, let us consider which measures are undertaken to weaken or remove all mentioned and unmentioned secret or known factors - to liquidate the system of GP? While analyzing any of these factors it isj necessary to use only systematic analysis. In other case, all parties of the conflict one-sidedly explain these factors: for example, Armenians attempt to display "Turcism" as something more frightful than fascism and we, on the contrary, tend to show this

as example of fair and high culture. Systematic analysis enables us to define in which form we can apply our potential under present circumstances. In such case we can evaluate to which extent the slogans as "The twentieth century is the age of Turks", "Turks have no other friend than Turks" are correct. At first, systematic analysis principle necessitate separate analysis of these factors as separate systems. If we will conduct analysis in this direction, when it will become clear which tasks must be done at first.

In fact, we without detailed analysis attempt to solve the problem by medieval approach of "heroism". To resolve Garabagh problem our actions consists of the following:

1) do not allow Armenia to participate in South Caucasian economic projects with participation of Azerbaijan; 2) no mutual relations between Turkey and Armenia; 3) announcing Armenians as murderers and occupants, and not sitting together at negotiations table; 4) turn into sensation the arrival of Armenians into Azerbaijan, etc. Systematic analysis shows that these factors may assist to acquire incomplete success, but ultimately, will not make it possible to resolve the problem. For example, one of the discussed issues today is the dialog between us and Armenians. It is obvious that politicians and most of population do not support the dialog. However, it is not possible to definitely say whether this will assist to regulation of the problem. This also should be the subject of systematic analysis. For example, I would like to express as a hypothesis that if we choose 20-30 influential representatives of high intelligence, patriotism, with thorough knowledge of events and allow them to lead the dialog we may fulfill more serious steps towards the resolution of GP. But we just sit and wait for some international organizations to prepare a package of acceptable measures for us.

If today, we are in the process of integration into the world organizations, such problems may be resolved only by assistance of leading powers of the world and our actions for resolution of these problems must conform to requirements of the system created by foreign countries. "Heroism" and pressure are incomplete means which are far from principle of systematic approach.

As it was mentioned above, systematic approach method | distinctly requires to clearly define *what is the aim* when we talk about resolution of Garabagh problem. With higher number of forces which are involved in resolution of the conflict and a broader gap between aims of these forces the resolution of the problem will be more complicated.

As Azerbaijan we have to define our long, middle-term and immediate goals for resolution of the problem.

Obviously, while regulation of Garabagh problem the long-term goal consists in restoration of justice, defense of integrity of our territories and providing of harmonious integration of Garabagh, which is one of the most beautiful regions of Azerbaijan and cradle of musicians, into the Republic. Our

middle-term goal must be directed first of all to approximation of goals of various forces, which influence the problem and bringing of those goals into conformance. **We have to attempt to convince those, whose goals distinguish from our goals and those who may make corrections to their goals.** In systematic approach this is called "conformance of goals". This must be done not only through propaganda and activity of Diaspora. There must be serious concrete activity and we have to develop a special program of our activity. No doubt, it can be said that there is activity of the state and the Presiden}. However, if we analyze by systematic approach that activity we can see that it is insufficient. The activity also must be systematic. In our activity system related to Garabagh problem some components must operate in mutual relation as efficient and strong system. These components are the following (numbering did not reflect the importance):

1) President of the Republic; 2) Parliament; 3) force structures; 4) political parties; 5) research centers; 6) various government organizations; 7) non-governmental and public organizations; 8) wealthy people; 9) people which have influence among population; 10) scientists; 11) people of art; 12) various classes of population; 13) mass media; 14) Diaspora 15) Turkey; 16) Moslem countries, etc.

However, it is up to experts to define a number and content of this list.

One of crucial tasks for resolution of Garabagh problem consists in bringing these components into a single active system.

ABOUT NECESSITY OF USE OF MILITARY FORCE

A number of factors show that the only possible way to eliminate Armenia's aggression and its results and restore Azerbaijan's territorial integrity and sovereignty is war and use of military force.

1. Activity of international organizations, especially that of OSCE and its Minsk group, attempted to remove results of aggression by peaceful means showed the impossibility of this way. UN is satisfied only by passing 4 resolutions (N 822, 853, 874, 884) and suspending itself from the regulation processes, transferred the responsibility to OSCE. Thus, conditions for long-term, exhausting and ineffective negotiations were created. UN does not undertake required initiative to interfere into the regulation process.

2. Activity of OSCE beyond its Minsk group activity is directed to covering by silence the fact of Armenia's aggression, clearing off its baseless claims, hiding the essence of the problem and forcing Azerbaijan to concessions in all fundamental questions. At the OSCE summit in Budapest (1994) there were attempts to show the aggressor regime in Daglyg Garabagh as a party of conflict

only, at the Lisbon summit (1996) - to transfer nation's right to choose its own destiny to separatist forces of Daglyg Garabagh, at the Istanbul summit (1999) and other international meetings held with participation or under supervision of OSCE there were attempts to display indifference to territorial integrity and sovereignty of Azerbaijan.

3. In general, handing over responsibility for removing of aggression to OSCE is not a correct step. Because the priority tasks of OSCE's activity cover human rights, rights of ethnic minorities and freedom of press. That is why, OSCE and its Minsk group instead of eliminating Armenia's aggression to Azerbaijan, gave preference to defending rights of Armenians minority in Daglyg Garabagh, more precisely to defending rights of a group of separatists which were turned into aggression instrument of Armenia.

4. Three ways of solving the problem, which were prepared by Minsk group through 1997-1998 and declared only in 2001, as well as proposals made at negotiations held in Paris and Qwest, contradict to interests and sovereignty of Azerbaijan nation and therefore, can not be taken as basis for regulation process. Evidently, negotiations held on basis of these proposals, as well as continuation of these negotiations lose their sense and must be considered as unacceptable. Such conceptions as showing aggressor regime of Daglyg Garabagh as a conflict party, setting aggressive Armenia free of responsibility, offering "non-enclave" principle, ideas on territory exchange, intention to give to separatists of very high status and other similar ideas are unacceptable.

5. Sometimes the opinion is expressed that "OSCE, Minsk group and its co-chairs have done everything possible". Obviously, those who express such viewpoint would like to draw attention to possibility of measures which are in the interest of aggressive Armenia. However, it is obvious that without acknowledgement of the fact of Armenia being the aggressor, there will be no positive results of Minsk group and its co-chairs activity for resolving the conflict. Most frequently, in private discussions representatives of international organizations agree with the fact of aggression, however they think that it is not essential to emphasize the fact. In fact, for successive results of negotiations there is an urgent need to declare Armenia as aggressor. International organizations do not want to undertake this step. Anyway, the fact of aggression should be acknowledged and negotiations have to continue in this direction.

6. Armenia's leaders - R.Kocharyan, V.Oskanyan, S.Sarkisyan and others officially stated that it is impossible that Daglyg Garabagh will stay as part of Azerbaijan. Armenia's actions do not restricted by official statements only, but include also concrete measures for annexation of Daglyg Garabagh. These include election or appointment of Azerbaijan's citizens which reside in Daglyg Garabagh

for government positions (including the President), Armenia's deployment of its troops on territory of Nagorno Karabakh of Azerbaijan and sending its citizens for military service to Nagorno Karabakh, adoption by Armenia's Parliament of a resolution on December 1, 1991 on NKAR (Nagorno Karabakh Autonomous Region) annexation to Armenia and the resolution, which was not abolished until now, inclusion of Nagorno Karabakh into financial turnaround domain and annual economic development plans of Armenia and other actions.

7. Public opinion, public and political parties resistance formed under impact of objective and subjective reasons in Armenia, threats and pressure from some international forces, which are interested in freezing the conflict, attempts to resolve the conflict by peace negotiations seriously impede Armenia's refusal from territorial claims and withdrawal from Azerbaijan's territory and regaining of sovereignty by Azerbaijan.

8. It can be seen from stated above that due to approach of international organizations and world's greatest states from Armenians positions makes impossible elimination of Armenia's aggression and its results through negotiations. Thus, Azerbaijan is deprived of choice and forced to attempt to resolve the conflict by war. In other words, territories annexed by use of armaments can be liberated only through use of military forces.

9. From viewpoint of financial and human resources, which play crucial role while military actions, the superiority belongs to Azerbaijan. Armenia's hope is only for foreign donors. In fact, Azerbaijan can lead war with a success only relying upon its internal resources.

10. Azerbaijan army keeps superiority also by its fighting characteristics. Historically, Azerbaijani people were distinguished by their fighting ability, which can not be said about Armenians. Occupation of Azerbaijan's territories during the First Karabakh War was related to a large extent to participation and leading role of foreign forces and political instability within Azerbaijan itself than to success of Armenia's armed forces. Azerbaijan army superiority over Armenia and its allies was clearly seen during the battles of spring-summer of 1991 and summer-autumn of 1992.

11. Azerbaijani soldiers' courage, strong patriotic movement and ability to give the life for the country were clearly displayed during the First Karabakh War. There were hundreds of battle heroes.

12. Azerbaijan also possesses of moral and psychological advantage. Azerbaijan will fight on its own territory to liberate its own regions. This is just war for Azerbaijan and for Armenia it is the war of aggressor. That is why, the sympathy of international community will be for Azerbaijan.

13. Azerbaijan has always complied with international legislation and sought from international organizations to punish Armenia as aggressor. International Law does not restrict Azerbaijan from liberating its territory by war.

14. Azerbaijan has higher chances to make allies. Desire of a number of countries to support Azerbaijan is evident. In addition, countries, which have economic interests in Azerbaijan are expected to keep at least the neutral position. On the contrary, in each country, which Armenia can consider as its strategic ally, there are serious internal forces which will oppose those countries open participation in war against Azerbaijan.

Destiny of independent Azerbaijan's statehood is defined in Garabagh. No perspectives of negotiations, on the one hand, and internal and external resources of Azerbaijan, on the other hand, necessitate use of military forces for resolution of the conflict and Azerbaijan's victory. Azerbaijani nation's generation which live today will fulfill its human and civic duty in the face of its past and future.

Ali Abasov

GARABAGH CONFLICT - AS A NATIONAL PROBLEM

1. Considering Garabagh problem with a close attention it becomes clear that on the one hand everyone is involved in resolving of the problem and, on the OUVT, no one is really involved. It is not correct to attempt to resolve personal problems while resolving this conflict. This is a national problem and it can find its solution only through will of the nation and thoroughly developed activity program of its elite.

2. A national program has not be just of political nature, it must include historical, psychological, cultural and other research aspects. That is why, in development of such program not only politicians, but all elite of Azerbaijan have to take part. Unfortunately, for 15 years of Garabagh conflict, there is no such national program, nor such active participation.

3. All Azerbaijani people should have in their minds that Garabagh is one of the major centers where from cultural point of view the nation's language, literature and culture have been formed and from political viewpoint the statehood and national consolidation were developed. In general, everyone should understand that the integrity of Azerbaijan nation, including existence of Azerbaijani as a nation, is impossible without Garabagh. Undoubtedly, we talk about nation which has gained its independence and sovereignty. However, we can not pretend that we forge ahead as a nation towards the national goal through these years of independence.

4. Let us consider aspects which impeded in the past and prevent it now to develop a national program for Garabagh. Independence is a type of political

maturity and substantiality, which is in addition to external factors, is characterized by some internal attributes and specific state organization. In addition to independence and historic and cultural characteristics, it is required to gain a certain level of political consolidation of the nation. Despite the existence of a number of ethnic groups and ethnic minorities with varying cultural confessions (religious) in Azerbaijan, the ground must be prepared for formation of a single political unity - Azerbaijan nation. To prepare such ground it is crucial to create conditions favorable for development of institutions which are characteristic for democratic, civil and legal state and protect social and cultural rights of its citizens irrespective of their nationality and religion. Three political elite, which ruled Azerbaijan, regarding these problems as insignificant or dangerous, paid a little or no attention to them. If political elite can be justified somehow, the fault of cultural elite - Azerbaijan's science and art intelligentsia - is unforgivable. Another question is who represented in this elite? Those who grew up during former Soviet state or newly generated national cultural elite, which just started to search its way? In any case, without joint activity of cultural and political elites it is impossible to develop a national program and form national and political unity of the nation. Evidently, this is the task for the next authority of Azerbaijan. But what we have to do- wait? Of course, not. On the contrary, changing ways of reaching the target, we have to be active. It is pivotal to turn Garabagh problem into the factor, which will unite and consolidate Azerbaijan nation.

5. As one of such actions we can indicate "Charter of Four", which through short period of time has gained respect of most political parties and social organizations of Azerbaijan. However, pure political nature of this document caused its short lifetime. Political and largely the cultural elite did not regard the document as the one, which gives platform for future development and national consolidation. However, the situation can be changed by a good will.

Kinsfolk and nepotism are the major obstacles in formation of Azerbaijani nation and it must be confessed that these infected a majority of population. These are displays of patriarchal methods in politics. At the same time, they nicely conform to democratic facade of our statehood. We can even find, that these methods are deliberately applied to delay formation of Azerbaijani nation.

On the other hand, we may indicate that in Azerbaijan the society and its separate unity - a family do not have any mutual connections. Benefits and wealth of a kin are always more important than benefits and wealth of society. Such illegality as "People for state - no state for people" should be liquidated. As the first step for this we propose development of a new program for Garabagh, a program which will provide spiritual revival of the nation. A program of social optimism is needed, which will form decency of free citizen with no pessimism, who do not use unbearable living conditions of refugees, do not complaints of territories occupation and "double standards policy" and who believes in just of his

rights. However, in this case, it must be kept in mind that Azerbaijan consists not only of Baku, but of tens of regions, which demand the same level of attention.

7. Concrete measures: Azerbaijan should refuse from negotiations with its own citizen and war criminal R. Kocharyan and demand to draw him to international war crimes tribunal. Consider Armenia's official decisions on Garabagh not only as "interference in internal affairs of Azerbaijan" , but according to international law as announcement of war; International organizations, mediators involved in Garabagh process and international community have to be informed about a unite approach, which is accepted by a whole community of Azerbaijan.

8. That is why, the program must be grounded on modern political values and democratic principles. It really must be accepted that without freedom of all people of South Caucasus, including freedom of our neighbors, there couldn't be freedom of Azerbaijan's citizens. We have to set our goal in such a way that the unification of Azerbaijani people to be accompanied by unification of South Caucasus people and political and economic unification of Europe since our region will be the part of Europe. These values and principles are well-known, however they are rarely used and this is related mainly to our heritage and difficulties existed today. In the future, policy of "double standards" in respect of our country will depend only on our internal policy.

Ali Mamedov

MASS DISPLACEMENT OF ARMENIANS FROM OTTOMAN EMPIRE AND IRAN INTO NORTH AZERBAIJAN

Migration of ancestors of Armenians continued through the centuries as a stage-by-stage process from West to East: from Balkans, i.e. from Europe to Asia, Caucasus, including Azerbaijan. At the beginning of the XX century N.Adens, coryphaeus researcher on Armenia wrote: "in the VIII century B.C. in Fractiya, in Balkans the Cimmerians are emerged, which according to ancient Egyptian scripts. Here they are entered in contract with ancestors of Armenians, which they take to the east, to Asia Minor" (N. Adens . Armenia - New encyclopedic dictionary. SPb, 1912, vol.3).

I.Shopen, Russian researcher of Caucasus in XIX century also noted that "Armenians are strangers here. They are a branch of frigiands and polytsev, which came to northern valleys from Anatolian mountains" (I.Shopen, New notes on ancient history of Caucasus and its dwellers. SPb, 1896, p.26).

Migration of this ethnos from one region to other does not evidence uniting of that ethnos in a same union. On the contrary, as N.Dubrovin wrote: "Being under the rule of various countries and spread almost across the whole world, Armenian tribe, being the subject of diverse climatic conditions, lifestyle and activities, has lost its common type." (Dubrovin N. History of war and dominion of Russians in Caucasus. Vol.1, book 2, SPb, 1871, p.406).

I think this phrase does not require any comment. Divided in 387 by Sassanid and Byzantine Empires, Armenians, who lost their statehood, were prone to migration to the South Caucasus. By support of Arab caliphate Armenian Grigorian Church suppressed Agvan church. (Caucasian Calendar for 1853. Tiflis, 1852, p.483).

Armenian author V.Ishkhanyan at the start of XX century also confirms their arrival to South Caucasus during the last centuries: "True motherland of Armenians... is the Asia Minor, i.e. beyond the borders of Russia and except for several purely Armenian districts (first of all, Irevan province) Armenians came to various parts of Caucasus during the last centuries" (V.Ishkhanyan. Nationalities of Caucasus. SPb, 1916, p. 18).

Population of Artsak region of Albania was the subject of influence of Armenian church. Russian historian I.Petrushevsky wrote that "Garabagh never belonged to cultural centers of Armenians". He also wrote that Armenian Church in Albania "was the mean to Armenisize the country" (I.Petrushevsky. About pre-Christian beliefs of peasants in Nagorno Garabagh. B., 1930, p.8) This role of church is especially visible from the start of the VIII century.

According to experts (prof. S.Onullahi, prof. V.Piriyev and others) the word Garabagh is met for the first time in the work "Cami-ettaiix" by the author Rashiddaddin (1247-1318). Population of Garabagh, most of which consisted of Azerbaijani, was used without any decree the word Garabagh to name this region. In other words, emerging of toponyms as Artsakh, Uti and Garabagh belong to Azerbaijani and it is impossible to "appropriate" them. It is not accidental that the XVII century traveler Evliya Chelebi named Garabagh as "Small Azerbaijan".

During the rule of Shakh Abbas I the small administrative units - melikliks established in Garabagh, made significant efforts in order to assist Russians to invade Northern Azerbaijan, including Garabagh. Thus, in February of 1729 meliks wrote to the Peter II: We prostrate ourselves... please help us". (P.G.Butkov. Materials for new history of Caucasus from 1722 to 1803, vol.1, SPb, 1869, p.47-48).

Skills of Armenians in fabrication of false stories, no doubt, are related to their genes. For example, in 1790 they "wrote to Yekaterina that in surroundings of Shamakha only, there are 17 thousand armed Armenians. But in fact, in 1811 of 24 thousand families in Shamakha khanate only 1500 were Armenian families.

(F.Kocharli. Garabagh. Baku, 2002, p. 128).

In the XX century 2 million Azerbaijani were exterminated by terror, deportation and genocide.

In general, first arrival of Armenians into the Russia took place in the XIII century, during the rule of Russian tsars Galitsin and Danil. Russian-Armenian relations became even closer during the rule of tsar Aleksey Mikhaylovich (1645-1676) and especially that of Peter I.

Armenian Minas during his visit Peter I in 1714 gave thorough information about nature and economy of Caucasus and proposed to built a church on the coast of Caspian sea and upon necessity to use it as a fortress during war battles. The p.Sisyanov alone invited 16 thousand aysories in 1804 to the North Azerbaijan. (Kh.Verdiyeva, R.Husey-zadeh "Genealogy" of Armenians and their migration from Balkans to Caucasus. Baku, "Elm", 2003, p.31). Let us consider another fact. In September of 1806 Russian Commandment of Caucasus troops was informed that 10 thousand Beyazit Armenians want to migrate to Irevan khanate of Azerbaijan. At the same time, Armenians migrated here assisted Russians to occupy these territories.

Armenian assistance to Russian army to occupy the Northern Azerbaijan was underlined by General N.Sinyagin: "Armenians were distinguished by fearlessness and their loyalty to Russians" (Parsanyan V.A.History of Armenians. Yerevan, 1972. p.30).

Armenians who moved here at the start of XIX century and earlier played a role of assisting factor in dividing of territory of Azerbaijani Turks into two portions. Thus, in 1822 Armenians of Kars and Erzerum provinces of Ottoman empire wrote to General A.Yermolov: "arrival of Russians - our saviors" (Nersesyan M. From history of Russian-Armenian relations, volume 1, Yerevan, 1956,p.232).

During Russian-Iran and Russian-Turk wars through 1804-1813 and 1826-1829 an active part while occupation of Azerbaijan territories took Katalikos of Armenians - Nerses, General Madatov of Armenian origin, heads of army units M.Vereiyan,G.Manucharyan and Colonel Kh.Lazarev, whose grandfather moved from Julfa to Russia in XVIII century. Manucharyan was awarded by the 4th degree Orders of Georgy, Vladimir and Anna. Kh.Lazarev in fact palyed a role of an assististant to A.Griboyedov while implementation of the XV Article of Turkmenchay agreement, which envisaged Armenians migration to Northern Azerbaijan. (Ezov G.A. Relations of Peter I with Armenian nation. Documents. SPb, 1898, XII, XXIII).

It is obvious that Kurekchay Agreement concluded between Sisyanov and Ibrahimkhalil khan on May 14, 1805 were signed with Azerbaijani because ethnic dominance was of Azerbaijani. At that period there was no indication about Armenian community in Garabagh. They were just moved in this region. In 1828 on the territory of Irevan and Nakhchivan khanates a new administrative unit -

Armenian province was established and of 1110 settlements here only 62 were Armenian villages. (B.A.Budagov, G.A.Geybullayev. Glossary of toponyms of Azerbaijani origin in Armenia. Baku, 1998, p.6).

Thus, as a result of last Russian-Iran and Russian-Turk wars mass migration of Armenians took place. From Turkey 84000 and over 40000 Armenians from Iran were migrated to Irevan, Ganja and Garabagh khanates of Northern Azerbaijan and over 200000 desyatin of area were given to them. (History of Azerbaijan, Vol.IV, Baku, 200, p.49). If in 1832 about 91% of population of Garabagh was Azerbaijani and 8.4% Armenians, mass migration policy implemented by tsar Russia in the first half of the XIX century led to drop of a number of Azerbaijani to 64.8% while Armenians reach 34.8%. (History of Azerbaijan, Vol.IV, Baku, 200, p.49).

Russian author N.Shavrova displays in his work published in 1911 that today in South Caucasus, especially in North Azerbaijan, of 1 300 000 Armenians 1 million were not the local population and were moved here as a result of Russian policy (N.Shavrov. New danger to Russian activity in Caucasus: future sale of Mugan to Iordanians. S.Petersburg, 1911, p.63-64).

Thus, Armenians migrated to North Azerbaijan territories along for two centuries, 1531 years after 387, i.e. in 1918 created a country on ethnic-historic territories of Western Azerbaijan. They also succeeded to establish autonomy for Armenians in Garabagh by use of Soviet regime. Starting from 1988 Armenian terrorist and separatist groups occupied 20% of territory of Azerbaijan, exterminated 30 thousand people, wounded 50 thousand, forced to flee 1 million Azerbaijani people from their homelands.

Successors of Peter I silently fulfilling his will aimed to use Armenians in Northern Azerbaijan territories as an ethnic barrier in order to further move to Fore Asia and Middle East.

Gasym Bey Zakir went to Iran and "visiting Mehdigulu khan stayed a night in his house" and "after talks about 500 families from Soragly village at 12 trees distance on the other bank of Araz river were moved to Tug village on this bank of Araz." (Gasym bey Zakir. Selected works. Baku, 1984, p.3-4).

The Shusha city foundation was put by Panahali khan of Garabagh. Shusha in Azerbaijani Turkic means a highest place, pinnacle. It is ridiculous to try to make it Armenian. A.Bakhikhanov is absolutely correct while indicating that here City Novruz existed prior to Shusha and comparing it with Azerbaijani city Tebriz.

Thus, mass migration of Armenians to North Azerbaijan, including Garabagh, in the first half of XIX century aimed at creating conditions favorable for future tragic events against Azerbaijani people.

GARABGH DURING THE AZERBAIJAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Revolution of the October 1917 led to more tension in the country and gave a push to struggle for power in Azerbaijan. The struggle between Eser-Menshevik-Dashnak block and Bolsheviks in Baku resulted by victory of Bolsheviks. Meetings of Baku Soviet on October 31 and November 2, 1917 provided victory of Bolsheviks at the initial stage and announced the power of Soviets in Baku.

Establishment of South Caucasian commissariat in Tiflis on November 15, 1917 had brought to dual power in Azerbaijan. One of the powers was Baku Soviet and the other was South Caucasus commissariat. Baku and its nearby villages ruled by Baku Soviet and the rest territory of the country were ruled by South Caucasian commissariat.

In December of 1917 as a result of elections to Baku Soviet the creation of Bolshevik-Dashnak alliance made political situation in Azerbaijan much worse.

In December of 1917 assignment of S.Shaumyan as a commissar for extraordinary situations in Caucasus and policy implemented in Zangezour district and other portions of Garabagh created situation favorable for atrocities done by Armenians. Armenians supported by Bolshevik Russia attempted to create a state on account of Azerbaijan territories and for this they used any disgusting mean.

They even participated in organizing of protests of peasants in Garabagh. S.Shaumyan repeatedly appealing to a Moslem population of South Caucasus called for occupation of properties of local wealthy people.

In the beginning of 1918 the movement of peasants started in Shusha and Javanshir districts lasted for a long time. Villagers in Yevlakh, Garyagin (Fizuli) and other areas attacked local authority bodies, occupy private territories and killed some landowners.

By creating political confrontation in Garabagh Armenians tried to ease fulfillment of their own purposes.

Armenians relied upon support of Russia through activity of S.Shaumyan and others. Armed robber groups of Dashnak General Andronik entered Garabagh and reached area at 35 km distance from Shusha. Groups of Andronik willfully acting were engaged in plundering in some areas of the region, including Cherabert, Verende, Dizak and attempted to exterminate Turk-Moslem population. After this, Andronik attacked Zangezour. In May-August of 1918 his groups occupied Sisyan area of Zangezour and started "ethnic cleansing" there.

M.Namazaliyev, head of Zangezour district, in his report sent on September 11 of 1918 to Ministry of Internal Affairs of ADR. had noted that

armed forces under rule of Andronik frequently attack Moslem villages and exterminate population irrespective to the gender and age.

To stop atrocities against Azerbaijani population and to save! Azerbaijani the Ottoman Empire - Turkey in the fall of 1918 sent its troops to Shusha in amount of 400 and about 2 thousand soldiers to Khankendi.

According to trap of Mudros agreement concluded on October 30, 1918, Turkish forces left Azerbaijan and English forces, which supported Armenians, entered Baku on November 17. In December of 1918 England sent its units with two armor cars into Shusha. Mission of English militaries were located in Shusha at that period. The aim of the mission was to control local authorities in Garabagh. Later in Shusha there was established the department of "Committee of American assistance to Middle East". The USA desired to keep political and economical control over Garabagh by that Department. Activity of the American Department caused discontent of local population.

In the end of 1918 and beginning of 1919 there was a complicated situation in Garabagh. Here, the activities of National Committees of Moslems and Armenians were intensive.

Armenians National Committee toady to English mission and fulfilled their instructions without any objection. On the other hand, Armenians interfered activity of Azerbaijan government and attempted to destroy situation. In the end of 1918 and beginning of 1919 there were more attacks of gangs of Andronik on villages of Zangezur and killing of civil population. Shusha was full of refugees from destructed Turkic-Moslem villages. There were about 8300 and in Jevanshir district about 2500 refugees.

Authority of ADR taking into account complicated situation in Garabagh decided it necessary to establish the temporal authority of General-Governor in Zangezur, Shusha, Jevanshir and Jebraïl districts. On January 29, 1919 meeting of Azerbaijan government the report on "Assignment of General-Governor to districts of Jevanshir, Shusha, Jebraïl and Zangezur" was delivered and Khosrov bey Sultanov was assigned as a General-Governor. The decision has been made on rendering of 5 mln.manats for activity of General-Governor from a 20 mln.manats fund of Ministry.

On February 12, 1919 Kh. Sultanov arrived in Shusha and started to fulfill his functions. However, authorities of Armenia objected this. On January 31, 1919ina response telegram to note of S.Tigranyan, Foreign Minister of Armenia, the A.Ziyadkhan, acting Foreign Minister of Azerbaijan, had stated that any objection to establishment of General-Governor is baseless, because those territories belong to ADR. A.Ziyadkhan, in his telegram evaluated the objection of Armenian government as attempt to interfere into internal affairs of Azerbaijan.

It must be noted, that in June of 1919 Regional Committee of Bolshevik party was created in Garabagh. For this the important role belongs to Kamran

Agazadeh, sent from Baku Committee of the party. Odjakgulu Musayev, Husi Hajiyev, Neriman Abdullayev, Suren Shadunts and others were the activists of Regional Committee. Regional and District Committees of Garabagh paid a special attention to creation of party cells, which were created in such villages as Gocamamedli, Khatynbulaq, Pirahmedli, Horadiz, Baby, Garyagin, Juvarly, Hadrud, etc. By the autumn of 1919 18 party cells was in Garyagin and 20 in Hadrud. One of the major tasks of Garabagh branch of the party consisted in strengthening of "internationalism".

Attacks of Armenian armed forces continued through the end of March of 1920 and start of the April. These attacks resulted in abandoning of some villages by their dwellers. Thus, period through 1918-1920 is featured by continuous armed attacks of Armenians over Garabagh and Zangezur territories.

Due to complicated situation in Garabagh the ADR government had sent there a contingent of troops, a large portion of which was located in Khankendi. Battalions and squadrons were also located in Shusha, Khodjaly, Agdam, Askeran, Jebrail and other places.

As a result of some measures undertaken by Azerbaijan Democratic Republic it was possible to repulse territorial claims and ethnic cleansing attempts of Armenians.

After occupation of Azerbaijan by Russia's Bolsheviks on April 27 of 1920 Armenians became more active. They made territorial claims for Nakhchivan, Garabagh and Zangezur areas after establishment of Soviet ruling in those regions. Russia's support rendered to Armenia or in other words, requirements of strategic-interests of Soviet Russia led to lost of Zangezur region by Azerbaijan to benefit of Armenians. After resolutely expressed denial to annex Daglyg Garabagh to Armenia they set gaining of autonomy as a primary goal.

Arif Yunusov

DEPORTATION OF AZERBAIJANI FROM ARMENIA THROUGH 1948-1952

Proclaiming Soviet power in Armenia and Azerbaijan did not remove the issue of Garabagh from agenda, the issue just transformed into other plain. This was explained by existence of idea of "great Armenia from sea to sea", actively supported by dashnaks at the turn of XIX-XX centuries, had continued and had many supporters in already communist Armenia. And this was natural, because several generations of Armenians have been brought up by this idea. That is why, one of the leaders of dashnaks Kachaznuni in 1923 outspokenly said to other

members of party: "Dashnatsyutun led Armenian issue and brought political liberation of Armenians to definite point, and from this point to the next they have to be replaced by Armenians-Bolsheviks...Armenians-Bolsheviks are dashnaktsakans, the only dashnakt-sakans today, more dashnaktsakans than me or you".

Experienced politician being excellently aware of psychology of his nation made a correct prediction. In fact, officials of communist Armenia in 30-ies started the campaign for change of Azerbaijani geographic names in the Republic to that of Armenian. Based on resolution of Supreme Soviet of Armenia dated from January 3, 1935 in the Republic the names of 51 Azerbaijani villages were changed. Later, especially in 1946-1952 and through 60-80-ies this campaign gained large-scaled nature and by the start of Garabagh conflict in 1988 over 600 Azerbaijani toponyms were changed to Armenian ones. This was a specially developed policy of authorities of Armenia for liquidation of evidences of Azerbaijani presence in the region.

Then, it was the turn of Azerbaijani population and Kurds-Moslems. The excuse for this was found soon: immediately after end of the World War II in many foreign Armenian colonies the movement started for returning back to homeland. Mainly due to activity of Anastas Mikoyan, Stalin regarded to this with favor and in November of 1945 gave his permission to organize repatriation of Armenians from abroad into Soviet Armenia. Since at the start of 1946 a number of those, who wanted to come back to Armenia reached 130 thousand, the Committee was created for reception and settling of repatriated Armenians.

Taking favor of this, then head of Communist party of Armenia Grigoriy Arutyunov in November of 1945 appealed to Stalin-with letter requiring inclusion of DGAR into Armenia as a Garabagh region. According to order of Stalin the Secretary of Central Committee of Communist Party (b) Malenkov sent an inquiry about this proposal of Arutyunov to Mir Jafar Bagirov, the secretary of communist party of Azerbaijan. Bagirov proposed other solution, that is, the exchange of territories: all territory of DGAR is given to Armenia, except for Shusha region populated mostly by Azerbaijani. Instead three regions of Armenia, adjacent to Azerbaijan and populated mostly by Azerbaijani goes to Azerbaijan.

Such version clearly dissatisfied Armenians and they decided to temporarily remove the issue of DGAR from agenda and, first of all, absolutely resolve "Azerbaijani problems" in Armenia itself. In this case also, Armenian authorities found support of Stalin. By the hand of "nations father" on March 10, 1948 there was signed the resolution N 754 of USSR's Soviet of Ministers "About measures for move of kolkhoz members and other Azerbaijani population from Armenian SSR to Kur-Araz lowland of Azerbaijan SSR". According to this resolution over 100000 people "voluntarily" during three years period had to move from five mountain regions of Armenia - Azizbekov, Ekhegnadzor, Sisian, Vedi

(later renamed into Ararat region), Basarkecher (later- Vardenis) - into waterless Mil-Mugan steppe. According to plan, for the first year move of 10000 Azerbaijani was scheduled, in 1949 - 40000 and in the next year - 50000. According to resolution all this implemented in order to increase population of those regions of Azerbaijan where ...cotton was cultivated. However, true reason was explained in Article 11 of the resolution, which said: "Give permission to Soviet of Ministers of Armenian SSR to use houses left free by Azerbaijani population ... for settlement of Armenians arrived from foreign countries to Armenian SSR".

Thus, for the third time in XX century the withdrawal of Azerbaijani and Kurds from Armenia took place, but this time it was well-organized and under the control of state structures. The process was ceased with death of Stalin. By the start of 1953 a number of forcibly moved Azerbaijani and Kurds reached 150.000 people. Since it was difficult to locate all of them in steppe areas, part of them was moved to new cities, which were under construction at that period - Sumgait and Mingchevir.

Ariz Geozelov

ABOUT SOME ASPECTS OF IDEOLOGICAL CONFLICT OVER DAGLYG GARABAGH BETWEEN ARMENIA AND AZERBAIJAN

Ideological war for Daglyg Garabagh has been started by Armenians a long time ago. For Armenians Daglyg Garabagh problem is considered as a transition problem. Thus, "Armenization" of Daglyg Garabagh is accepted just as a stage in creation of "Great Armenia". At the same time, Armenians already focus their activity on developing of ideological bases for Armenization of other regions of Azerbaijan. From this point of view, analysis of major aspects of continued ideological war over Daglyg Garabagh is crucially important.

Claims of Armenians for Daglyg Garabagh are clearly expressed since the beginning of the XX century. Thus, at the start of the last century Armenia's claims for Daglyg Garabagh resulted in war with Azerbaijan Democratic Republic. During the Soviet empire this conflict tuned to internal political level and was directed to creation of conditions favorable for separation of disputable areas in the future. One of the major aspects of this activity consisted in influence to the consciousness of young Armenians.

It must be noted that attitude of Armenians toward Turks does not distinguish from attitude to other nations and ethnicities. Thus, through the history it was possible to observe Armenians territorial claims toward Georgians. Such approach of Armenians resulted in separatism in Samtskhети-Javakheti region of

Georgia and increased tension in the region. It is interesting that at the beginning of the XX century Armenians violence was also directed against Kurds and Russians. Armenians attempt to keep this secret, however in research works of some foreign scientists these historic facts are distinctly reflected.

It should also be noted that Armenian expansion at the initial stage was conducted in the sphere of culture. But Azerbaijani paid no attention to this. From this point of view, one of successes of Armenians is liquidation of Alban Christian Church and establishment of Armenian Church. As a result, there were conditions for appropriation by Armenians of Christian religious tombstones in Azerbaijan.

In succession of practical measures Armenians, first of all, preferred to withdraw Azerbaijani from Armenia. Withdrawal of Azerbaijani from Armenia was stage-by-stage process. Thus, Azerbaijani withdrawal from their own territories took place through 1848-1953 and 1990-ies. Despite that one may consider this as unnatural, withdrawal of Azerbaijani from Armenia is a subject of some regularity. Thus, territory known as Armenia are in fact territories, which historically belonged to Azerbaijan. After withdrawal of Azerbaijani from those territories, Armenians feel themselves as absolute owners. At the same time, Armenians always try to appropriate cultural values historically belonged to our nation. One of the major reasons of cruelty of Armenians to Azerbaijani is the "competition" over the culture. For example, there are a number of cases of appropriation of Azerbaijani music by Armenians.

Possession by Armenians of strong ideological organizations has a special importance. In this respect, the role of Armenian Church is undeniable. Armenian Church is one of the forces, which triggered development of national consciousness of Armenians. Thus, Armenian Church does not limit its activity by borders of Armenian territory. Armenian Church is a united religious body for Armenians living in various countries. Armenian Church is formed on the national principle and assisted to widening of national principle.

Simultaneously, some Armenian political and social organizations operate since last centuries. One of the major organizations is Dashnaktsutun. Such organizations possess a broad experience of propaganda. Involvement of international organizations of Armenians at initial stages of Armenian-Azerbaijan conflict made its influence on conflict and results of military operations.

Let us consider methods used in propagandistic campaign of Armenians. First of all, Azerbaijani are shown to international community as "Barbarian" tribe. On the contrary, Armenians are shown as ethnicity with ancient history, including history of statehood.

The second widely used method of Armenian propaganda is protuberance of Armenian Christian culture and belonging of Armenians to Christian nations. Turks display the western civilization as an outside factor. Efficiency of this

method used by Armenians is high. Thus, attacks of Turkish troops have not been wiped out of genetic memory of European nations. From this point of view, representative of Western civilization considers Turkish factor as aggressive element.

One of the other methods used in ideological fight is the spreading the thesis about Azerbaijan Republic being a temporary and conventional. Internal propaganda of Armenians widely spread the slogan of being always ready to start the war with Azerbaijan. Armenia, which suffers from deep economic crisis announces about highly trained military units deployment on its territory and in Daglyg Garabagh. Armenia, which does not possess necessary human resources and economic reserves, undertake this tactical method in order to influence psychology of Azerbaijani.

Within the framework of ideological war historical monuments of Azerbaijan are destroyed or appropriated. A special attention deserves the case then some Azerbaijan historic monuments were not destroyed but announced as monuments belonged to Turkmen. By this, Armenians attempted to obtain an ally in ideological war. Unfortunately, Turkmen authorities agreed with this thesis and while their visit to Armenia also visited sites of monuments as places of historical heritage of Turkmen.

I would like to underline that results of Armenian-Azerbaijan armed conflict significantly impacted public psychology of conflict parties. Namely, the psychology of aggressor is formed in Armenians. In Azerbaijani the factor of "defense" is dominating. If any ethnicity is defeated in any conflict the idea of revenge prevails in public opinion. By this the ethnic group provides succession and stability of its activity as a social system. Revenge of ideology is necessary for concentration of internal reserves of ethnic group and repulse foreign aggression. Unfortunately, occupation of 20% of Azerbaijan Republic's territories did not raiser; any revenge ideology among population. In this case, willingness of nation for liberation of its territories is very questionable. Aggressive public opinion developed in Armenia draws attention of Azerbaijan. Ideology, which forms in young generations of Armenia - the idea of expediency to occupy territories of Azerbaijan, creates conditions favorable for armed conflicts in the region in future. In such situation, a certain system of measures must be developed and implemented in order to be ready to resist intentions of an enemy. Instead of calls to start the war a special activity program must be implemented in order to develop moral principles and patriotic attitude. As a result of such approach it is possible to foster generation at any moment ready for war with aggressor. In our point of view, in order to win in ideological war conducted by Armenians the dominance must belong to such tactical method.

**PROBLEM OF EFFICIENCY OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY
USE IN GARABAGH PROCESS**

For the last months the theme of severe discussions in the country's community consists in expediency of use of public diplomacy in Garabagh process, in particular the efficiency of visits of representatives of various Armenian public organizations in Azerbaijan in order to establish peace in the region.

Undoubtedly, officially these visits are organized by various public institutions of Azerbaijan and Armenia. In fact, such visits are the part of international mediators program fulfilled for preparation of public opinion in Azerbaijan and Armenia to compromises within the framework of Garabagh process. For the last years co-chairs of Minsk group of OSCE from the USA, France and Russia, as well as official representatives of these countries of various ranks repeatedly underlined that they consider public opinion as a major obstacle for reaching the peace. They confessed that namely unpreparedness of Azerbaijan and Armenian community to reconciliation was a major cause of refusal of both countries from almost agreed peace contract.

In this situation, it is not surprising that one of the major ways of changing the situation the international mediators consider in making public diplomacy means more active and renewal of economic relations between conflicting countries.

In this respect, it is not accidental that Elizabeth Johns, advisor of State Secretary of USA during her Baku visit in 2001 insistenty requested Heydar Aliyev to implement "explanatory work" within community of Azerbaijan in respect of peaceful solution of Garabagh conflict. The president was firm and responded that he "can not use his authority to gain consent of people for achieving peace, which is unsuccessful for Azerbaijan". However, Siyavush Novruzov, one of the leading officials of Yeni Azerbaijan Party, admitted that Azerbaijan authorities were forced to meet representatives of human rights organizations of Daglyg Garabagh in Baku in September 2001 in order "not to damage international image of Azerbaijan".

However, reality shows that visits of representatives of Armenian non-governmental organizations to Azerbaijan do not lead to approaching of positions of conflicting countries, on the contrary, they trigger intensification of mutual blames and hostility. Failure of such visits, undoubtedly relates to ignorance by true organizers of political realities in the region.

In distinction to western countries, in Azerbaijan and Armenia the process of civil society development is at embryonic stage. Due to this, non-governmental

organizations do not have authority enough in Azerbaijan and Armenian community and, moreover, they are not able to really influence positions of official Baku and Yerevan for settlement of Garabagh conflict, specially taking into account that present state power of Azerbaijan is characterized by neglect of public opinion. In such situation attempts to use methods of public diplomacy in solution of Garabagh conflict are condemned for failure beforehand.

Inefficiency of these methods also caused by the fact that positions of Armenian non-governmental organizations arrived in Baku practically do not distinguish from positions of official Yerevan and their thoughts are literal copies of hostile expressions of Robert Kocharyan. Almost at aircraft stairways they state that they represent "independent Garabagh", as it happened in September 2001. Namely that statement, to a large extent, initiated contrary actions of Organization of Karabakh Liberation (OKL), which estimated arrival of representatives of "independent Garabagh" as outrageous for Azerbaijan state and nation.

Such position of OKL was supported by many influential public organizations of Azerbaijan. Only after public pressure the leaders of opposition parties of Azerbaijan, including "Musavat", AXCP (Popular Front Party of Azerbaijan) and AMMP (National Independence Party of Azerbaijan), who despite preliminary made agreements, refused to meet representatives of Garabagh Armenians. Opposition leaders explained change of their positions by an argument that they have been informed previously about acceptance by arriving Garabagh Armenians of Constitution and territorial integrity of Azerbaijan.

In fact, disseminating pacifist ideas and loudly calling to refuse of military actions for liberating Azerbaijan territory under occupation, the organizers of such visits initiate moral and psychological disarmament of Azerbaijan nation in their struggle for returning of occupied Azerbaijan territories. As a result, this leads to discredit of public democracy methods, which in this case, in fact are used to eternalize Armenian occupation of Azerbaijan's territories.

Azad Tagizadeh

"PUBLIC DIPLOMACY", OR HOW AND WHAT CAN BE DISCUSSED TO AGGRESSOR

There are a lot of discussions in Azerbaijan about expediency of visits of Azerbaijani officials and public figures to Armenia and possibility of direct contacts with Armenia. Before answering this question let us consider the facts.

In 1988 by resolution on annexation of "DGAR" (Daglyg Garabagh Autonomous Republic) to Armenia adopted by Armenia's Supreme Council, Armenia announced war against Azerbaijan. At present, military forces of Republic of Armenia occupies about 20% of Azerbaijan's territory. During military

operations the regular forces of Armenia's Defense Ministry by support of the third parties killed tens of thousands civilians of Azerbaijan, fulfilled genocide in Khodjaly and ethnic cleansing in occupied territories and in Armenia, committed a number of military crimes. Armenian military criminals headed by RKocharyan hold key positions in government of Republic of Armenia. In occupied territories the puppet regime is established with A.Gukasyan as a head.

Now we just have to reword the question and call things by their real names Is it possible to hold official (or unofficial) negotiations with aggressor country? Whether is it possible to sit at the same desk together with military criminals and their supporters? What can be discussed to them (agreed)? The answer is easy. It is known from the history.

Let us just formulate it once again:

1. Negotiations with officials of highest rank of the aggressor country can be held only in exceptional cases and only for the subjects of war and peace. All other contacts at official level are impossible until liberation of occupied territories and final regulation.

2. Unofficial negotiations are possible only in third countries with mediation of international organizations. These meeting must be used, first of all for explanation of position of Azerbaijan.

3. For solution of humanitarian problems such as liberation of; war prisoners, information exchange and other issues, the contacts of public organizations and persons who do not hold official positions are possible, providing that they will be held in third countries by assistance of international organizations with further wide acknowledgement of public about the course and goals of those meetings.

Azad Isazadeh

ROLE OF MILITARY PSYCHOLOGY FACTORS IN RESOLUTION OF GARABAGH CONFLICT

Military psychology as any applied science has its own directions and application spheres. Conditionally they can be divided into three major directions and levels of preparation, which should constitute a unity.

1. General level of preparedness. Mass propagandistic-psychological impact on civil population (specially developed recommendations for TV, newspapers, state organizations, schools, public organizations, etc.)

2. Special level of preparedness. Psychological training of military

forces.

3. Highest level of preparedness. Special psychological programs for training of military servicemen, which undergo highest tension and acted under extreme conditions (groups of special purpose, military aviators, fire-operators, snipers, etc.)

Let us consider all three levels in respect of settlement of Garabagh conflict, because irrespective of ways of Garabagh conflict resolution-peace negotiations or by military actions - all three levels must be used.

Levels 2 and 3 are applied or must be applied in Military Forces of Azerbaijan. The first level must be applied across a whole territory of Republic. All three levels should be related to each other and therefore must be subject to a united conception of government. Absence of one of these levels or break of their succession leads to unpreparedness of army and population to possible losses and temporary failures. That is, the soldier, who did not undergo in civil life the 1st level, very hardly passes through the 2nd level and practically does not accept the 3rd level. On the contrary, the specialist underwent through the 3rd highest level must again pass through the 1st level during peace period.

We will not consider the 3rd level of training in Azerbaijan army, because it relates to closed subjects. But, taking into account that the 1st and the 2nd levels of military-psychological training in Azerbaijan are not complete, then we can talk about serious problems, which may face Azerbaijan in the future. For example, let us analyze psychological situation during period of active military actions in 1992-1994.

The 1st level during those years, especially at the beginning was quite high, but this was due to patriotic spirit of population. However, there was no propaganda system and no a special psychological preparation of Republic's youths and civil population in war zone. In 1993-1994 this led to desertion, attempts to avoid mobilization and mass migration of population from war zone. As a result, there were difficulties with replacement of losses in battle-field (there were inefficient methods of forced mobilization of untrained soldiers) and impossibility of guerilla movement in back-front of enemy.

At the 2nd level it was necessary to remove pitfalls of the 1st level by efforts of deputies for political training and deputy tutors, which professional training frequently does not correspond to required level and was not subject to a single system (conception). As a rule, it was impossible to conduct special psychological training of military forces due to time shortage and absence of specific knowledge. As a result, there were large losses, especially wounded, desertion, unreasonable leaving of some settlements, involvement of army units in internal political and kinsfolk processes.

It is quite difficult to infer whether the 3rd level existed at that period, however it can be evaluated by several examples. Partial or full lack of

information of military intelligence prior to Shusha (1992) and Kelbadjar (1993) attacks of Armenians and attacks of Azerbaijani army such as Lachin (September, 1992) and Farrukh (February, 1993) and unconformity of special units actions while attempt to suppress a revolt in Ganja in 1993, losses while air-attacks over Garabagh and pitfalls while bombshell, etc.

In our point of view, most of shortages in military-psychological issues and military-propaganda are also present today. But we have to keep in mind, that most realistic way to solve Garabagh conflict is military-political approach and not only military actions or political methods. Military-psychological training being correctly organized at all three levels will allow Azerbaijan to fulfill a couple of quick attacks for liberation of part of occupied territory and then to hold negotiations on parity basis (there are abundance of required resources).

Chingiz Sultansoy

NATIONAL INFERIORITY COMPLEX AND GARABAGH PROBLEM

In Azerbaijan the discussions devoted to idea that "our nation is bad" are so widely distributed that it causes a concern. Publications in mass media show that this concerns most of population. While people's gatherings in shops, wedding parties, mourning ceremonies or even in the Parliament the ideas are expressed, such as "our nation is bad", "we are lazy", "we are not diligent", "we are the most corruptive nation", "there is no and can not be the unity among Azerbaijani", "we are pulling legs of each other", "enemy is among us", and this shows some serious disorder in public mind.

During the Soviet period the most of Azerbaijani do not like their own language, culture, literature, history and traditions. Even this tendency is weakened to a some extent during the period of independence, there are those who consider Azerbaijani as a gathering of naive, obsolete and thoughtless people. Those who think about the nation as unskillful, dishonest and think that "we are not the nation yet" doubt that Azerbaijani are formed as nation and reach the level of nation. Those who do not believe the creativity and future of Azerbaijani people are of opinion that this nation can not build independent and democratic state and will leave Armenian invasion without response.

The increasing number of people which intend to refuse from citizenship of Azerbaijan indirectly evidences about crisis. In quite a large number of Azerbaijani there is a shortage of feelings as national dignity and self-respect. I think that this idea does not need any proof.

Indirect ethnocide.

Indirect ethnocide aims to develop a complex of collective inferiority, ethnic (national) shame, regret and shame of belonging to that ethnic group (nation). The final goal is to melt that ethnic group within the dominating nation. Such psychological restrictions ultimately lead to weakening of vitality.

Do you see an awful resemblance between destiny of unlucky Indians of far Latin America and atrocities which we are suffering from?! Does this terrible and shocking resemblance answers questions tearing your mind and clarifies a lot of facts which were secret? Now, do you understand why we say that our nation is bad and do not like ourselves and ready to rack each other? Do you believe now, why through the history Azerbaijani Turks which are the symbol of heroism, manliness, courage see themselves as coward, traitors and dishonest?... Do you understand now why the nation which endowed the world poetics by Nizami and Fizuli, Khaqani and Seyid Azim Shirvani, Mehseti and Khurshud Banu Natavan, astronomy and mathematics by Nesreddin Tusi and Lotfi Zadeh, architecture by Asir Ali and Abubekr Adjemi, philosophy by Fazlullah Naimi and Imadeddin Nasimi, Rashidaddin and Bahmanyar, arts by Kemaleddin Behzad, Sultan Mohammed and Sattar Bahlulzadeh, social journalism by Mirza Jalil Mamedguluzadeh, revolutionary movements by Babek and Sattarkhan, state development by Garagoyunlu Gara Yusif and Aggoyunlu Uzun Hasan, Shah Ismail Khatai and Mamed Emin Resulzadeh, diplomacy by Shirvanshah Ibrahim and Sara Khatun and many other personalities, today doubt that it may manufacture qualitative guns and defeat Armenians? Do you understand now why Igor Belyayev alludes on the pages of newspaper "Literaturnaya gazeta" saying that "it is not a shame to be Azerbaijani"?

Mosoni does not display which methods are used to fulfill ethnocide, more precisely these methods were not shown in mentioned source. In fact, it is no use to search for types and description of these methods in literature published during the former USSR period. Most probably, such kind of methods were applied by secret institutions of Defense Ministry or KGB of former USSR and currently applied by associated institutions of Federal Security Service of Russian Federation. Known facts, even being without proof, now allow to make an undeniable judgment: Azerbaijan nation was the subject of "indirect ethnocide" and most probably up to now, even a long time after collapse of Soviet Union the same policy is continued. In any case, certain information has been spread. For example, two or three years earlier during Chechen war, one of the Russian television channels showed interview with a young Chechen man. Man, who already fought at war arrogantly said: "I have to fight, it is not possible for me not to fight. I am not Azerbaijani?!" Only naive and uninformed people can believe

that these humiliating words are said by the young Chechen man sincerely and not deliberately shown by Russian television.

But what is the way out? Which way we have to go in order to get rid of complex of national inferiority and cure?

First stage of removal of national inferiority complex (NIC)

At this stage it is necessary, similar to any ordinary case of curing of inferiority complex, to remove causes of the inferiority complex.

In fact, to cure one from complex described as "once beaten, twice shy" it is required first of all to remove causes of inferiority complex, i.e. those who beat and danger of being beaten. Naturally, if one is repeatedly beaten, one will hardly get rid of that complex.

Thus, curing of national inferiority complex consists first of all of removal of NIC causes. Other question is whether is it possible to remove a bunch of factors - open or secret? The fact is that some of these factors are already removed and others are on the point of being removed.

Braking factors

1. Complex of national inferiority became a chronic disease. High social tension resulted from war, economic crisis, inflation, refugee factor, unemployment and other factors, still continues.

(Only the fact of occupation of one fifth of our territories by Armenians may create inferiority complex).

2. Factors causing NIC are not totally removed:

a) the trace of repressions which deprived the nation of its intelligentsia and lead to serious drop of general intellectual level.

b) most powerful mass media means as television, radio and some newspapers still at post-communist positions.

c) Education system is still based on conceptions, textbooks and programs grounded on communist ideology.

d) A group of special secret measures continues to be unknown.

3. Factor, which is known in social psychology as consciousness being behind the reality (this is also called as "inertia of consciousness") results in slow down of above mentioned processes, which may lead to normalization and improvement of situation and that is why the criticism continues and it is even deepening.

4. Armenians are encouraged by success in Garabagh war and in diplomatic front. Naturally that their successes negatively influence us. Tragedy of Khodjaly proved this once more.

It must be taken into account that national inferiority complex took place not only in Indians, undeveloped nations and Azerbaijan, but it was also observed in nations which played leading role in the world's politics, economy and culture.

Nations which had NIC:

1. **Germans.** In Germany, defeated in war, the destruction, inflation, chaos, starvation reached the point when the future of German nation was undermined. As a response to these difficulties the Kaiser Wilhelm said "Until there are German mothers and German teachers, I believe into the future of Germany!". (Even it is possible to say the same thing about Azerbaijani mothers, it is not possible to say the same thing about Azerbaijani teachers. However, this is a separate subject.)

2. **Japanese.** After defeat in the World War II, Japan was in deep crisis and there took place the national inferiority complex.

This continued until the beginning of 1950-ies. Further economical successes of Japan has gradually dropped inferiority complex to zero. According to acquired information, the first step undertaken in order to devoid of NIC was the Grand-Prix awarded to "Rashomon" movie by now famous Akira Kurosawa in 1950 at the Cannes festival. Through that period, the "Grand-Prix" award had higher prestige than Oscar of the United States. Today this fact may seem strange to us. Ancient nation as Japanese felt proud by this small success - award of Japanese movie and considers this as a stage in a way to devoid of self-disbelief and cowardice.

3. **Italians.** Famous actor Nino Manfredi in the movie "Bread and chocolate" says to Swedish companion "You Swedish are guard composed of Swedish!...". The character played by Nino Manfredi felt so annoyed by its own nation that he pretends to be a Swedish...

By the way, display of this movie in "Retro" program broadcasted by Azerbaijan channel would be very useful for avoiding of national inferiority complex.

4. **Scottish.** Being under the servitude of England since the Middle ages the national inferiority complex is strong in Scottish which lost their state and language. Let us consider such fact: at international football competition in Spain the Scotland's team defeats Englishmen. Scottish ruptured by this victory rush into the play-ground with former national flags in their hands and shouted "Aren't we a nation?". The nation which does not doubt of its being a nation, in fact, does not need such assertions and ask such question. Some reasons of development of Scottish national inferiority complex I have expounded in publication "Besstrastnaya ulibka Klio" (Impassive smile of Klio).

5. **Englishmen.** There were publications in mass media which described the mood of Englishmen after victory over Argentina in the issue of Falkland

(Malvinas) islands: "Victory in conflict over Falklands is the second (!) by its value after the England's victory in the World War II. This victory has strengthened self-esteem of Englishmen, which was weakened for the last period". If we remember separation of colonies, and mainly India, from England then we will clearly understand the idea...

6. **Americans.** American media wrote that victory in Iraq allowed to remove national inferiority complex (!) in Americans caused by Vietnam war.

Undoubtedly, national psychology has its strange secrets and zigzags. Even influential Americans and Englishmen may suffer from NIC and need some actions in order to remove this complex.

Removal of NIC

Removal of NIC, similarly to removal of ordinary inferiority complex, consists in explanation of IC existence to those with that feeling of IC. If the first stage of treatment has been correctly conducted, the second, self-curing process starts and inferiority complex vanishes by itself. Obviously, as we stated in definition of inferiority complex, it is the ***incomprehensible*** part of consciousness, which defines the structure and direction of consciousness. To understand the existence of this incomprehensible subject, which influence the human, its consciousness, psychology and behavior, means to devoid of its impact. No doubt, it takes the time to totally devoid of IC.

For example, by drawing attention of person which suffers from complex described by adage as "once beaten, twice shy" and explaining that its fears are baseless and ridiculous, that feeling of fear gradually vanishes. Undoubtedly, only if that person will not be repeatedly beaten. I would like to repeat once again that to remove inferiority complex the first stage of treatment is to remove factors which cause the complex.

Even the national inferiority complex distinguishes a bit from ordinary one, its removal must be also treated similarly to treatment of ordinary inferiority complex.

It is obvious that defeat in war and loss of territories may create national inferiority complex in any nation without such complex and may strengthen the complex if it already exists. In our case (Azerbaijan, the XXI century) some factors causing NIC were removed, however the other serious factor emerged -Garabagh problem. Social tension - unemployment, low quality of life, corruption and other factors enforce the national inferiority complex. There may be various causes, but the result is the same -most portion of the nation is infected by national inferiority complex and feel worry from this. Consequently, to devoid of national inferiority complex we must liberate Garabagh and to liberate Garabagh we must devoid of national inferiority complex. What must be done to break the tricks of this fortune? My dear reader, dear sister and brother! Other nations found way out of similar

crisis, so will we do. In any case, we get rid of major cause creating our complex - the Russia's dominance, communist regime and ideology, and succeed in building of independent state. So, let us think together.

Eldar Ismayilov

GARABAGH KNOT: IN RETROSPECTIVE PERSPECTIVE PRISM

It seems that there is no end of military conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan. In fact, since 1994 the "ceasefire" is in effect. But how long the ceasefire will last? "Garabagh problem" started since 1988 did not bring any success and progress to involved parties. On the contrary, it has brought suffer and pain to both nations.

In historic reviews written until XX century there are no indications of ethnic conflicts between Armenian and Azerbaijani. However, in the XX century there were bloody conflicts and a number of attempts to trigger such conflicts. The first large-scaled ethnic conflict was in 1905, which left a serious trace in Russia's history. Even today it is quite difficult to comprehend causes of those events. Both nations were devoid of statehood and there were no bases for territorial disputes. However, those events clearly showed that both sides were not ready for civilized resolution of the conflict. Actions of both sides were characterized by mass atrocities.

New wave of violence and oppression took place on the background of events of 1918-20-ies. That was the period of emergence of two states - Azerbaijan and Armenian Republics. There is no sense to talk about causes of that conflict, its true initiators, those who suffered the most and who had gained in result of violence and shed blood. In any case the situation was calmed after Azerbaijan and Armenia had lost their independence.

Sometimes, we criticize Bolsheviks fairly and unfairly. However, namely Bolsheviks in 1920 by their severe and ruthless policy put the Azerbaijani-Armenian conflict to the end, and as we can judge now they succeeded to put 70 years moratorium on this conflict.

After a long period of time those who initiated tension started to criticize Stalin keeping with rules of "perestroika" period. It was emphasized that he was incorrect in deeply burying this problem. It was speculated that the problem would be solved once and for all if Daglyg Garabagh was annexed to Armenia. No doubt, Stalin can be blamed for a lot of things. But it can't be pretended that he was loyal to Azerbaijani and not to Armenians. Stalin was a huge political figure who expressed interests of a large Motherland. The Central Government policy

consisted in idea that the country, which was weakened by civil war and economic depression was in need of political stability and peace, including ethnic tolerance. Daglyg Garabagh problem was considered namely from this point of view. In fact, Daglyg Garabagh's destiny was defined on July 4-5, 1921 at the plenum of Caucasus Central Committee of RK(b)P.

On June 5 the Caucasus Bureau repeatedly discusses the problem and accepts a new resolution. According to the resolution, Daglyg Garabagh stays within the Azerbaijan SSR, providing that it will gain high level of autonomy. It is possible to find explanation of this decision in the resolution of that meeting of Caucasus Bureau, which was attended personally by Stalin. It says: "Proceeding from necessity to establish a peace between Moslems and Armenians..."

Bolsheviks understood that joining Daglyg Garabagh to Armenia will renew the tension. In 1921 the Bolsheviks, which had Azerbaijanies and Armenians among them, understood that danger, however 70 years later those who brought the problem back to agenda did not want to comprehend possibility of blood shed. In other words, communists of the 1920-ies understood that territorial disputes will certainly repeat events of 1905 and 1918-1920-ies.

In the autumn of 1945 the Armenia's government put a task before USSR government to hand over Daglyg Garabagh to Armenia and appeals to Stalin. Stalin gives the letter to G.Malenkov, Secretary of Central Committee of UK(b)P, which in turn sends the letter to Mirjafar Bagirov, Azerbaijan's leader.

Mirjafar Bagirov, in his response objects to arguments. However, he agrees handing over of Daglyg Garabagh, except for Shusha, to Aimenia, providing that three regions of Armenia SSR where Azerbaijani reside will be handed over from Armenia SSR to Azerbaijan. This put the problem to the end. In 1967 Armenian intelligentsia repeatedly appealed to SSSR mthorities with a request to annex Daglyg Garabagh to Armenia. This led to clashes and blood shed in Stepanakert and resulted in serious measures undertaken by Soviet authorities in order to prevent widening of the conflict.

Only after permission of M.Gorbachev, the last leader of SSSR, the problem was renewed and the lack of his determination and sense hampered stopping of events, which was undesired for empire. This speeded up the collapse of former USSR.

However, only great empires may regret for collapse. At the same time, supporters of independence have no ground to praise Azerbaijan-Armenian conflict. Tens of thousands of killed, hundreds of thousands of refugees. Burnt and devastated cities and villages, brains darkened by ethnic hatred - all these are results of a decade of conflict.

What is the perspective? The situation is still very unclear. Can you imagine the day when Azerbaijan will agree with separation of Daglyg Garabagh?

We could not imagine this yesterday, can not imagine today and won't tomorrow. This is for certain.

Armenians state that they can not live within Azerbaijan. Why? They can live as large settlements in most countries around the globe. It must be noted that a decade ago the settlement of two hundred thousand Armenians lived in Baku and settlement of thirty thousand Armenians lived in Ganja. Take into account arguments shown below. The negative attitude of this nation to Azerbaijani relate to the fact of Armenians coming to Caucasus only in XI century. It is very absurd to pretend that ancestors of modern Azerbaijani came to the region in XI century. But, almost thousand years elapsed since XI century. The period is sufficient for any nation to be adapted and be regarded as indigenous.

Their other argument consist in statement that majority of Nagorno Karabagh population are Armenians. From this they infer that the territory eternally belonged to Armenians and Karabagh Armenians have a right to define their fate, including establishment of their own government. How Nagorno Karabagh sees its independence in such critical geopolitical situation? Whether its integration with Azerbaijan is possible beyond limits of Azerbaijan? It is very doubtful. Under these circumstances Nagorno Karabagh is condemned to be constantly under impact of economic and political problems. Armenian side should understand that major countries around the world do not doubt principle of integrity of present borders of Azerbaijan, because they do not want to make precedent.

European leaders after World War II clearly understood importance of keeping intact the existed borders for safety of nations and providing of peace, It is quite difficult to expect such wisdom" from some politicians of post-Soviet era, However, it would not be correct to fall into despair.

Azerbaijani and Armenians have lived as neighbors for hundreds of years. And there were various situations in such neighborhood. Naturally, there were mutual claims along such long period of neighborhood. Today, it seems that they make a fence of stone between them, which height increases any other day, however the problem is still unsolved. Nevertheless, two nations have to live as neighbors and this is the verdict of history. No nation has a benefit from neighboring with enemy, Previously we all have lived in a communal flat and it was natural to have some disputes in such flat, Nowadays, every nation has its separate "flat", but has no peace. And the challenge is to make that flat more comfortable and cozy. Evidently, relations between two nations will hardly be brotherly, However, it is quite possible and very crucial to build relationship on normal, pragmatic basis. For this, it would be worthwhile to refuse from intention to widen own territory at the expense of neighboring country. Undoubtedly, this approach has no alternative,

ABOUT INFORMATION WAR

Countries which desire to strengthen their influence in South Caucasus always used Armenians and no doubt will also use them in the future. It would be naive to think that Armenians, which always were used against South Caucasus countries and nations in the regions, will behave quietly in the future. Rough analysis of Armenian history proves this result. From strategic point of view, withdrawal of Armenians from South Caucasus will be one of the major problems which will challenge Azerbaijan in the near future. Armenians, settled in the region for the last 200 years, are the most destructive ethnoses in the region, which created in the past a serious impediment for progress of indigenous (local) nations and their states, and continues to do this today.

This problem (withdrawal of Armenians from Caucasus) must be approached from 3 aspects:

1. *political-military aspect;*
2. *political-economic aspect;*
3. *information aspect.*

To fulfill efficient political-military-economic struggle it is necessary to develop a strong information propaganda machine. Armenian information-propaganda machine created conditions favorable for Armenian expansion before their attack. Thus, both at the moments of defeat and victory the Armenian propaganda machine succeeded in creation of "poor Armenians" image in public opinion.

Information-propaganda struggle must be started in Azerbaijan in aim to destroy information-propaganda machine of Armenians and create conditions necessary for efficient struggle in political and economic spheres.

Major directions of information war.

Contemporary level of computer technologies development makes it possible to fulfill efficient propaganda. There are all means for destruction of Armenians propaganda machine for one century period and transfer from passive defense to active propaganda war. Information war conducted by application of computer technologies is much cheaper than information war by use of other means (paper, TV, radio). In this case the main task relates to resolution of organizing problems which define rules of information war.

Information war must be conducted in the following major directions:

1. decrease efficiency and gradually destroy information-propaganda

machine of Armenians (internet sources of Azerbaijan already do a certain work in this direction and there is a need for government support);

2. conduct propagandist work in order to deepen contradictions in ethnic (Garabagh and Yerevan Armenians), social (poverty, corruption) and religious spheres (Grigorian church and other churches, other branches of Grigorian and Christian churches);

3. recover to international community the essence of Armenian policy and discords created by them in the region (for example geography and aims of Armenian terrorism);

4. in developed countries attempt to decrease the rating of political figures (MPs, congressmen, senator, etc.) which support Armenians by informing their electorate about the essence of Armenian policy;

5. dissemination of analytic publications about the danger which Armenians cause for countries and companies which have economic interests in the region;

6. fulfill researches in order to display facts about Azerbaijani being the indigenous population and the hays being migrated population, and involvement of our historians for restoration of Azerbaijan's history. In this sphere the conception related to ethnogeny of Azerbaijani is developed, (<http://www.karabakh-doc.info/ru/azerprople/ap-013az.htm> information war must involve all activity done in this sphere.

In our point of view, implementation of information war will create conditions favorable for success of our Republic in political, military and economic spheres.

Farhad Mamedov

ARMENIANS CLAIMS FOR DAGLYG GARABAGH REFLECTED IN SOME HISTORICAL SOURCES

Armenians claims for territories of Azerbaijan, for Daglyg Garabagh in particular, have a long history. But if during the whole XIX century Armenians migrated to territory of present Armenia and Daglyg Garabagh, from beginning of XX century the struggle over territories transferred into open confrontation. Military forces of Armenians for a long period of time terrorized Azerbaijani population of Garabagh and Zangezour. It was not accidental that at the time when XI Red Army was at the border of Azerbaijan, military forces of Azerbaijan Democratic Republic (ADP) were in Garabagh and fight with Armenians.

Coup of April 28, 1920 had brought Bolsheviks to power in Azerbaijan and opened for Armenians the path into Azerbaijan's government, which was impossible during the rule of ADP. Internationalism of Azerbaijan Communist Party and presence of a large number of people of various nationalities in leadership of the Party, especially of Armenians and Russians, were in the interests of Armenian nationalists. Assigning a lot of Armenians for high positions allowed them to start activity for separation of Garabagh from Azerbaijan. In historic archives there are a lot of facts, which confirm this. Let us show just few of them.

Telegram from comrade Parshin dated from June 15, 1920 informs Transcaucasian Regional Committee: "We would like to inform that c. Kerakozov sent by you to Jevanshir district (territory of Garabagh belonged to this district) up to now did not organized food supply, which negatively impacted strengthening of Soviet power in the district. Dissatisfaction of population is also caused by the fact that most members of Jevanshir Revolutionary Committee are Armenians despite that most of population of Garabagh are Moslems (i.e. Azerbaijani)".

Despite this letter, Kerakozov was not called back from Garabagh. He continued his work and constantly sent information to Baku about situation in Garabagh. Below we give an extraction from his speech devoted to situation in Garabagh and Zangezur dated from September 18, 1920 at the joint meeting of Organizing and Political Bureau of ACP(b). In particular, he said: "the work in Armenian region of Garabagh is gradually coming to order, there are Revolutionary Committees, which involve poorly people. The situation is bad in Moslem (Azerbaijani) region, where all revolutionary bodies include kulaks and it is necessary to assign a responsible party member to this region". This extraction draws an interest. Displaying Azerbaijani of Garabagh as kulaks and anti-revolutionary elements, which were regarded by Bolsheviks with a distinct hostility, the Armenians attempted to decrease the number of Azerbaijani in administration of Garabagh.

Armenian tactics of struggle caused open dissatisfaction among Azerbaijani communists under the leadership of N.Narimanov. It is not accidental that renowned communist Lominadze said at the II Congress of ACP(b) (October 16-23, 1920) during discussion of national issues: "We have ten, several tens of comrades, which say: "Moslems can not be trusted, one may be a good communist, but anyway he is a Moslem" (in other words, Azerbaijani). The same is said by Moslems - "scrape any Armenian and you will find Dashnak underneath".

As a result, after a short period of time Armenians claimed annexation of mountain portion of Garabagh to Armenian SSR. This issue was discussed at the meeting of Transcaucasian Regional Committee of RCP(b). N.Narimanov, chairman of People's Commissars Council of Azerbaijan SSR participated at the meeting as a representative of Azerbaijan. Before N.Narimav's arrival to Tiflis the issue was discussed at a joint meeting of Org. Bureau and Polit. Bureau of ACP(b)

on June 27, 1921. The resolution says: "Polit. Bureau and Org. Bureau consider this as unacceptable due to certain economic ties of Daglyg Garabagh to Azerbaijan. That is why the proposal to separate areas with Armenian and Turkish population and annex them to Armenia and Azerbaijan respectively, from point of view of administrative and economic expediency is also unacceptable. The only solution of this issue may be the active involvement of Armenians and Moslems into building of Soviet country as states declaration of Narimanov".

Armenian population of Garabagh is also unambiguously reacted to this proposal. The following are two letters of Mirzoyan, who was sent to Garabagh. In the first letter dated from August 1, 1921 he wrote: "It is proved that from economical, moral, political and national viewpoint Garabagh is closely related to the center -Baku. The population considers as correct and expedient the resolution of Transcaucasus Committee about establishment of a separate administrative unit from mountain portion of Garabagh". But the end of the letter notes: "delegate Pogosyan opposed this. He said that everyone knows that peasants want to be annexed to Soviet Armenia". Such statements allowed Armenians to speculate in the future also by opinion of population for separation of Garabagh.

In the end the mountain portion of Garabagh received the status of Autonomous Republic. But this was just the start of separation of Daglyg Garabagh.

Daglyg Garabagh issue came to agenda again after 25 years after the letter of Aryanutunov, the Secretary of CC (Central Committee) of Armenian SSR to one of the leaders of USSR -comrade Malenkov. That document was revealed due to activity of doctorate of historic sciences and professor Musa Gasymov. The letter says that population of mountain portion of Garabagh consists mainly of Armenians and agriculture of the region is very similar to that of mountain area of Armenia SSR. Annexation of DGAR to Armenia SSR will enable the local population to have proper education in Armenia.

In response letter, M.Bagirov, Secretary of Central Committee of Azerbaijan SSR noted historic injustice of such proposal. Making historic review of the period from emerging of Garabagh khanate in 1747, M.Bagirov rejected all reasons for annexation of DGAR to Armenia SSR stated by Arutyunov. M.Bagirov also added that DGAR has no joint border with Armenia SSR. M.Bagirov has also made the response proposal. Taking as a basis of proposed version the approach of Armenian side, which consisted in idea that the territory is populated mainly by Armenians, M.Bagirov made the following suggestion: "during the discussion of annexation of DGAR to Armenia SSR, I ask you also to consider the annexation of Azizbekov, Vedin and Garabaglar regions of Armenia SSR to Azerbaijan SSR because population of these regions are Azerbaijani and these regions are very close to the border with Azerbaijan SSR".

After such sharp answer the issue was removed from agenda. But reaction of Armenians was not long awaited. Hundreds of thousands of Azerbaijani were displaced from territory of Armenia from 1948 to 1953.

For a long period of time the DGAR issue did not trouble Azerbaijani community. However, in the end of 1980-ies Armenians gaining support of Central governing bodies in Moscow started open and aggressive struggle for Garabagh. A large number of documents, adopted by Supreme Council of Armenian SSR through that period, clearly displayed willingness of Armenians to annex DGAR to Armenia. Resolution of Supreme Council of Armenian SSR dated from December 1, 1989 on annexation of Garabagh was a final step in making annexation the institutional.

Results of war between Azerbaijan and Armenia are not advantageous for us. Together with capture of mountain portion of Garabagh (it is 4.3% of a whole territory of Azerbaijan), there were occupied several other regions, which did not belong to territory of DGAR. After signing of ceasefire agreement in 1994 the conflict parties started to work out for their countries the major principles of conflict regulation process. If in Azerbaijan there was adopted a Charter, which expressed opinion of public and based on fundamental principles of International Law (territorial integrity of country and a right to use force for restoration of territorial integrity), the Armenian version is quite the opposite. In particular, it is suffice to show the first Article of the document approved by the Parliament of Armenian Republic on April 30, 2001 in order to understand the aggressive position of Armenians in this issue: "annexation of Daglyg Garabagh to Armenia or independence, providing establishment of joint border between Armenia and Daglyg Garabagh", which means continuation of occupation of Azerbaijan's regions.

Analysis of historic sources allows to infer that Armenians' actions aimed to separate Garabagh were successive through a long period of time. Generations have changed, but the idea was the same and it was enriched by new fictions. On the contrary to Armenian lies we can show a large number of historic sources and modern documents. However, it must be noted that proceeding from realities and principles of modern world, when "The strong is always right", it is necessary to be powerful in order to have right for restoration of territorial integrity of Azerbaijan Republic. Because the UN Bylaws, which state that any country has the right to use military force against aggressor, has not been canceled yet.

**APRIL (1920) INVASION AND SOCIAL AND POLITICAL
SITUATION IN GARABAGH PROVINCE OF
AZERBAIJAN**

On April 27, 1920 the Azerbaijan Democratic Republic was overthrown by Bolsheviks supported by bayonets of the XI Red Army. On April 28 the Central Committee of Azerbaijan Communist Party announced newly established Revolutionary Committee as a new government body of the Republic. In its very first appeal the Revolutionary Committee being afraid of resistance against XI army stated that it will use terror to avoid this.

By the August 25 of 1920 Revolutionary Committees were established in 16 districts of Azerbaijan.

In the beginning of May the units of XI Army entered Garabagh from Yevlakh. Khosrov bey Sultanov, General Governor of Garabagh, declared himself a chairman of Revolutionary Committee of Garabagh was distanced from power by Bolsheviks. Until mid of May the XI Army totally controlled Garabagh region. On May 11 the Revolutionary Committee in Garyagin and on May 15 in the city of Shusha has been established. Bolsheviks obsessed with idea that "New society has to be built on ruins of the old one", mercilessly destroyed everything gained by Garabagh population through the centuries.

However, patience of the population which met XI Army with a relative silence was limited. Tyranny and execution of innocent people by occupant army caused the rage of population. Wave of rage has turned into the revolt. The first revolt against Bolsheviks took place in Ganja. After Ganja revolt was suffocated with blood, the confrontation between national Army and the XI Army triggered a new wave of revolt in Terter, which spread later across the whole Garabagh.

Distrustfulness of Bolsheviks towards the National Army led to decision to liquidate the national army.

In the early June cavalry regiments of Azerbaijan army deployed in Sheki, Terter, Jevanshir and Agdam could not stay indifferent to atrocities of local government and Armenian Dashnaks and attempted to stop them. For this reason the population trusted National Army, while Bolsheviks lost their supporters in the region.

On the other hand, Bolsheviks, which announced their rule in the region, do not provide security of population. In the region where ethnic relations were acute Armenians crept into the favor of soldiers of the XI army and fulfilled their dirty intentions. Thus, Armenians succeeded in triggering confrontation between the National Army and the XI Army.

In report sent from Garabagh it was said that "Political situation in the region is so tense that there is a need for urgent measures here. On both sides illegal actions took place, innocent people are detained and population fears of military units. The major cause of population discontent was related to a large number of Armenian Dashnaks within military units".

Units of National Army could not stay indifferent to tyranny taking place in the region. That is why, the XI Army decided to liquidate units of National Army and started armed operations on June 10. During the operation military aircrafts bombarded Terter and its surroundings. In unequal fight the XI Army took control over Terter on June 10, over Agdam on June 11 and over Khankendi and Shusha on June 14. Thus, Garabagh revolt was suppressed.

But the victory of the XI Army did not remove national, economic and political crisis in the region, on the contrary, it made the crisis even deeper.

The following is the extraction from report sent on December 4, 1920 by a chairman of Revolutionary Committee of Shusha district to N.Narimanov, chairman of Revolutionary Committee of Azerbaijan and H.Sultanov, National Commissar of Internal Affairs: "Over than 6 months the 28th rifle division deployed in Garabagh and Zangezur is not able to defend us either morally or technically. Local population thinks only about self-defense. Each day hundreds of people come to me and to headquarters of extraordinary committee and ask for arms in order to be able to defend themselves". In other report it was indicated that for the last period a number of army units entered into the district from Shusha, confiscated all provisions from population and provisions committee of Shusha. This created serious crisis, which may lead to unwanted results.

Ch. Ildirim described the situation in Garabagh in his report sent to N.Narimanov, chairman of Revolutionary Committee of Azerbaijan and M.Huseynov, the chairman of Supreme Economic Council, as the following: "According to the given order I went to districts of Garyagin, Shusha and Gubadly. In my opinion in none of these districts there is a stable Soviet authority. Because of fault of party chairman in Shusha district the speculations, robbery, murders and burglary are widespread here. I was surprised mostly by behavior of XI Army. Each week there are carouse parties. But soldiers, who do not have their helpings of bread look into the windows".

Republican authority concerned by these reports established a special commission headed by N.Narimanov. The commission went to districts. Struck by miserable situation, N.Narimanov on October 12 sent a special order by telegram from Shusha. The telegram said about a lot of complaints of revolutionary committees, provision agents and representatives of the XI Army units, which expropriated the last slices of bread. He wrote: "I think that this means indifference and offensive attitude of revolutionary committees to their activity. This also relates to the units of XI Army and in a very short time this must be stopped".

However, this disgraceful behavior had not been stopped. On the contrary, as a result of policy implemented by Moscow in Azerbaijan, N.Narimanov was withdrawn from the Republic. Daglyg Garabagh was given the status of autonomy and this was such a serious stroke to territorial integrity of Azerbaijan, that the nation even today suffers from the event.

Fikret Nabiye

GARABAGH IN THE CONTEXT OF GEOPOLITICAL INTERESTS OF MODERN WORLD

Geopolitics today is the major term of theory of international relations. Geopolitics characterizes location of historic forms of territorial-spatial features of countries and alliances of countries and influence local, regional, continental and global international processes.

Let us consider historic facts related to antagonistic conflicts. At the end of November 1920 on the territory of former Irevan khanate, which population mostly consisted of Azerbaijani Turks (later it was named as Irevan province) the Armenian Soviet Republic was established. Since ancient times Azerbaijani lived in this territory. In 1826 of 737 villages of Irevan khanate 674 villages were populated by Azerbaijani, 37 villages by mix of Azerbaijani and Armenians and only in 199 Armenians lived, to all these villages 200-250 thousand Azerbaijani were living, which constituted 78% of population. Even in 1905 of 624 villages in Irevan province 341 were populated by Azerbaijani, 37 by Azerbaijani and Armenians, 199 villages by Armenians only. Increasing number of Armenian villages was explained by migration of Armenians from Iran and Turkey. Establishment of Armenian state in indicated area was the continuation of policy of Russian empire implemented in Caucasus against Turkey. Lenin also frequently used the phrase "Turkey's Armenia". Russian Soviet state by establishing Armenian Soviet Republic succeeded to create buffer Christian state between Russia and Moslem countries in the south. Prior to this, through the period 1918-1920 as a result of activity of Dashnak Armenian Republic 208 Azerbaijani villages in Armenia were devastated and population was forced to flee. Policy of withdrawal of Azerbaijani from their locations in Armenia continued during the Soviet era. All Azerbaijani population was forced to flee through 1931-1988 from 61 Azerbaijani villages and 104 villages where Azerbaijani and Armenians lived together. By the end of 1988 the rest 72 Azerbaijani villages were occupied and by the end of 1989 not a single Azerbaijani was in Armenia. Thus, through 90 years of Russian empire and 70 years of Soviet era Azerbaijan were totally withdrawn from their homeland Irevan khanate. During the former USSR era the Supreme Soviet of Armenia SSR adopted the decision to annex Daglyg Garabagh, a part of

Azerbaijan, to Armenia. To implement this decision in practice nationalist groups of Armenia fabricated a number of tricks. As a result, Nagorno-Karabakh was occupied by armed forces of Armenia. Under these circumstances, Azerbaijan, which is a member country of CIS appealed to CIS countries to defend its rights and territorial integrity. Non-objective attitude of some countries supported Armenia towards Azerbaijan is the major obstacle for restoration of territorial integrity of our Republic.

Diplomatic political mentality is closely related to concept of interdependence in the world, Those who support the concept of interdependence In the world proceed from a thesis that domestic and foreign policy have a common basis, Representatives of transnationalist school are of opinion that currently world politics is not defined only by relations between states, Thus, activity of non-governmental organizations and enterprises drives out relations between countries from center of international relations and as a result transnational relations moves to the forefront, In this respect, separation of internal and foreign policy becomes less significant, Foreign and international policy of countries is closely related, as well as constitutes a unity with domestic policy, major subjects of foreign policy are the following: countries, parties of foreign countries and other public organizations, worldwide organizations and International regional organizations, Internal and foreign interests possess interrelation. In this respect, foreign policy of a country characterizes activity of a country in international community and regulates its relations with other countries.

Success of foreign policy also depends on favorable internal situation. Development of internal political processes makes it possible for the country to hold a proper position in world policy. National interests generate from basic interests of ethnic unions and groups tied to each other by specific relations, relations of genetic and spiritual - cultural origin. National interests embody efforts to unify representatives of nation on the basis of community of culture shown by language, family, religious and moral traditions. It is also expressed in political system, behavior, even clothes and jewelry. National interests are also displayed in respect shown by any person to other members of the same nationality and aimed at efforts to preserve the national dignity and integrity of nation.

National interest is one of the motives of behavior and activity of an individual, nation and ethnicities, various nationalities, community or the state.

Ideology is able to upraise the national interest to a "common" level. In some cases national interest is fulfilled by restriction of interests of other nations and strengthening success gained by ideology. No doubt, in such case emerged ethnic conflicts sometimes lead to armed conflicts and military operations.

Realization of national interests along with other factors most probably demands provision of national security. American political observers Hans Morgenthau proposed to study problem of national interests from point of view of

national security in general. Previously in studies of western political observers the national security problem was considered as military security. In national security three levels of security are the most important: security of an individual, society and state. In case of any threat to nation the security of society and state becomes a priority issue. In case then totalitarian and authoritarian regimes are create such dangerous situation the security of an individual is a basic issue. For democratic society the freedom and security of an individual are more important. For democratic society the goal consists not only in provision of security of a state and society, but provision of freedom and security of an individual. State security is fulfilled through mechanism of powerful management and coordination of political forces and public groups activity. State security is also implemented by activity of appropriate institutions. Security of society is closely tied to existence of public institutions, norms and forms of developed mature consciousness. These factors make it possible to fulfill rights and freedom of all groups of population and to fight against attempts to divide the community. Security of an individual envisages a set of legal and moral norms, which create basis for development and realization of socially important ability and demand, as well as formation of public institutions and organizations. This, in its turn brings to zero the confrontation between state and society.

Within the structure of national security the vital positions belong to political, economic, military and environmental factors, including security of information and cultural progress of nation.

National security is one of the crucial categories of politics. Its aim is to make secure situation for existence and development of social institutions, individuals and society, characterizing by this the activity of those institutions.

Military security plays an important role in formation of political thought. According to Madjid Efendiyev, Azerbaijani political observer, political security first of all is based on internal stability of the country. Existence of stable political system, political order and political regime, which reflect interests of major social groups, create a ground for unity of the nation and efficient resolution of economic, social and cultural development. In addition, influential political management bodies, which defended by larger part of the nation, are able to successfully defend interests of a country at international level. Political security envisages existence of stable political sovereignty and stability of society within the framework of system of international relations. This provides development of political system, balance of interests of various social groups taking into account the supremacy of an individual.

One of elements of national security is economical security. Essence of economic security of any country does not consist in isolation of the country itself from other countries, but in creation of financial basis within the country for

thorough development of its community and enter international economic relations as an independent subject with equal rights.

Specifics of military security consist in provision of national security by means of military violence. Military aspect of national security characterizes ability of nation to resist and prevent operations of external military forces. This envisages use of modern military forces and necessity of collective or general military security. It is also important to enter into military alliances. Experience of a cold war confirms that one of efficient ways to strengthen military security is formation of efficient international security system. Internal factor of military security is related to strengthening of army.

Other crucial element of national security is security of cultural development of an individual and society. In fact, the nation which lost its traditions transforms into a crowd. I.Kant divided population into two portions - the nation which owns cultural traditions and a crowd which distanced itself from spiritual life of community. It is not possible to imagine a nation, which is unaware of cultures of the world and nation.

National security depends on self-comprehension of nation by means of its culture. Political foresightedness to a large extent depends on legacy. Stable development of society also depends on preserving its traditions.

Foreign policy of any country directs attention to resolution of major global problems - environmental problems, starvation, international stability and prevention of danger of war.

Application of new rules in world politics, development of new way of political thought is a verdict of social development and historical progress. In the world politics the triumph of new sensible activity provides existence of international political, public and cultural relations on a new progressive basis and makes it possible to create a world without crises and conflicts. It is not accidental that in western political thought the theory of new society and new world is reflected. The idea of a community which establishes peace, prosperity and justice is expressed by representatives of liberal-democratic humanist futurology. Rebuilding of humanity on basis of democracy is a common irrefutable rule of civilization. Democratic political thought is in the process of transforming into the leading way of thinking around the globe.

Traditional and major form of fulfillment of foreign policy consists in establishing of diplomatic relations between states. Other forms of implementation of foreign policy are the next: representation of a country in international worldwide and regional organizations or entering into those organizations as a member country, cooperation with political parties and public organizations of friendly countries; establishment of ties with representatives of various foreign parties and public organizations.

Today in Azerbaijan there are diplomatic representations of most countries of West Europe, the USA, Middle Eastern countries and UN. Turkey, Iran, Germany, USA, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Georgia and other countries have their Embassies in Azerbaijan Republic. In march of 1992 Azerbaijan Republic became a member of United Nations Organization. Later the Republic entered a number of international organizations, such as OCSE, Organization of Islamic Conference, Economic Development, Bank of International Development and Reconstruction, Bank of Islamic Development, European Council.

In developing of international cooperation various international organizations play an important role. For example: OSCE plays an active role for peaceful regulation of Azerbaijan - Armenia dispute over Daglyg Garabagh.

Significant importance in development of international cooperation belongs to UN. Its various organizations and institutions (such as MOP, UNESCO, etc.) assist to a broad cooperation in economical, technological, cultural and other spheres. Azerbaijan is involved in UN activity, especially in the issue related to problems of refugees and forced migrants. It is commonly known that international humanitarian aid is rendered to over one million of refugees and forced migrants located in various parts of our Republic. Humanitarian aid is one of the principles of international humanism.

Firdovsiyya Ahmedova

GARABAGH WAR AND PSYCHOLOGICAL STATE OF AZERBAIJAN SOCIETY

Garabagh war, which started just as a conflict, by many aspects impacted differently on consciousness of Azerbaijani living within the Republic and across the territory of former USSR and Azerbaijani living beyond its borders.

Azerbaijani living in various countries around the world could not be able to promptly react to the events due to lack of information and paucity of historical data. Just a portion of them, particularly those who emigrated for political reasons, took an active position. However, due to their uncoordinated activity, this was not considerably helpful from political and economic point of view.

Within the Republic, as well as for Azerbaijani living on the territory of former USSR the emerging conflict was unexpected and caused confusion and stress. Further deepening of the conflict embraced an exhausting period, which is characteristic for territorial disputes and created a crisis in the minds of people related to:

a) zero probability of war within the state system in which they lived, consciously being not ready for internal war and incomprehension of events from historical point of view;

b) collapse of values on which traditional way of thinking is based, those values become meaningless and people's belief were shaken (up to even refusal of those values);

c) internationalization of the problem led to wider distribution of Azerbaijani range of vision, and facing this with unpreparedness and own weakness. Felt as "abandoned" by great powers the people fall in pessimistic state of mind;

d) psychological state caused by changes in social and political structure during the period of war. Transition to a new system, emerging social tension and new values.

Continued military failures during the war, loss of territories, waves of refugees, changes of government, several attempts for, coup d'etat, incomprehension of political conflicts caused a deep depression in minds of Azerbaijani.

Garabagh war has set new values: National self-perception, deepening of national consciousness, higher activity of citizens, etc.

Transition of Azerbaijani (who lived during Soviet period) possessed by internal benevolence and inspired by ideas such as friendship of nations, prosperity of nation and justice to such ideas as national perception and national values. Another problem facing consciousness of Azerbaijani people is returning to name of its nationality - Turkish.

Classification of essence-stages of psychological state during Garabagh war is as following:

- Moral unity
- Moral shock
- Self-confidence and moral mobilization
- Feeling of confidence replacing despondence
- Process of adaptation to the problem
- Position of waiting, indifference, psychological state with national perception feelings awakening from time to time.

Below is described the way out of crisis, which developed under the impact of Garabagh war:

a) Moral mobilization of our nation at the present historic stage, perception that the future of the nation depends on its own will and energy; refuse from provincial mentality and integrate with international community; the consideration that opinion of great powers is very important encourages Azerbaijani living in those countries to be more active in all spheres.

b) Foreign policy course based on strong economy, professional army and moral mobilization;

c) Extract a maximum benefit from interrelation of factors of foreign policy and economy of the country;

- d) Enforce diplomatic activity according to modern standards;
- e) Display of political will grounded on important position in international community due to geostrategic position and natural resources of Azerbaijan.

Fuad Mamedov

ABOUT CULTURAL APPROACH TO RESOLUTION OF GARABAGH CONFLICT

One of the actual and most painful issues for Azerbaijan nation in the sphere of national security of Azerbaijan is the Garabagh problem.

For resolution of this problem it is possible to outline two approaches, which are absolutely opposite by their philosophy and technology. One of them - is political regulation through peace negotiations based on principle of stability of borders and territorial integrity of Azerbaijan, taking into account the right of Armenian population of Daglyg Garabagh for national self-determination. Within the framework of this approach the important value has the use of knowledge and experience in the sphere of peace culture and cultures dialog. The other approach is resolution of the conflict by use of military force.

However, there is a third solution, on which to a large extend, the efficiency of former two approaches depend. It is of long-term and strategic nature and "works for" the future of Azerbaijan nation. This is a priority development of intellectual and moral culture on the basis of cultural approach to formation of new social-cultural policy.

Applying deduction method let us consider the problem in a wide context. Cultural analysis of public development processes in Azerbaijan today brings to agenda the next question: whether we have right to make mistakes in social-cultural policy and management under severe conditions of transition period and globalization? No way. It is known, that incorrectness, non-productivity of national policy in sphere of culture, leads to stagnation and crisis in public development of any country. One of the reasons is inability or unwillingness to see while the process of dialectic development the methodological and managerial mistakes of some officials or governing bodies, as well as, mass media. Comprehending these regularities, which have significant value, Azerbaijani scientists have to assist politicians and officials to find correct social-political solutions, which are most appropriate for national security of our country. Complexity of the problem is related to the issue that Azerbaijan, at the present stage of its development has to correctly and quickly adapt to globalization process, taking into account its national interests and their harmonization with interests of other nations in regional and world scales. In our point of view the

correct cultural resolution of this problem demands from state to develop high managerial culture and efficient political culture of democracy, which meets present time requirements and directed to:

- development of culture of civil society, which stimulates high level of social activity and responsibility of citizens for the future of their country;
- high quality of education and bringing up in order to improve intellectual, legal and moral culture, which provide continuous social-economic development and quick transfer of the country to information society;
- progress of science and high technologies providing environmental safety;
- free development of arts as one of the means to keep cultural heritage and national identity, restoration of national and cultural values, formation of humanistic philosophy of ethics and esthetics of people;
- high culture of development, preserving, use and transferring of values and norms of spiritual and material culture, which provide spiritual perfection, prosperity and life quality of people;
- implementation of fair human resources policy, oriented for professionalism and high civil ethics of officials at all levels;
- efficient public monitoring of democratization processes of national culture.

Today social-cultural code of Azerbaijan nation targets, primarily, development of arts, folklore and ethics. It is almost impossible to overestimate axiological dependence of such approach for bringing up and spiritual development of people. The art is the mirror of a human soul and thought, the source for formation of beautiful feelings. It is not only the artistic form of reflection of objective world, but technology of its creation, which helps to spiritual improvement of a human. This is artistic culture, which creates wonderful world of human ideals and images by language of art and music, theater and cinematograph, architecture and literature. This wonderful world has a huge axiological transforming impact on human mind, psychology and character, stimulates fantasy, creative and productive activity of people. It positively changes our comprehension of the world, values and meaning of life.

At the same time, comparative cultural analysis of various world cultures shows that basis of prosperity, secure development and ability of nation to defend itself consists in priority development of intellectual culture, healthy national conception and democratization of national culture. Proceeding from this, intelligentsia have to assist to government in reorientation of social-cultural policy of a country to priority development of education, science and high production and information technologies, which are competitive in the world markets. Such political innovation as "public therapy" will assist to progressive changes in social-cultural code of the nation in order to conform to requirements of beginning of the

third millennium. It will create new opportunities for enhancing "national immunity" in the struggle for fair resolution of Garabagh conflict, for strengthening of spirit of our citizens through their minds enrichment by scientific knowledge, fostering of nice and noble feelings and strong will of the nation. Correct scientific resolution of these problems is possible by development of new branch of culture as "cultural study of Azerbaijan".

Geyret Guliyev

CEASEFIRE: ESTABLISHMENT, DEVELOPMENT AND CRISIS

Signing of Bishkek protocol in 1994 in fact may be considered as recognition of separatists. This was a kind of representation of Russian-Armenian joint occupation zone existed in Garabagh on the rest of territory of our country.

At that period, within state power there was not a united attitude to signing of the protocol. A.Jalilov had refused to sign the agreement. I do not want to say that he was killed for this reason. In any case, such version must be considered by investigation. The only co-author of this regime- Resul Guliyev has signed the protocol. Azerbaijani people protested the decision at the rallies on May 21 and September 10, 1994. Later, two persons which hold high positions at that time and who are now in opposition, said that only that rallies stopped juridical handing over of Garabagh. Those rallies also removed the issue of deployment of Russian peacekeepers in our country. If this happened it would be equal to returning of Russian army into our Republic.

Children born at the start of ceasefire are now at the third course of school. Not only those children, but the society as a whole has turned into hostages of ceasefire. Today ceasefire concerns everything but the war. It turned into an integrated mean to make the society silent. Ordinary action which does not please the state power is considered as attempt to break ceasefire. In the Milli Majlis it has been underlined that thinking in other way means to break stability. There are thousands of such cases in all spheres. Ceasefire has started from June 4, 1993. Until that Armenians agreed to have "cultural autonomy", however, now the idea of "highest autonomy status" has been buried.

33 battalions were demobilized and this was equal to disarmament. The state power liquidated cliquishness, uncontrollability, illegal armed units and authoritarian principles in army. Undoubtedly, these were a significant success. However, formation of army was carried out weakly. Speculations in army have taken a form of usual action. There were some attempts to turn army into the mean of inflicting a punishment.

At that period Russian-Armenian alliance failed to reach Ganja-Yevlakh line. This was a success. Unfortunately, there was a Murovdag tragedy. Defense ceasefire should have been stopped and transition to attack ceasefire had to take place. Unfortunately, this was not happened. Ceasefire crisis started and continues now. Clear examples of this crisis were in both Republics in autumn of 1999. On October 27 in Armenian parliament the peace supporters were shot and in Azerbaijan three officials of highest rank, which opposed this disgraceful peace, have resigned. These events were very similar by their essence. What kind of ceasefire is this if it is daily broken? For example, during a year it was broken for 426 times. Every day soldiers are killed and for a long period of time they are not considered as martyrs. The figure of killed medical orderly increases every day. It may even reach that of war period.

Every day the ideological diversion took place in the army. For example, the desertion is excused. Nothing can discredit the army more than that. There is a dreadful stability. Any action is stigmatized - "plot attempt", "coup -d'etat", "unrest"... Explanation of any shortage by war became an ordinary case. The opposition also explained its inactivity for 4-5 years by the same reason.

We must get rid of feeling of ceasefire hostages. Because, its crisis goes beyond the framework of development crisis.

Hasan Guliyev

CONFLICT IN GEOPOLITICAL CONTEXT

Present collisions and perspectives of Caucasus are mainly caused by processes of transformation of bipolar world order into a new one: which is distinctly displayed in intensification of tension and confrontation in various parts of the globe.

Caucasus is one of such zones of geopolitical bifurcation: priority interests of great powers- major subjects of contemporary world order are oriented to this region. The motivation of their interests orientation to Caucasus is also well-known - uniqueness of geo-location of the region and presence of vast energy sources. Ethnic conflicts, existed here, create favorable climate for inclusion of the region into context of intensive geopolitical innovations and mutations. All this makes Caucasus the site of confrontation of various interests - vectors of force. As a consequence, situation and perspectives in the region are mainly defined by "cumulative" impact of external factors and not by the desire of Caucasian nations. Inconsistency of great powers interests complicates the situation and keeps the region under high risk: Garabagh conflict is involved into this zone of uncertainty and its collisions are defined by development of geopolitical processes.

Geopolitization of Garabagh conflict was caused by the "fitting" of its parameters into plans of great powers for Caucasus. The conflict played an important role in washing out of sovereignty and security of countries of the region and strengthening of dependence on external factors. Manipulating by the conflict, great powers grounded the necessity of their peacekeeping, humanitarian and other missions, by which they camouflaged their geopolitical aspirations. In other words, conflicts created premises for transformation of countries in the region into hostages of geopolitical processes. Under their influence:

- immunity of countries of the region is weakened and they become more dependent on external factors;
- peacekeeping and other abilities are significantly restricted;
- geographic borders of the countries (their jurisdiction) were washed out.

Conflicts have created the ground for geopolitization of the region according to the principle: "divide and rule". However, widening influence of great powers was accompanied by emerging of confrontational geopolitical climate. Now, it can be confessed that there is a tight interrelation between Garabagh conflict (in particular) and plans of great powers for Caucasus: manipulation by conflicts become the compound of plans for involvement of Caucasus into large political games, which lead to strengthening of dependence of the region (and conflicts) on collisions of geopolitics.

Over 10 years the Garabagh conflict underwent significant transformation and its subjective status has qualitatively changed. Earlier active subjects were conflicting parties (Armenia and Azerbaijan), however, now the key factors of the conflict are controlled by great powers and by geopolitical process itself. Conflicting parties become passive observers of geopolitical game or active "marionette" of great powers. As a result, the leading powers of the world are transformed into major subjects of collisions of the conflict (in case of co-chairs of Minsk group of OSCE).

With complication of geopolitical situation and deepening dependence of the region the possibilities of Azerbaijan and Armenia are minimized: there is a strange situation, when conflicting parties are devoid of ability to solve their problems by "war or negotiations". But such paradoxes are typical for modern geopolitics: by controlled conflicts (and frequently by wars) the great powers solve some of their problems.

Present status of Garabagh conflict characterized by formulae "neither war, nor peace" is the consequence of its geopolitization -strengthening of great powers role and restriction of activities of conflicting parties. Geopolitization of conflict imposes on Azerbaijan and Armenia restricted "framework behavior" with strictest bans (threat of imposing sanctions). Conflicting parties in status of "marionette" of big politics are not free in making decisions - their behavior are

controlled by geopolitical taboo "neither war, nor peace". At the same time, possibility of violation of this taboo is blocked by comprehension of inevitable geopolitical punishment.

Accepting geopolitization of the conflict as a "zero point" of analysis underlines importance of studying of tendencies in big politics and its "Caucasian" projection. This means that resolution of Garabagh conflict supposes fulfillment of multilevel analysis in pursue to decode collisions of its geopolitical context. Ignorance or diminishing of these realities may significantly impede search of paths for resolution of the problem. It must be noted, that great powers attempt to hide their interests in freezing the conflict as "neither war, nor peace" situation: existence of the conflict simplifies manipulation by the region. Great powers implement their plans under the cover of peacekeeping mission and for minimization of their responsibility they frequently talk about expediency to initiate direct dialog between Armenia and Azerbaijan. Keeping the control over the conflict and region, they imitate interest in reanimation of active role of conflicting parties. In fact, this may mean that at this stage great powers do not have a desire to solve the problem and by use of such tactics they try to transfer their responsibility and fault to conflicting parties.

It is possible to question the fact of geopolitization of the conflict and attempt to bring it back to previous situation, when conflicting parties played very active role. However, today it is dangerous to doubt that the conflict is controlled by great powers. Obviously, while being hopeless because of conservation of the conflict, it is easy to tempt to simplify the situation and overestimate one's own abilities. Some behave namely like this: they suppose that we can and must resolve the conflict by military force. In fact, for making any decision it is necessary to make clear the motives of geopolitization of the conflict and possible reaction of great powers. Pitfalls in this case may lead to situation when we may become the victims of inevitable geopolitical punishment. In other words, we have to start with analysis of possible variations of geopolitical context:

- excessively confrontational,
- consensus,
- one- dimensional.

Confrontational context.

This regards the present situation, which may turn to be long-term (in case of activity of co-chairs of Minsk group of OSCE): continuing uncertainty of the region and geopolitical perspectives, irreconcilable positions of Armenia and Azerbaijan, controversy of situation within these countries. State of Garabagh conflict is characterized by presence of interrelated levels of confrontation:

- a) Azerbaijan-Armenia (conflicting parties),
- b) right wing opposition- state power- left wing opposition,
- c) USA - Russia (as major subjects)

At each level the confrontation dominates over aspirations to reach consensus and peace. Conflicting parties hold irreconcilable hostile positions. But peculiarity of the situation consists in clear dominance of geopolitical confrontation, which gives the impulse for triggering of tense relations between Armenia and Azerbaijan, as well as within these countries. For the time being, the leading subjects of a big politics (in simplified model these are the USA and Russia) attempt to play out its rival from the region and establish thorough control. At this the great powers take into account realities of internal political situation in Armenia and Azerbaijan, as well as confrontation between them. That is why, Garabagh conflict is in the area of influence of various forces and uncertain situation "neither war, nor peace". Intention of one power simultaneously blocked (openly or hidden) by other and as a result the conflict still under conservation.

At the same time, geopolitical struggle is characterized by intensive dynamism and the situation can be transformed into consensus or one-dimensional (under the control of one great power). These phases are most favorable for resolution of the problem. Three level confrontation model is characterized by a wide spectrum of possibilities for collisions of conflict situation.

It is possible to outline "horizontal and vertical variations" of transformation.

Reaching consensus at "horizontal variation" at least at one level of confrontation may be the factor, which will initiate the similar process at other levels. Because of domination of geopolitical factor we may note high probability of primary consensus at a common level (while approaching of positions of USA and Russia) with further forcing to consensus of Armenia and Azerbaijan. "Vertical variation" means possibility to gain consensus beforehand between subjects of three levels (for example, approaching of "left wing opposition" of Armenia and Azerbaijan is provided under patronage of Russia or approaching of "right wing opposition" of these countries are provided under control of the USA, etc.) with further gain of consensus at other levels.

Prediction of confrontational geosituation transformation into one of consensus forms supposes analyzing dynamics of great powers positions and collision of their interests for Caucasus. In this respect, the positive influence may have analysis of Balkan conflicts, which according to some aspects (post socialistic motivation, rival countries, expansion of NATO, etc.) and by nature of geopolitical context is very similar to Garabagh. Namely Balkan conflicts were used to test various schemes of confrontational geosituation transformation into consensus with tendency to transform into "one-dimensional". Balkan experiments were useful for evaluation of probability of reanimation of war as a condition for transformation of geopolitical situation: this experience has showed that transfer to consensus may suppose suppression "by force" of resistance of opponents (states) - play them out or force to consensus.

Consensus context.

Such situation may emerge while approaching positions of most participants of Caucasian geopolitics. In this case there may be objective premises for resolution of the problem, providing that the situation conforms to geopolitical plans of consensus group. Because, its influence onto collisions of the conflict will dominate over resistance of possible opponents. Gradually, uncertainty of "neither war, nor peace" situation will gain the impulse for transformation into a new state. Mechanism and direction of transformation will be mainly defined by intention of consensus group; the scale of possible resistance of opponents may define probability of short-term reanimation of war. Geoclimate of consensus in addition to creation of premises for collisions of the conflict, defines also vector of innovations for benefit of Armenia or Azerbaijan. Most may depend on composition and a general geoposition of consensus group, as well as on behavior of opponents which will be in a status of "geopolitical isolation" (i.e.) out of dominating vector of impact onto situation). Detailed prediction of possible tendencies of consensus geosituation and adoption of any plan for regulation of the conflict (which meet interests of Azerbaijan and Armenia) requires thorough analysis of plans and intentions of representatives of consensus group and their possible opponents.

One-dimensional context.

This situation may arise in case of transition of geopolitical situation under a control of one state. For our region this version is quite possible: after September 2001 high probability of transfer of South Caucasus under patronage of the USA is clearly traced. Such context is the simplified version of former one - as a result of transform of potential leader of consensus group into distinct leader, which is able independently resolve all key problems of the region. Evidently, "one-dimensional" context has additional possibilities for successful implementation of any acceptable model of problem resolution. Theoretically, various versions of formation of such geopolitical climate are possible. This means also possibility of various versions for resolution of Garabagh problem - for benefit of Azerbaijan or Armenia. But, holding the conflict under conservation is also not the exception. In this case perspectives of the conflict are mainly defined by intentions of one great power.

Summary

Acknowledgement of realities of geopolitization of the conflict is the axiom, which gives leitmotiv to analysis of Garabagh problem and searching ways for its resolution. Evidently, due to geopolitization our ability to implement desired versions of problem resolution has dropped to minimum. However, this does not mean that we just have to trace development of geopolitical context of the conflict

and wait for a right moment. We always have opportunity to actively block unacceptable tendencies even up to minimization of our dependence on collisions of external situation. This is quite a complex task. However, we should start from analysis of geopolitical situation and prediction of its tendencies.

Ismayil Musa

AZERBAIJAN-ARMENIA AGREEMENT AND CONFERENCE (1919)

November of 1919 can be characterized as a month of active and tense diplomatic confrontation, as well as a lot of correspondence of various kinds, meetings and agreements caused by another round of provocations by Armenians. Even before the situation in Zangezur was strained both sides agreed to hold a conference in Baku.

After negotiations, N.Yusifbeyli together with M.N.Hajinski, member of Azerbaijan delegation to the Paris Peace Conference, and Alshibaya, Ambassador of Georgia in Baku went to Tiflis on November 20 (in some sources on the 19th). Through November 20-22 delegations from Azerbaijan and Armenia (the latter was headed by A.Khatisyan) held direct bilateral negotiations (based on proposal of J. Ray, representative of the USA in Caucasus). Negotiations revealed serious divergency in formulations of basic clauses and separate provisions concerning the problem of cease of military actions in Zangezur. In order to create a ground for the conference both sides conveyed their proposals to J.Ray on November 22 and requested him to take upon a function of mediator.

After additional meetings and negotiations on November 23, 1919 the agreement between Azerbaijan and Armenia had been signed by the mediation of Americans. The agreement was signed by N.Yusifbeyli and A.Khatisyan, heads of Azerbaijan and Armenia governments, J.Ray, representative of the USA in a position of guarantee and E. Gekechkori, Foreign Affairs Minister of Georgia. Agreement consisted of five clauses envisaged the following:

1. Armenia and Azerbaijan undertake to stop current clashes and do not use weapons once again.
2. Armenia and Azerbaijan governments agree to repair and open roads to Zangezur and implement measures for safe movement through those roads.
3. Armenia and Azerbaijan governments undertake to solve all disputes, including border issues, through peace negotiations. In case when result will not be achieved by peace negotiations both governments agree to choose a neutral person for position of the third party-judges and accept its decisions as a must; at the present time such neutral person is Colonel J.Ray.
4. It is agreed to hold Armenian-Azerbaijan conference on November 26,

1919.

5. The agreement is taken into account from the day of signing and will be in force since the day of ratification by both Republics parliaments.

Concluded agreement was temporary. That was because a whole set of disputable matters between two countries had to be solved at the future Armenian-Azerbaijan conference in accordance with that agreement. Touching its results, it must be noted that this agreement was not beneficial for Azerbaijan, on the contrary, it damaged political -military interests and positions of Azerbaijan.

By its content the agreement did not significantly change the situation and did not solve territorial disputes. It failed to define precise and clear principles for future solution of discords between two Republics; in fact, it meant "status quo". The agreement only legalized the actual situation and envisaged mutual cease of military actions and necessity of negotiations in case of emerging conflicts.

The second and the major point is that believing into the agreement, Azerbaijan soon withdrawn its military forces from Zangezur. Similar to the situation with Garabagh, the Armenia upon deciding that the situation will not be beneficial for it, in aim to exert influence on Azerbaijan to stop "military actions", had appealed to Georgia, namely to Uordop and Ray and the appeal gave its negative result. Armenia, taking advantage from the situation had violated the agreement and immediately deployed additional units of its regular troops in Zangezur. Armenian armed forces mercilessly slaughtered civil Turkish population in Zangezur and Dereleyaz districts.

The third, this agreement did not provide the peace and stability in the region due to it being the diplomatic trick of Armenians. On contrary, it led to further deepening of political controversy and military conflict between two states.

Starting from the first days since signing of the agreement on November 23, 1919 Armenians intensified military actions in Zangezur. Touching the position of representations of western countries in Caucasus, it must be noted that as in previous cases they were satisfied only by issuing diplomatic notes and did not attempted to regulate the problem in a way which will suite both sides.

Azerbaijan-Armenian conference was held through December 14-21, 1919 in Baku. APP (Azerbaijan People Party) was represented by F.Khoyski (chairman), M.Hajinsky and R.Vekilov and Armenian side was represented by Arutyunants (chairman), Argutinsky, Dolokurov and Bekzadyan. Major aspects of negotiations at the conference are the next:

1. Azerbaijan delegation (F.Khoysky and M.Hajisky) defined the major task of the conference as resolving territorial-borders disputes according to agreement from November 23. In this respect, they suggested to discuss at first the territorial problems. Armenian delegation (Arutunyants and Bekzadyan) responded that it is not the correct time and there are no necessary conditions for resolving of the territorial disputes. They insisted that at first the problems of refugees and

temporary demarcation borders should be considered. In this case, F.Khoysky underlined that there will be no use of temporary borders-demarcation line and stressed that considering diplomatic statement of November 2 as "Status quo" the discussion of territorial claims should not be delayed.

2. There were defined positions in respect of some aspects of territorial problem:

- define all aspects of the problem and speakers, make it clear why borders have to be temporarily defined (F.Khoysky);
- postponement of the problem solution due to unavailability of participating sides (Arutunyan)
- immediate start of negotiations (Bekzadyan)
- make clear position of Armenian side in respect of the problem (Vekilov).

3. As a result of further exchange of ideas Azerbaijan delegation suggested to discuss territorial problems as a whole and under present situation to solve the problem only by defining demarcation line. This conclusion proceeded from a number of causes:

- unconformity of position of Armenian representatives;
- unclear intentions of Armenians;
- extreme complexity of the problem;
- sharply distinguished approaches of both governments;
- possible negative results of distinct bordering at present situation.

4. To the end of negotiations there were acute disputes agreement defines demarcation line or "modus vivende" and the agreement can be approved once again and proposed to continue negotiations in Tiflis. Azerbaijan diplomats reminded that immediately after signing of November 23 agreement the Armenia violated the agreement (M.Hajinsky) and underlined that the conference has no authority to approve the agreement (F.Khoysky).

5. At the second plenary session of the conference the following proposals were expressed:

- a) to stop military actions between Republics;
- b) in respect of all controversial problems to make positions totally clear through negotiations (Argutinsky and Dolqorukov).

In general, the conference did not clarified relations between two countries and did not gain any progress in solution of territorial-border disputes.

JOURNALISTS WENT TO ARMENIA AND DAGLYG GARABAGH SHOULD BE PUNISHED NOT FORGIVEN

It is up to you to put the common before or after the word NOT

It is not long time since the scandal in November of 2001, when Namik Abbasov, National Security Minister published "facts of indecent behavior" of our journalists in Armenia, and now the next group of Azerbaijani newspaper and television workers went there. After their return from Armenia even the "panel discussion" was held in the editorial office of pro-government newspaper "Yeni Azerbaijan", where expediency of mutual visits of Armenian and Azerbaijani journalists was discussed.

Since that period the dispute is unresolved whether visits of our journalists to Daglyg Garabagh and Armenia is good or bad. I was three times in those places and I think that these visits are necessary, at least in aim not to be "fed" by false information about Armenia and Daglyg Garabagh.

One may object me, correctly indicating my subjectivity. Let me cite opinions of aces of journalism.

They may go - thinks Arif Aliyev, the chairman of journalist organization "Yeni Nesil". From 1994 the war of armed forces was replaced by information war, importance of which could be seen in postulate of Committee of military headquarters of the USA: without victory in information war there is no military victory.

Beybala Mirzayev, Executive producer of "Space" television channel, continues this opinion and remembers that Englishmen during the World War II prior to army attack invited the best journalists of USA and Europe, which implemented wide anti-German propaganda. This was one of the reasons of reluctant fight of German soldiers against Englishmen and Americans.

However, Minister NAbbasov meant a bit different thing: cooperation of our journalists with intelligent service of enemy. The group of our colleagues will hardly convey any secret information to enemy if they go to Armenia and Daglyg Garabagh and actually, the Minister did not show such fact - thinks Eldaniz Elgun, the journalist from same television company.

It is strange to hear blames of our opponents that Azerbaijani journalists visiting Armenia and Daglyg Garabagh are smiling and posing for photos with Armenians and sit with them at the dinner table. May be, President H.Aliyev did not smile to R.Kocharyan or our fellows being in Khankendi and Yerevan had to eat Azerbaijani canned food?

I am sure that it is better to make an opinion about patriotism of our journalists on the basis of their speeches and papers, but not evaluating the food they eat together with Armenians. Besides, having a good wine in hand it is possible to say to separatist something that will force him into deep thoughtfulness while suffering of insomnia.

It is a pity that those who protest visits of our journalists to "behind the trenches" they admit: no journalist being "there" or later, upon return to Motherland did say or write something that can be evaluated as betrayal of national interests. If it is not true, then it is a shame that National Security Ministry did not detain such "traitor" - complained E.Elgun.

It seems that according to initiatives of international organizations such visits will take place until the war in Garabagh restarts.

Consequently, there are questions. Who have to go there?

Experienced journalists, heads of journalist organizations of Azerbaijan are of opinion that "babies", i.e. those who just come into journalism must not be sent to Armenia. It would be correct if Council of Editors or other journalist organizations of Azerbaijan undertake to control quality of our delegations. At the same time, according to A.Aliyev, in cases, when visit is organized by international organizations, they select journalists by themselves. Consequently, the "pitfalls" are not the exception.

The other question is - where to go? May be, it would be better to focus on Daglyg Garabagh? We already know (namely due to visits of our journalists) that relations between citizens of Daglyg Garabagh (DG) and Armenia vary from mutual hatred to spitefulness. One party blames the other (vice-versa) that Armenians (both of DG and Armenia) live under bad conditions and fight with Azerbaijan.

So, if we think that Armenians of Daglyg Garabagh are citizens of Azerbaijan and if we do want that those Armenians strive to be citizens of our country, we have to be friendly to them. As correctly said A.Gukasyan, the leader of separatists of Daglyg Garabagh, until the population of DG will make such decision the Garabagh issue will not be resolved. Even if these people will be forced to sign unwanted peace treaty there will be a lot of people who will arm and go to mountains to fight against Azerbaijan.

As mentioned A.Aliyev, there is no war now and if we just sit in our capitals and write about what Russian journalists have seen in Yerevan (Khankendi, Baku) we will not make victory closer. Besides, in any normal society, journalists are requested to go "there" and even risking by their lives to inform the people.

So, we - journalists, and not politicians and businessmen have to go to DG and Armenia more frequently until there is no war, in order to communicate, cooperate and even help to ordinary and poor people of Daglyg Garabagh.

Because, in fact only they can put the final point in the old dispute - whether Daglyg Garbagh must be within Azerbaijan or Armenia?

Kamil Salimov

**INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING OPERATION TO
FORCE FOR PEACE - REAL PATH FOR RESOLUTION
OF GARABAGH CONFLICT**

Accumulation of problems does not mean leaning back from their resolution. On the contrary, this obliges us to seek ways out and in respect of situation in Daglyg Garabagh and nearby areas it is required to make geopolitical leap in global scale.

Undoubtedly, one of ways out consist is use of military force and namely, start of military actions in conflict zone for liberation of occupied territories. In this respect, military actions as a mean for conflict resolution should not be excluded from arsenal of acceptable means. Its application is justified, providing that force, including armed forces, is applied according to legislation and only if peaceful means were inefficient.

It must be noted that forms for applying force are different and include, in general, such measures as detention of separatist "leaders" and terrorists groups, creation of "peace corridors" and interference of peacekeeping forces, which may impact some events, which keep the conflict.

However, starting the war, especially if it is the liberation war since we talk about restoration of territorial integrity is easy. It is necessary to be ready for war and especially to be ready for peace, which sooner or later will be established between two neighboring countries. The major task is to make sure that, starting military actions we will win with minimum human losses. It should be noted, that nobody must have doubts in military training of national army of Azerbaijan, since the psychological factor is concerned - national-patriotic spirit of our people. We have also take into account that for the last period a lot has been done in the country for army.

But, this fact only is not sufficient for achieving a victory. A clear example is military operations of Russian army in Chechnya, which administrative borders within Russian Federation are controlled by government. The start of military actions in Daglyg Garabagh does not exclude possibility of this being of a long-term positional nature.

This is probably related to the reason that some countries, in particular Russia will assist Armenia financially, technically and by other means. A significant role in assisting Armenia will probably have Iran, which support

Armenia in any way and has common border with Armenia and uncontrolled border with occupied territory of Naglyg Garabagh. In addition, actions of Azerbaijan will be qualified by international community with a service of official Yerevan as a next Turkish genocide against Armenian minority - citizens of Azerbaijan in Naglyg Garabagh.

In this case one can predict behavior of great western powers, international and European organizations, and especially our north neighbor, which could repeat scenario of B.Yeltsin of 1992, when Russia's government blocked railways, highways and water communications of Azerbaijan. This played significant role in occupation of our territories. On the other hand, the problem is whether we will be able to continuously use marine and onland communications through the territory of Georgia to the West, taking into account present complex situation in Georgia.

Which actions should be undertaken to reach concrete results? In our point of view, the major task consists in gaining by Azerbaijan the political support and international sanctions for implementation of considered problems. First of all, it is required to achieve acknowledgement of already occurred international crime in Naglyg Garabagh. In this respect, the initial legal position should be defined for evaluation of criminal actions in Naglyg Garabagh not as the infringement of international law, but as international crime.

In fact, it is necessary to analyze resolutions of legislative and executive organizations of Republic of Armenia, which contain sufficient number of evidences about direct aggression of Armenia against Azerbaijan and violation of its territorial integrity and sovereignty.

At the same time, it is necessary to give legal evaluation of actions of illegal armed groups of marionette "army of Naglyg Garabagh" as terrorist national-separatist forces. Analysis of legislative and normative acts of Armenia, as well as actions of "Naglyg Garabagh army" enable us to confidently state that there are all required legal bases to achieve acknowledgement of Armenia's aggression by international organizations and expediency to impose political and economic sanctions against Armenia.

Thus, to start the procedure, today we need to reach imposition of political and economic sanctions against Armenia and so-called "army of Naglyg Garabagh", which consequently will allow us to start use of force in Naglyg Garabagh. In fact, we talk about humanitarian action of influence by force. We will not consider here the problem of legal evaluation in detail due to limits of this publication. However, we must note one important aspect, which has a specific role while consideration of all scenarios of possible events.

If conflicting parties will not gain a success by peace negotiations, in case of start and cease of military operations, return of refugees and IDPs back to their settlements and providing safety of Azerbaijani and Armenian citizens the issue of

peacekeeping forces deployment in conflict area will gain a special importance. It is commonly known that in international practice there is a method for separation of conflicting parties, which envisages creation of "safety corridor" and deployment of peacekeeping forces there. That is why, today Azerbaijan must be prepared to such scenario and, consequently, consider possibility of adopting efficient and collective measures for liberation of occupied territories.

In addition, it is required to thoroughly study international practice of control over regulation of conflicts at any stage, which constitutes necessary portion of foreign policies of all countries.

In this respect, Minsk group of OSCE must define a new strategy for regulation of Garabagh conflict. Thus, in modern international law there are the following qualifying features of the conflict: prevention, management, regulation, transformation, which relate to various stages of emerging and development of conflicts.

Taking into account destructive tools of policy of Armenia towards Azerbaijan, including aggressive actions of separatist regime of Daglyg Garabagh by means of "Daglyg Garabagh army", which is qualified as international crime, it is necessary to appeal to UN in order to choose some intermediate position, which in modern international practice is called as "measures for implementation of peace process" or "measures for forcing to peace". These measures are fulfilled without consent of the party-initiator of the conflict and envisage use of elements of forced actions within framework of peacekeeping contingent of UN.

The good example is actions of coalition of UN states-members with leading position of USA, which liberated Kuwait from occupation of Iraq during the war in Persian Gulf in 1991. Peace support envisage peacekeeping activity of military servicemen and in particular, deployment of military forces to ease regulation process, for which there are four resolutions of Security Council, which oblige Armenian forces to liberate occupied territories.

In this case, we mean activity of Azerbaijan, as well as activity of international community according to international law in pursue of making decisions for imposing economic and political sanctions against Armenia and "army of Daglyg Garabagh".

Undoubtedly, this activity envisages various tactical means and approaches, starting from forced actions to diplomatic measures and from economic pressure to social-cultural programs.

At present, in various portions of the world 16 such operations of UN for peace-enforcement are implemented. Usually special missions of "blue helmets" are involved in these operations.

However, it is no need to think that "blue helmets" will take active part in military actions. Strategy and tactics consists in liberation of occupied territories

by national army and internal forces of Azerbaijan. Mission of "blue helmets" will only fulfill control in order to keep military and political stability in the region.

In our point of view all above indicated proposals constitute realistic approach to the problem and may assist to liberation of occupied territories, restoration of law and territorial integrity of Azerbaijan and keeping peace and order for all citizens of Azerbaijan, irrespective of their nationality.

No doubt, such strategy gives Azerbaijan another chance to regulate Garabagh conflict with participation of international peacekeeping forces, which in its turn will guarantee implementation and safety of transnational projects, which have pivotal importance for a whole region and international community.

Kemale Huseynova

GENOCIDE OF MOSLEM TURKS THROUGH 1905-1906 IN GARABAGH

The first revolution of XX century, which is known in history as a century of revolutions, was the I bourgeois-democratic revolution in 1905-1907. The revolution triggered deepening of social-economic and political crisis, active struggle of working class, which turned into the leading force of revolutionary movement, activation of people in rural areas and struggle for independence of ethnic minorities, which constituted 57 percent of population.

Baku being the base of raw materials for developing industry of empire and one of the four largest industrial centers had transformed into the center of workers' movement. The strike of workers in oil fields of Balakhany, Sabunchu, Ramany started from December 13 and ended on December 30 by signing of collective agreement, the first in Russian history between oil industrialists and workers. Use of economic terror methods (125 rigs were burned through December 25-30 in oil fields of Balakhany-Sabunchu-Ramana, in total 225 were burned). (D.Huseynov. Glorious victory of Baku proletariat. Baku, 1955, p. 61, I. Bagirova. Political parties and organizations of Azerbaijan at the start of XX century. Baku, 1977, p.66-67).

Russian empire, which attempted to keep its dominance, in order to distract masses from revolution applied "one of the most ancient methods of despotism" consisted in "separation" of nations which are its subjects and cause a confrontation between them.

Failure of separatist activity of Armenian nationalist groups formed in the second half of the XIX century on the territory of Ottoman empire lead to transfer of their activity center to Azerbaijan. Despite that all this was well known to

Russian empire, Russia as a continuation of Russian chauvinism supported fight of Armenian-Dashnak gangs, which had gained experience in "struggle" in Turkey against armless peaceful Azeri Turks.

Dashnaks, which widened its structure and thoroughly armed, started to fulfill its dirty aims - withdraw Moslems from their homeland and fight for creation of Armenian state. First attacks took place in areas with dense Armenian population - Yelizavetpol, Irevan province, Gars, Shusha and Nakhchivan, because they have higher chances here. Members of totally armed "zinvor" units, taking advantage of absolute indifference of government bodies of tsarist Russia, started to mobilize Armenians for struggle against "Turks". Speedily moving Dashnak armed forces fell like typhoon on unprotected Turk villages and mercilessly devastated them. Their tactics was very simple: unexpectedly attacking civil population to kill them, loot and burn their houses, and finally went away in order to avoid revenge. (B.Nadjafov. Face of enemy. History of Armenian nationalism in Caucasus in the end of XIX-beginning of XX century. Baku. 1993, p. 174-175).

Armenian nationalist program of creation of "Great Armenia" envisaged as one of the major tasks the occupation of Shusha. Shusha being a major city and one of the social-economic, cultural centers of Garabagh, also possessed favorable geographic and strategic location. "Dashnaksutun" even had plans to connect Shusha and Ganja and rendered money in amount of 60 thousand for construction of pipeline. That highway had to pass through territory of Azerbaijani villages in Garabagh (B.Nadjafov. Face of enemy. History of Armenian nationalism in Caucasus in the end of XIX-beginning of XX century. Baku. 1993, p. 182). Armenian-Moslem conflict started on February 6 of 1905 in Baku "... exploded as a bomb... and a whole Caucasus was under fire from here. (M.S.Orudubadi, Bloody years. Baku, 1991, p.13). Over May-June of 1905 Armenian-Moslem conflict covered provinces of Irevan, Nakhchivan, Shusha, Jebrail and Garyagin. In the summer of 1905 the government made no attempt to stop Armenian-Moslem confrontation in Baku, Ganja, Shusha, Jebrail and Garyagin.

Population of Shusha, being inattentive to Armenians armament and preparation for war, continued to live with thoughts "may an Armenian be an athlete?", "Armenians are cowards". On August 8 of 1905 Armenians killed an Iranian Azerbaijani and looted caravans of Moslems. On August 16 an Armenian was killed by Kazaks while attempting to escape. Armenians who blamed Azerbaijani for these event started riots. After the dentist Mashoryans' call for Armenians to start the war against Turks the Azerbaijani districts of the city were attacked. On August 17 thoroughly armed Armenians attacked Azerbaijani districts Khalfali and Kocharli of Shusha. The attack was beaten off by Azerbaijani. On August 19 Azerbaijani fired Khandemirov theater and a number of houses of Armenians. Firing in Shusha continued until September 10. Arrival of Vorontsov-Dashkov, representative for Caucasus put the end to firing. Despite that

from September 14th the peace was announced, 17 Iranian workers were mercilessly killed by Armenians on August 21. However, Moslems showed the patience and did not break the peace. During the August events in Shusha about 100 Azerbaijani were killed and 20 houses were burned. (M.S.Ordubadi. Bloody years. Baku, 1991, p.58). A year later the second Shusha tragedy happened by the blessing of empire's officials. Armenians fulfilled bloodshed in Nakhchivan and Irevan in the summer of 1906 continuing their offensive activity. Armenians, which in June did not reach their goals in districts of Jabrail-Garyagin showed a distinct diligence and taking advantage of weakness of Garbagh beys succeeded to bring back the Goloshapov, head of Duma. Upon return by instigation of Armenian Kiki Kalantarov, he allowed the next round of genocide against Azerbaijani population of Shusha. Dashnaks, which succeeded in gathering in Shusha of 7000 armed Armenians from surrounding villages, also supported by 850 Russian soldiers subordinate to the General. Due to treacherous activity of Kiki Kalantarov, on July 12 Goloshapov, who accepted a bribe in amount of 10 thousand mantas, give a permission to Armenians for a broad armed attack against Moslem population of Shusha. "...5 cannons of Russian army, 6 cannons of Armenians shot from trenches without the break... citizens of Shusha with only one cannon put on the wheels moved from one trench to other and confused Armenians. This bronze cannon made by master from Shusha caused such an awful noise... that Armenians were horrified" (M.Navvab. Armenian-Moslem conflict took place in Shusha in July. "Veten qezeti" newspaper. August 28, 1991, p.4-5). Azerbaijani with support of groups of people from surrounding villages started counter-attack and put on fire houses in Armenian districts and occupied trenches of Armenians. In the battle lasted for 5 days 18 Azerbaijani and about 700 Armenians were killed. Among Kazaks and Russians there were 31 killed. (M.Navvab. Armenian-Moslem conflict took place in Shusha in July. "Veten qezeti" newspaper. September 5, 1991, p.2). Despite that the peace was announced between Armenians and Azerbaijani on July 18, Goloshapov, who clearly comprehended his own fault, behaved with a great care in the city. After a number of complains to government bodies from Moslems, Goloshapov was sent to Tiflis, where he was killed by activists of "Difai" party.

These events in Garabagh were not the first and not the last of Armenian atrocities. It is an interesting fact that despite a century elapsed since those events, the tactics and strategy of Armenians were not changed. M.S.Ordubadi on the basis of 245 respondent letters painfully described Turk-Moslems genocide fulfilled by Armenians in Azerbaijan through 1905-1906. Most of the causes of that genocide do exist today.

**DYNAMICS OF POPULATION AND ETHNIC
COMPOSITION OF DAGLYG GARABAGH
AUTONOMOUS REPUBLIC**

One of the most falsified issues in history of DGAR is dynamics of population changes and ethnic composition. In this respect, in order to display position of Armenian authors, let us consider the table compiled by prof. Y.Barsegov.

Table 1.

Comparison of values of DGAR population by values of natural increase and actual figures (according to census) by prof. Y.Barsegov

The source: Y.G.Barsegov. Right for self-determination is the basis for democratic resolution of ethnic problems. Problem of Daglyg Garabagh. Yerevan, 1989, p. 101.

Years	Armenians		Azerbaijani	
	Actual figure	Counted figure	Actual figure	Counted figure
1921	12806	128060	7594	7594
1939	132800 (3.6%)	208317 (38.5%)	14100 (46.1%)	9875 (23.1%)
1959	110100 (20.6)	375667 (44.5%)	18000 (21.7%)	15003 (37.5%)
1970	121100 (9.1%)	517223 (27.45%)	27200 (33.8%)	22315 (29.2%)
1979	123100 (1.6%)	620238 (16.6%)	37200 (26.9%)	27176 (17.9%)
1989		731959 (15.3%)		32548 (16.5%)

In order to mislead the reader, Y.Barsegov gives only absolute figures, however to make comments more clear it is necessary to consider relative figures also. By adding relative evaluations to the table it is possible to see how absurd is figures in the table. Is that logical if in case of actual increase of Armenian population as 3.6%, evaluations show 38.5% and in case of actual increase of Azerbaijani is 46.1% evaluations shows it as 23.1%. Such approach is the reflection of deliberate distortion from the truth and since it is done in very rough

manner it is not anything but deception of reader. Now, let us consider such evaluations in order to consider the problem from scientific point of view.

Table 2.

Average density of Armenian population in Armenia and Y.Barsegov's evaluations for DGAR

Years	Average density of Armenian population		
	In Armenia (actual figure)	In DGAR (according to Y.Barsegov)	
		In total	Difference in comparison to Armenia
1921	-	29.1	-
1926	25	-	-
1937	33.8	-	-
1939	35.6	47.3	+ 11.7
1959	52.1	85.4	+33.3
1970	74.1	117.5	+43.4
1979	91.4	141	+49.6
1989	103.4	166.4	+63

Source: Census 1926. Transcaucasus SFSR, v.XIV.M., 1929, p.1 1-13;

Incorrectness of Y.Barsegov's evaluations is seen by astronomic figures he gave for average population density for mountain areas of 4.4 thousand sq.km. Armenian authors distort the truth in such a manner that it is quite difficult to recover it. Real figures in respect of population dynamics of DGAR are as the following.

Dynamics of population in DGAR through 1926-1988

Years	Population number, thousand	Increase in comparison to previous period		Average annual increase for the period, percent
		by thousand people	percent	
192	125,3	-	-	-
193	150,8	25,5	20,4	1,45
195	130,4	-20,4	-13,5	-0,7
197	150,3	19,9	15,3	1,3
197	162,2	11,9	8,1	0,85
198	182,4	20,2	12,5	1,3

Source: Z.Samed-zadeh. Daglyg Garabagh: unknown truth (About some aspects of social-economic and demographic development of region). Baku, 1995, p.31.

This table based on results of official census (excluding 1989) is more accurate in reflecting the real situation.

Now, let us consider figures reflecting ethnic composition of DGAR population.

Table 4.

Ethnic composition of DGAR population
(according to census; by thousands)

	1939		1959		1970		1979	
	absolute		absolute	%	absolute		absolute	
All population	150,8	00	130.4	100	150.3	100	162.2	100
Armenians	132,8	88,1	110.1	84,4	121,1	80,6	123,1	75,9
Azerbaijani	14,1	9,4	18,0	13,8	27,2	18,1	37,3	23,0
Russians	3,2	2,1	1,8	1,4	1,3	0,9	1,3	0,8

Source: Achievements of Daglyg Garabagh in the 9th five-years. Stated., Stepanakert, 1976, p.8, Samed-zadeh Z. Ind.col., p.31.

Despite that census of 1989 held prior to collapse of USSR was influenced by events of that period, the Foreign Ministry of Azerbaijan published ethnic map of DGAR. It can be seen from the map that according to census of 1989 in DGAR of 187.8 thousand people 145.4 thousand were Armenians (77%) and 40.3 thousand (21.5%) were Azerbaijani.

It can be observed that in comparison to census of 1939-1979 Azerbaijani population in DGAR increased. This was due to devotion of Azerbaijani to their own land and demographic increase. On the contrary, Armenians are known as the nation prone to migration and their growth was low. Prior to 1989 census, attempts made by Armenians to change ethnic content of the region led to decrease of a number of Azerbaijani.

Leyla Aliyeva

THE CONFLICT AND DEVELOPMENT OF STATEHOOD

One of paradoxes, which frequently mentioned in the literature about the region and about Garabagh conflict in particular, consists in the fact that the 20% of territory of the country with 8 mln. population and rich natural resources is under occupation of country with 3 mln. population, i.e. by country approximately 2 times smaller and with poor resources. The argument frequently stated at the start of 1990-ies, that it is explained by Russia's military assistance to Armenia (or participation of Russian army from Armenian side) became weaker in the course of time, especially in the light of failure of Russia's first military action in Chechnya.

Attempts to search for causes of Azerbaijan's military failures in external factors, even substantiated, in fact diverted attention from deep internal political factors, i.e. the nature of state development in the country during post Soviet era. In 1993 two scientists from Harvard University published a book "Strategy of unforcible conflict". Based on examples from the history of the XX century the authors show that even small and weak country or nation may win over country, which is stronger in military respect (for instance, superpower) only if they have thoroughly developed and clever strategy. This crashes the idea that any resistance to a state with powerful military forces is useless.

Existence of the country and defense of its integrity under conditions of threat depend, first of all on existence of efficient government institutions. Within the framework of these institutions there are developed and implemented strategies

for settlement of crucial political problems - legitimate power, army, external policy ministries and diplomatic services, etc.

This, in its turn depends on a series of objective and subjective reasons

1. Rate and character of national mobilization (consolidation).

In distinction to Armenia and Georgia, the national government in Azerbaijan has been established 2 years later. Since development of government institutions, including national army, depends directly on implementation of independent policy, it is obvious why establishment of such institutions as army were delayed. (The other question is, why national consolidation went slowly and harder than in other countries of Caucasus: as one of the reasons the deeper assimilation policy of Russia in Azerbaijan can be indicated, which led to establishment of more firm support of communists in Azerbaijan and their higher resistance to consolidation- nationalistic processes in the community).

2. Internal political instability, frequent change of power.

Azerbaijan, when compared to other countries of former Soviet Union, is distinguished by almost a record speed of change of leaders through the period from 1988 to 1993. Through these 6 years the 5 leaders power change took place in Azerbaijan. It is obvious that such instability negatively reflected on rate of development of power institutions.

3. Incomplete legitimacy of authorities.

Weakness of post Soviet Azerbaijan is significantly explained by degree of power legitimacy. In some cases leaders came to power not through elections, in other cases they considered elections of only one branch of power as quite sufficient, or held elections which do not keep with international standards.

4. Use of resources and potential by leaders in order to develop state strategy.

Leaders of post Soviet Azerbaijan could not properly use their leader potential (such as charisma, popularity, nationalism) for development of strong institutions and consolidate the power, or in case if they succeed in doing this, they excessively centralize it, ignoring the role of any institutions except for presidential power.

All this, ultimately, influenced possibility of creation of strong army, mobilization of huge intellectual, human and natural resources for development of strong state and efficient strategy, for creation of the country's image and attempts to win in information war, for ability to create alliances and gain international support.

Idealism or limited pragmatism in foreign policy does not allow to foresee or comprehend the essence of international relations. In respect of settlement of Garabagh conflict the realism consists in comprehension of mechanism of making decisions at international level, comprehension of difference between "victory"

and "settlement" of the conflict and understanding of limits and interests of countries involved in resolution of the conflict.

Process of resolution of Garabagh conflict has transformed from the stage of lobbying of involved countries interests into the level of influence on conceptions for conflict resolution in international organizations or level of intellectual "competition".

The leaders must resolve for themselves: do they want to "win" the war at the battle-field or war of intellectual strategies, or "resolve" the conflict, which means "search for mutually acceptable solution". In both cases the success will depend on ability of leader to mobilize, first of all, intellectual, human and other resources in a community with abundance of those resources.

Leyla Yunus

ARMENIAN POTENTIAL FOR PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT OF THE CONFLICT

First of all, I would like to note that I'm the supporter of peaceful settlement of the conflict. The Armenian side is united and its division into Yerevan and Garabagh parts is incorrect in my viewpoint. Armenian side is divided into powerful people and other citizens. The state power of Armenia with Robert Kocharyan as its head, does not admit peaceful resolution of the conflict. (Peaceful resolution of the conflict envisages restoration of territorial integrity of Azerbaijan by peace negotiations). In distinction to L.Ter-Petrosyan, which is ready to resolve the conflict through peace negotiations by stage-by stage approach, Kocharyan directs negotiations into deadlock of a so-called package agreement. Approach of Kocharyan consists not in resolution of the problem, but in further living with this problem. Potential for peaceful resolution of the conflict of present Armenian government is equal to zero. A different approach of society exists both in Armenia and in Garabagh. Armenians with a common sense do understand that without peaceful settlement, a new round of military actions could not be avoided. Armenians, which suffer from difficult social-economic situation, obviously do not want a new war.

How can we assist and how we impede Armenian community development to direction of peaceful settlement? Evidently, economic prosperity of Azerbaijan, creation of strong army, correct foreign policy, democratization of society, development of civil legal society - is the only real way to peaceful resolution of the conflict. Undoubtedly, the significant part of responsibility for resolution of problems rests with Azerbaijan government. However, representatives of civil society may and must make their possible contribution into

development of strong democratic state. We do not live behind the iron wall any more and all our successes and problems are known to our neighbors also. They will have to take into account Azerbaijan with developed economy and strong army.

The second element of peaceful resolution, which is not less important, is the authentic information of Armenian side about position of Azerbaijan society in respect of peaceful resolution of the conflict. I would like to consider two impeding factors, which we create by ourselves.

The first it is necessary that neither Armenians nor international community HAVE ILLUSIONS that our community may agree with violation of territorial integrity of Azerbaijan.

Therefore, it is required to voice evaluation and stop of so-called "public diplomacy" of such organizations as HCA, which leader spoke at international conferences with statements that most of Azerbaijani community supports visits of Garabagh Armenians and is ready for reconciliation. Even in 1992 the meetings of Azerbaijan's HCA with Armenians shaken battle-spirit of soldiers in trenches. How could a soldier fight and die for the Motherland if he knows that at the same time his countryman sits with enemy at the same desk. Organized since 1994 the warm reception of Armenian delegations in Baku awaken in them false hopes that part of our community reconciled with loss of Garabagh.

The second - it is necessary that Armenians and international community be CONFIDENT that, Azerbaijan's citizens of Armenian nationality, which respect Constitution and Laws of Azerbaijan are defended by Law and their rights can not be violated. Statements of some officials of Azerbaijan like "It is indecent to defend a man, which origin of that of enemy" (statement of Nazim Nagiyev, head of Police department of Sabail region, said on April 2002 to "Zerkalo" newspaper in respect of arrest of Faina Kungurova, active member of ADP) in fact announces citizens of Azerbaijan of Armenian nationality out of law.

In Azerbaijan there must be the legal state, which defend rights of all its citizens irrespective of their nationality. Armenians of Garabagh and Armenia must be confident that Azerbaijan nation never will agree to change territory of our country and Armenians - citizens of Azerbaijan will have all constitutional rights in democratic, independent and legal society of Azerbaijan. It is the only way to peaceful resolution of the conflict.

**ANTI-AZERBAIJAN ACTIVITY OF ARMENIAN EXTREMISTS
IN GARABAGH (1918-1920)**

Armenian political organizations created mechanism of transfer of nonsense ideas about "Great Armenia from sea to sea" into the plain of concrete military-political events, expressed in their anti-Azerbaijan activity through 1918-1920.

Proclaiming of Azerbaijan Republic on May 28, 1918 in Tiflis and organizing of its government on the same day created new political realities, which had to be taken into account by Armenian political organizations. They faced a vital necessity to change their tactics in respect of narrower sphere of activity for reaching hegemony in Caucasus. They constantly attempted to destabilize the situation.

A special concern of Armenians caused the fact of assignment of Kh.P.Sultanov for position of General -Governor of Garabagh according to decree of Ministers Council of Azerbaijan Republic dated from January 15, 1919. Protests against this assignment poured out from Armenian political parties operated in Azerbaijan, as well as from those in Yerevan. Acute discussions took place in the Parliament. In the end, Foreign Minister of ADR demanded from M.Kh.Tekinsky, the diplomatic representative of Azerbaijan in Armenia, to inform officially government of Armenia that Khosrov Pasha bek Sultanov was assigned by decree of Azerbaijan government and was recognized by Union's Command on April 3 as a General Governor...".

During the whole spring of 1919 the Dashnak fraction in the Parliament actively protested against activity of Kh.Sultanov. Peak of this political turmoil was in June of 1919, which coincided with higher activity of Armenian nationalists in the region. It is not accidental that all these excesses happened simultaneously with emerging danger of Denikin attack to Azerbaijan and Georgia.

Armenians in their insinuations stepped over all permissible frontiers. Now they demanded to take Kh.P.Sultanov into the court... "All directions made by General Governor about expected riots of Armenians - said dashnaks - are speculations of government spies. General Governor has actual information that Armenian population did not go further passive non-obedience to Governor and did not have any aggressive intentions, no special preparations were undertaken in the city...". Undoubtedly this was a lie. In fact the situation was different. "Because he has exceeded his authority the General Governor must be immediately sacked and taken into the court" - rudely thought dashnak deputies. Thus, Armenians claims clearly gained a form of ultimatum. To compromise meant to make a

dangerous precedent for another twist of pressure to Azerbaijan government and Parliament.

At the meeting of Azerbaijan parliament on July 7, 1919 the dashnak Chubaryan doubted objectivity of Azerbaijan deputies in respect of events in Garabagh. As he had stated outspokenly: "Position of Armenians has military-strategic value", and thus he closely approached to correct evaluation of events in west of Azerbaijan Republic.

Armenians fabrications have been unmasked by Doctor K.Karabekov, member of Commission sent to Garabagh by Azerbaijan government. In his speech from tribune of Parliament he underlined that "Armenian population of Garabagh until recently was managed independently by their own national council and their internal order was unknown to us... Such situation was in Shusha, in residence of General Governor...Members of Armenian National Council did not want to allow expansion of Azerbaijan power over Armenian part of city." Further he noted that according to opinions of Armenians, which were in records of Commission members, there "was dominated another power -irresponsible gang, which terrorized the Armenian population and did not obey Armenian National Council". At the same time, Armenian National Council did not want to make any compromise and in fact acted against Azerbaijan government. "In areas - said K.Karabekov - where there is a power represented by Armenian National Council happens something strange...".

It was established that chauvinist organizations of Armenians, operated in Shusha and Zangezur, had "political and financial ties" to Yerevan. All money were delivered here from Armenia as it was made clear while a search in house of dashnak Arzumanov in Garabagh.

Representatives of Armenian political parties in Azerbaijan Parliament, in fact, acted as advocates of dashnak Armenia and its spies in Armenia. Their lies caused contradictory attitude of Azerbaijan democracy.

On the one hand, it has become clear that dashnaks are unhidden enemies of independent Azerbaijan and it is very difficult to reach agreement with them. On the other hand, Azerbaijani deputies had shown patience and willingness while understanding that history will verdict who wanted a peace and cooperation and who by any means attempted to mask aggression and expansion. Resolution of Armenian fraction for Garabagh was rejected by the Parliament.

Armenian government sent 400 thousands rubles monthly to Armenian National Council. A whole organization of rebellious units with participation of regular officers assigned by Ararat government was discovered in Shusha. Armenian National Council and Armenian organizations here served exclusively against Azerbaijan government (underlined by the author).

Assignment by Azerbaijan government of Kh.Sultanov to a position of General Governor in Jabrail, Shusha, Zangezur regions caused a serious trouble of

Armenian party officials and triggered a next round of tension in Armenian-Azerbaijan relations. After arrival of General Governor to Shusha, Armenians did not meet him because they were terrorized by a group of "dashnaks" and stated that they are ready to recognize officials sent by Azerbaijan government. Measures, undertaken by Kh.Sultanov for normalization of situation in Garabagh met fierce resistance Armenian nationalists. Agents of Ararat party "Dashnaksutun" and local "National Council" fulfilling subversive activity and attempted to destabilize situation in Garabagh and burn the fire of ethnic clashes.

It must be noted also, that there are undeniable proofs that National Councils and parties ruling here acted according to instructions and "... on behalf of Armenian government", which gave them full authority. Position of National Council of Armenians of Garabagh were evaluated by Englishmen as sign that Armenians-dashnaks do not want peace and as uneasy element (underlined by the author) must be arrested and sent out of Garabagh.

Foreign Affairs Ministry of Armenia protested the indicated note on January 26, 1919. Armenians insistently claimed establishment of Armenian rule in those areas of Garabagh, which populated by Armenians. However, in fact, the situation was different and expansionist aspirations of Armenians were directed for larger territories, imaginary called by them as "Great Armenia". They also demanded establishment of civil ruling "without mentioning the Republic's name..."

I. One of the serious obstacles of development of Azerbaijan state at important historic period - 1917-1920 was the outspoken, cynical and inhuman expansionist policy of occupation and annexation of Azerbaijan territories fulfilled by dashnak Armenia, thoroughly shown in activity of Armenian political organizations in Azerbaijan.

II. Proclaiming of Azerbaijan independence over 1918-1920 was marred by aggression of dashnak Armenia in Garabagh, Zangezur and Nakhchivan, which stimulated by activity of Armenian political organizations.

In this respect it was vitally important:

a) to reach national reconciliation and consensus among all political parties of Azerbaijan;

b) to strengthen constitutional order of the Republic;

globalization of military policy, which penetrates all spheres of life under extreme conditions of occupation of Azerbaijan territories.

**FACTS ON ETHNIC CHANGES IN GARABAGH EXPOUNDED
IN RUSSIAN SOURCES**

There are various, contradicting to each other versions about historic roots of Daglyg Garabagh problem and ethnic content of the region through various time periods. Some Armenian historians inadmissibly falsify historic facts and express illusive versions such as the Garabagh is one of the historic provinces of Armenia. But, what is the truth? Actually, facts about Armenians arrival to our territories are sufficiently reflected in historic sources, scientific researches and archaeological materials. There are also a number of Russian authors, which confirm these facts.

Garabagh, which is now the object of disputes and conflicts, at that time the khanate of Azerbaijan was annexed to Russia according to Kurekchay agreement concluded by General Sisyanov, the head of Russian empire troops and Ibrahim khan of Garabagh. According to the second Article of Kurekchay agreement the Emperor guaranteed the integrity of a country of Garabagh khan and its successors (Acts, collected by Caucasian Archaeological Commission, vol.11, editor A.Berje. Tiflis, 1868, doc. 1436, p.702-705). However, shortly after, in 1822 the tsar government violating this Article, liquidated Garabagh khanate and regarded it as ordinary province of empire. The empire, which pledged to Ibrahim khan that "emperor guarantee integrity of a country", from administrative point of view taking into account its being a purely Moslem province, did not separate the territory of Daglyg Garabagh from Azerbaijani provinces. Even tsar government had to take into account undeniable fact that Garabagh is a Moslem province. In 1805, when Garabagh became a part of Russia, only 1/5 of its population was Armenians.

Policy of colonialism implemented by Russia in Caucasus was focused first of all on dislocation of Armenians from Turkey and Iran to Caucasus, especially to West Azerbaijan and Garabagh.

Namely through 1804-1813 and 1826-1828 during Russia-Iran wars and later, the mass dislocation of Armenians from Iran and South Azerbaijan and their settlement in South Caucasus, including Garabagh, took place. As a result, number of Armenian population here increased every year. Through the period over 1826-1828 during Russia-Iran war 18 thousand Armenian families were dislocated from Iran and south provinces of Azerbaijan to South Caucasus, including Garabagh. (MIEBGK, vol.VII, part I, p.393).

According to stipulations of Turkmenchay peace agreement concluded between Russia and Iran after the end of war, Armenians could be able to migrate without hurdles from Iran. This agreement, in fact, made possible mass migration of Armenians from Iran to South Caucasus, especially Garabagh. About the goal

of empire while mass dislocation of Armenians to South Caucasus, and Garabagh in particular, and its influence onto demographic situation in Caucasus, N.Shavrov wrote: "Our colonization policy in Caucasus started from settling there members of other ethnicities, not Russians...From 1828 to 1830 we dislocated over 40 thousand Armenians from Iran, over 84 thousand from Turkey and located them in best areas of Yelizavetpol and Irevan provinces with a small amount of Armenian population. They were given more than 200 thousand of desyatines of land and private property lands were purchased for them from Moslems for over 2 mln.manats. The mountain portion of Yelizavetpol province (i.e. mountain portion of Garabagh) and shores of Goyce (Sevan) lake were populated by those Armenians... Taking into account those who migrated unofficially the total number of dislocated people are over 200 thousand. As a result, of 1.3 millions of Armenians living in Caucasus at the beginning of XX century over 1 million were dislocated by our efforts and they were not "indigenous" population" (Shavrov N.N. New danger for Russian policy in Caucasus. SPb, 1911, p.59-61).

Russian historian V.A.Velichko wrote: "Pashkevich was sent to Iran to Colonel Lazarev in order to invite 40 thousand Armenians to Caucasus. Patriarch of Echmiadzin also participated in this. He gave an order to move Armenian priests from Iran. Based on Andrianopol agreement over 100 thousand Armenians were moved from Turkey. After this event immigration of Armenians from Moslem countries to Russia gained continuous nature and was in mass form for the last years" (V.L.Velichko. Caucasus. Russian policy and ethnic issues. Baku. "Elm", 1990).

Other Russian scientist S.Glinka wrote the following in respect of Armenians migration: "On March 9,1828 the last Russian troop left Tabriz... Armenians from various villages started to move towards Garabagh based on Turkmenchay agreement...Lazarev, who hold Duke Arqutinski Dolgorikin in Tabriz in order to control migration of Armenians, went to Maraga with several officials in order to meet Armenians which impatiently waited for him. (Glinka S. Description of migration of Azerbaijan's Armenians into Russia. Baku. "Elm", 1990, p.81).

At the same time, the author of this idea - A.Griboyedov wrote about this: "We repeatedly considered ...the possibility to calm down and attempt to remove the fear emerged in Moslems because they are of opinion that Armenians once arrived at these territories will own them forever" (Griboyedov A.S. Note about migration of Armenians from Persia into our territories, vol.2,1971).

Thus, move of Armenians from Iran and Turkey to the territory of Irevan khanate, Garabagh and other provinces of Azerbaijan according to Turkmenchay agreement, has changed the demographic situation. In "Armenian province" created on the territory of Irevan khanate in 1828 was populated by 73.8%,

however through 1834-1835 the figure drop to 46.2% (Georgia MDTA, f.2, issue 3859, p.314, p.20).

According to a count of 1832, there were 32.4 thousand (64.8%) of Azerbaijani and 17.4 thousand (34.8%) of Armenians. Thus, Armenian population increased by more than four times in short time period in comparison to 8.4% in 1823. According to later evaluations in the end of 1980-ies in Shusha district the Azerbaijani population dropped to 41.5% and Armenian population increased to 58.2%. According to Russian census in 1897 those figures were 53% and 45% respectively (Caucasus calendar of Russian empire of 1897, LXIII – Elizavetskya guberniya. SPb, 1904, p.3).

In the end of 1980-ies of XIX century on the territory of Shusha district which includes present territory of Daglyg Garabagh the number of Armenians constituted 58% of population (Caucasus calendar for 1896, V otd. P.48-61). Even after mass migration Armenians in Daglyg Garabagh Autonomous Region (DGAR) constituted only 79% (Events in DGAR in wrong mirror of forgers (Transactions), 1989, p.6-7).

Despite demographic changes in Garabagh up to 1840 the territory of former khanate officially was named as "Garabagh province" and regarded as Moslem province. This territory together with the rest of Azerbaijani regions was ruled by a head of military district "Moslem countries of Caucasus". The headquarter was in Garabagh, in Shusha. That is why, four volume book "Description of Russian territories in Caucasus" published by 4 major Ministries of Russian empire, namely defense, foreign ministry, internal affairs and finances, had shown Garabagh in the list of Moslem provinces. That was because Garabagh khanate entered into Russia as Azerbaijan khanate, but not as the Armenian province.

In 1840 after fulfilled reforms on the territory of "Garabagh province", which also covered the territory of present Daglyg Garabagh, a new administrative unit "Shusha district" was established. However, this administrative area belonged to "Kaspi" province united North Azerbaijan, but not the Imereti province of Georgia or to Irevan province established a short time after. From 1868 Shusha district was given to Yelizavetpol (Ganja) province. This province along with Baku province covered North Azerbaijan territories. In 1917 Shusha district was joined to Yelizavetpol province during the period of rule of Special Caucasus Committee. Through 1918-1920 it was joined Ganja province during the rule of Azerbaijan Democratic Republic (Sources of Azerbaijan history. Baku, 1989, p.276).

Thus, it can be seen that despite policy of Russian empire, migration of Armenians and other factors, it is undeniable fact that Garabagh is territory of Azerbaijan. But, Armenians settled in Azerbaijan territories attempted to appropriate these areas and caused serious problems for Azerbaijani people. To

reach their dirty aims Armenians killed innocent people and devastated towns and villages.

Mubariz Ahmedoglu

DEMOCRACY, STABILITY AND DEVELOPMENT IN CAUCASUS

Caucasus is the complex political organism. In geographical sense, along with Azerbaijan, Armenia and Georgia the part of Russian Federation and Turkey also belong to European part of Caucasus. Caucasus is located on the intersection of Asia and Europe. There are representatives of about 150 ethnicities and four major religions.

In general, for making progress in processes undergone in Caucasus it is necessary to accept South Caucasus countries as models. Other nations living in Caucasus have close ties with at least two of these countries.

It is required to choose these three countries as a sample in order to enhance positive impact of intersection of various interests, decrease negative impact and gain any progress in Caucasus as a whole. Russia and Turkey may participate in processes underwent in Caucasus both as interested parties and countries of Caucasus. Other three states have no this choice, they can take part only in a single status.

On the basis of conceptual views by accepting of these 3 states of South Caucasus (Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia) as models it is possible to spread successes gained here to other parts of Caucasus. For this it is required to:

I. undertake efforts to develop and adopt concept of regional security. The concept have to include the following principles:

- 1) territorial integrity of regional countries
- 2) sovereignty of countries
- 3) not to turn into the mean of the third country for interfering into internal affairs of neighbor
- 4) be useful for each other.

In respect of regional security and cooperation there may be various models: a) 3+2 (3-Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia; 2-Russia and Turkey); b) 3+3 (3-Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia, 3-Russia, Turkey, USA); c) 3+3 (3 - Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia, 3-Russia, USA, European Union). It is possible to achieve additional combinations by adding OSCE. European Union and OSCE may also play the role of guarantor for implementation of Regional Security Conception.

II. Attempt to start demilitarization processes in South Caucasus, as

well as in a whole Caucasus. Caucasus as a whole must be announced as "armless zone". It is a small probability that arms accumulated here will stay useless. No arms or military bases of other states should be here. It will be easier for Caucasian nations to find a common language without any arms at all.

III. The positions of international organizations (UN, OSCE, EU, EC, etc.) involved in resolution of existed conflicts must rely upon same standards. For this "European Security Charter" adopted at Istanbul summit (December 1999) creates wide ground. OSCE in order to enhance efficiency of its efforts in regulation of conflicts, if necessary may apply "consensus-1" (consensus minus one) or "consensus-2" (consensus minus 2) principles in case if peaceful regulation prolongs. This can prevent attempts of one or two countries to confront international community and induce parties for more responsible attitude to peaceful regulation.

IV. To develop alternative communication means, which join Caucasus with West. The only way to the west from Caucasus passes through Georgia. Political pressure to Georgia is mostly related to this. Start of operation of Baku-Mehri (Armenia)-Nakhchivan-Turkey highway will connect the whole region by two ways (taking into account the highway through Georgia) to the rest of the world and make meaningless most of pressure over Georgia. It also could made communication to the Central and Middle Asia more firm. The major obstacle for opening of alternative way is Armenia. Armenia is not interested in integration of the region into the west, it is interested in keeping territories of Azerbaijan under occupation and continue blockade of Nakhchivan.

Attitude to conflicts in Caucasus must be relied upon two principles:

1) emerging of new countries is the serious danger for security in Caucasus.

2) Preventive measures must dominate.

In other case, a number of "Countries" in Caucasus will exceed 10 in a short period of time. None of three countries (Azerbaijan, Armenia and Georgia) reject to the 3+... model of South Caucasus.

VI. It is expedient to apply consensual model of democracy for democratic development of Caucasus. Possibility of spreading of this model to other regions of South Caucasus must be seriously taken into account. This requires a long-term preparation period. This model proves itself in regions with sharply distinguishing religion and ethnicity. Consensual democracy is grounded on two major principles:

1) Democratic management and conformation of rules;

2) Development of mechanism for control over rules of game.

While democratic development in any country the close attention must be paid to relations between political parties and their internal development. Responsibility for democratic development must be with parties.

VII. To gain economic integration of South Caucasus countries it is expedient to conduct activity in 2 directions:

1) develop political situation appropriate for economic integration. This mainly consists of removal of political hurdles.

2) bring to balance the internal economical development of a country. There is such a country in the region, which economic processes in some cases apply some elements of feudalism. These elements along with impeding economical integration of countries of the region also impede their integration into global economy.

VIII. It is expedient to systemize possibilities of public diplomacy and make it more dynamic. The essence of public diplomacy must be made clear. Representatives of regional nations have constant relations within the region and outside the region.

The meetings are more frequent in CIS cities. Relations of public diplomacy are not political and that is why "Official public diplomacy" has restricted abilities in making political societies closer.

IX. It is required to carefully analyze usefulness of South Caucasian countries for each other in modern world of globalization and make countries believe it.

X. International organizations and funds operated in the sphere of developing of democratic and civil societies have to ground their work in South Caucasus on the same unit standards. Societies in all three countries of the region are not far away from each other in respect of mentality.

Remove a gap in the process of thorough analysis of Caucasus. This must involve local experts. Establish the center for studies of Caucasus with headquarter in one of European countries and minimum 4 affiliates across the region. It would be very useful to study also local traditions, their political and social essence in order to integrate into civil development.

Nasib Nasibly

REALISTIC APPROACH TO GARABAGH PROBLEM

There are different approaches to the occupation of Armenia, which lasts for 15 years and has no solution yet. Through these years a lot of various ideas have been sounded, from naive to even fantastic ones. In approach to our vital problem the dominance belonged to liberal and revolutionary ideas. In our point of view, to comprehend the problem from positions of science and find ways out, the most correct approach is realistic theory, especially theory of balance of power, which constitutes its essence.

What is the power balance theory?

Theory of power balance is developed with arising of a modern insight into international relations and constituted the basis of Great Britain's foreign policy from the XVIII century to 1890-ies. Attention to this theory was renewed after 1920-1930-ies. Later this theory was thoroughly developed by Hans Morgenthau, American scientist, and became one of the most popular theories. In brief, the theory consists of the following:

- Policy is the fight for power/might;
- Power is control over the other one through influence onto its thoughts actions;
- National power consist of such components as geographic power, natural resources, industrial power, military force, population, national character, national spirit (moral), national diplomacy and government;
- Major player in international relations is nation- state;
- Nation-state must provide its safety by itself (principle of self-help).

The next are the classic ways to provide power balance between states:

- enforcing armament;
- hold as much territory as possible;
- creation of neutral buffer state;
- allies;
- interference;
- to gain respect of allies of the opposite side in order to change power balance.

If we will apply this realistic approach of international relations to solution of Garabagh problem, what will be the result?

Causes of Garabagh problem

Emergence of this problem and its influence on the country as paralyzing force was possible because of absence of power balance between Azerbaijan and Armenia from start of the conflict up to now. Armenia from point of view of national power in 1987 - after officially stating in Yerevan of its claims on Garabagh, in other words after starting of Armenia's occupation - has the advantage in comparison to Azerbaijan:

- From viewpoint of mobilizing of its population to fight for Garabagh and organizing level, the Armenia distinguished from its neighbors;
- Due to 200 years heritage of Russian statehood the Armenians were more superior by their military training;
- Local Soviet authorities in Armenia were closely related to national movement in comparison to their counterparts in Azerbaijan.

Because of all these reasons, Armenia and Armenians, which had advantages in comparison to Azerbaijan took the initiative and additionally, attempted to attract foreign assistance to national struggle.

What is the state of national power balance after 15 years? I do not think that there is a balance between Azerbaijan and Armenia in respect of national government power and national idea. And it demands some bravery to state that Azerbaijan has advantage in one of the most sensible spheres, which are military forces. Certainly, we are glad to hear that Azerbaijan's army is strengthening year by year. However, if we will take into account the presence of Russian military bases in Armenia and speedy armament of Armenian army through the past years, when we can see that there are no reasons for excessive optimism.

At the same time, there are no doubts that by internal aspects Azerbaijan has advantages over Armenia in a few factors, primarily by its population and economic potential. Especially, vast oil and gas reserves of Azerbaijan can provide advantageous position of the country. It would be expedient to discuss positive (Azerbaijan has territory by 2.5 times larger than that of Armenia) and negative (future military actions must be conducted in high mountain areas) aspects of geographic power.

Role of foreign factors in Garabagh problem

Heydar Aliyev intended to make a radical change in the process of Garabagh conflict solution by signing a ceasefire agreement with Armenia in May 1994 and then by signing contracts with major petroleum companies of the world. According to his assumptions, huge investments into economy of Azerbaijan made by petroleum companies of great powers of the world may change that power attitude to Garabagh problem. And in fact, signed oil contracts drawn interest of foreign countries to Azerbaijan and to establishment of stability in the region. However, these did not lead to significant change of power balance required for solution of Garabagh conflict.

Since February 1992 the solution of Garabagh problem was commissioned to OSCE and thus, it has gained the status of international conflict. At present, except for major parties of the conflict - Azerbaijan and Armenia, the other countries as OSCE Minsk group co-chairs the Russia, USA and France (representative of European Union) are actively involved in Garabagh peace process. In the region of South Caucasus and Caspian sea a severe struggle for influence over the region undergoes between major players.

An acute struggle is underway between the USA, which is interested in solution of the conflict, and the Russia, which tries to keep the region within the area of its geopolitical influence. If the USA and European Union influence in the

region is increasing every year, the Russia's influence decreases proportionally. The tendency is clearly observed after September 11 events.

Even this tendency created some changes in attitude to Garabagh problem, it must be noted that indicated major players are the countries in which Armenian lobby is the most powerful. It would be naive to think that they will unconditionally support the principle of territorial integrity and offend Christian Armenia. In any case, in political bargaining between great powers the Garabagh is actively involved as a playing card and this bargaining will play a major part in Garabagh peace process.

Summary

Thus, for solution of Garabagh problem it is necessary, first of all to change power balance. Creation of power balance, which will reflect both internal and external factors, depends on result of struggle for influence in the region and processes undergoing in Azerbaijan Republic and, to a large extent, in Armenia.

In distinction to Heydar Aliyev government the real alternative powers, which are pretentious for governing, promise radical approach to the problem. In distinction to Robert Kocharyan, which came to power along the wave of Garabagh separatism, his successor (next presidential elections in Armenia will be held in 2003) may take a constructive attitude to problem solution (even more constructive than that of former president Ter-Petrosyan). Besides, some people in these two neighboring countries are tired of "neither war, nor peace" situation and tend to mutual compromise.

Intentions of annexation of Daglyg Garabagh to Armenia oi expel Garabagh Armenian separatists from Azerbaijan are seemi unreal. In fact, it is most probable that there will be applied a formula of giving high autonomy status to Garabagh Armenians within the framework of sovereignty and territorial integrity of Azerbaijan Republic.

Natavan Kerimova

EUROPEAN UNION INTEREST IN REGULATION OF DAGLYG GARABAGH CONFLICT

For the past years western countries intensified their activity in Caucasus region in all spheres. Through position and status of such organizations as UN, OSCE and EU they participated in regulation of ethnic and territorial conflicts in Caucasus. There are international observes in the region, which are constantly here in order to control implementation of various agreements.

Members of European Union consider South Caucasus not only as strategically important region, but as a platform for access to riches of Caspian sea, Central Asia and Iran - "treasure", which contains huge reserves of natural (mainly energy) resources.

After cease of Soviet control over Caucasus this territory has turned into the center of competition of various countries and political forces. Officially declared aim of activity of European countries consists in maintaining stability in the region, control over safety of transport communications. Participation of Azerbaijan in this process is most acceptable, beneficial and perspective in comparison to that of other countries of the region.

In general, political stability in the region, cease of military actions in Daglyg Garabagh always draws attention of European Union, since conflict may transform into long and bloody war. This might influence implementation of EU plans in the region of South Caucasus. The major emphasis was made on economic presence of Western countries in the region and there was a tendency to political dialog.

In the beginning of 1990-ies the EU taking into account situation in the Republic and Daglyg Garabagh started to apply measures and special programs for humanitarian assistance to population, which suffered as a result of ethnic conflict. European Union understood that without of such assistance in the region of military conflicts it will be impossible to have any future plans for development and implementation of their commercial projects within the framework of international cooperation in Eurasian region. At the same time, EU continued to monitor the situation in zone of Garabagh conflict.

Through 1993 the EU twice reacted to this problem by passing the recommendation documents. At first, the statement, which condemned actions of Armenia and appealed to it not to use deterioration of internal political situation in Azerbaijan for escalation of situation in Daglyg Garabagh, was distributed in Brussels on June 24, 1993.

The second time, on September 3, 1993 the Brussels made a statement underlining that attacks of local Armenian forces of Daglyg Garabagh extend borders of armed conflict, create serious problem of refugees in Azerbaijan and involve neighbor countries into the conflict destabilizing regional security. Thus, EU confirmed its adherence to principles of territorial integrity and sovereignty of countries in the region and called for government of Armenia to use its influence over Armenians of DG in order to keep with resolutions of 822 and 853 of Security Council of UN and stop military operations in conflict zone.

Azerbaijan hoped that with assistance of EU it would be possible to avoid widening of the conflict since political appeal of EU as authoritative international organization must have influence to Armenians. However, resolutions in respect of situation in zone of Daglyg Garabagh, repeatedly adopted by European Parliament

(February 1992, March 1999, February 2002) made it possible to doubt objectivity of EU position in this issue.

On January 17, 1994 the EU once again made statement "About situation in Azerbaijan", in which it is appealed to conflicting parties to restart negotiations for peaceful resolution of the conflict and once again confirmed its adherence to territorial integrity of Azerbaijan.

With a big satisfaction the EU met the agreement concluded in 1994 in Bishkek between Armenia and Azerbaijan on ceasefire in Daglyg Garabagh. In a response, the EU Council decided to take another step towards South Caucasian republics. EU Commission became actively involved in preparation with conflicting parties of bilateral agreements on partnership and cooperation. These actions to a large extent reflected positive attitude of EU to development of political situation in South Caucasus.

Taking into account major principles of external policy of EU, where one of priorities is the principle of peaceful resolution of military conflicts, after signing of Bishkek Agreement in May 1994 between Azerbaijan and Armenia on ceasefire in Daglyg Garabagh (i.e. after demonstration by parties the desire to keep with one of the major principles of EU) the organization started to develop legal basis for development of further cooperation.

On the eve of signing of "Agreement about partnership and cooperation between EU, its member-countries and Azerbaijan Republic" (APC) there was held a meeting between Presidents of Armenia and Azerbaijan. As a result there was adopted a communique which confirmed once again adherence to peaceful regulation of the conflict and support of ceasefire regime until making a final political agreement. For final voting on Ratification of that APC with countries of South Caucasus, the EU expressed opinion to relate the date when the Agreement enters into force with resolution of Garabagh conflict.

In this respect a certain hope was related to mediation efforts of EU as influential and authoritative international organization, for which the regulation of this conflict may become a significant contribution into stabilization of situation in the region, in aim to assist economic development of South Caucasian countries and resolution of all humanitarian issues.

Later, such practice of negotiation process continued and intensified, but its basis was put namely in the mid 1990-ies by desire of both sides to speed up integration into International Community by strengthening of regional security and development of political-diplomatic cooperation in order to prevent local military conflicts.

In January of 1997 the EU Commission submitted a draft of resolution "About strategy of European Union in relations with Caucasus republics", which defined the aim of such strategy as support to strengthening of independence of Azerbaijan, Armenia and Georgia; peaceful regulation of crises and contradictions

between conflicting parties, including the problem of Daglyg Garabagh; development of democracy and civil society; economic development of these countries. South Caucasus was announced the region of strategic interests of EU.

On February 24, 1997 Konrad Shnayder, member of Committee for external economic relations of European Parliament at the meeting with deputies of Committee in the Brussels, noted in respect of Daglyg Garabagh problem that its territory is under Armenian occupation, while Azerbaijan is the zone of strategic interests of EU.

The International Conference devoted to conflicts in Caucasus has been held in Berlin over November 26-27, 2001. It was attended by representatives of South Caucasus states and experts of many international organizations, including European Union.

Representatives of Germany, EU experts noted that European Union expresses a special interest in fight against terrorism and extremism in regions of military conflicts. In this respect, situation in South Caucasus causes the concern of EU. European Union acknowledged that armed conflicts in South Caucasus create hurdles for political and economical development of countries of the region and impede cooperation with them. That is why, it is necessary to support all efforts undertaken by countries and representatives of International Community within the framework of various international forums and organizations, such as Minsk group of OSCE and UN.

At the last meeting of the Conference there was discussed "Pact of stability in Caucasus" compiled by director of Center for political studies in Brussels and aimed for resolution of conflicts in that region. Its idea emerged in June 1999, immediately after preparation of "Pact of stability for Balkans". The author took into account the necessity to keep balance in the region between Russia, USA and European Union, and proposed a concept for resolution of conflicts in the form 3+3+2 (countries of South Caucasus; Russia; Turkey; Iran; European Union and USA).

In respect of the conflict in Daglyg Garabagh, the experts noted that EU will not recognize Daglyg Garabagh as independent entity. In addition, EU intends further develop its relations with this region. Major conditions for development of such relations will be: deepening of reforms, development of democracy, struggle against corruption and regional cooperation.

As practice shows, European experts pay a special attention to the latter issue, being of opinion that start of economic integration between parties is impossible without fulfillment of major principle of EU - reaching political resolution of the conflict.

Heikki Talvite, special representative of EU in South Caucasus countries during its recent Baku visit confirmed that European Union will certainly assist co-chairs of Minsk group of OSCE in order that contacts between parties will not

stopped. At the same time, he acknowledged that at the moment negotiations are at difficult stage. It can be said that negotiations come to nothing, there are no positive results and co-chairs of Minsk group of OSCE offered to Presidents seek solution by themselves and took position of observers.

Efforts directed for political, peaceful regulation of the conflict, which envisage restoration of communications and rendering of humanitarian assistance, and at further stages - concluding an agreement, normalizing interrelation of two republics, would be accepted with a respect by all parties. Today European Union regrets that in 1998 it was not given the mandate for participation in regulation of conflict. As a result - efforts of Minsk group of OCSE did not give any results, the tension between conflict parties has increased, time was lost and the process should be started from beginning. However, neither for Azerbaijan or Armenia nor for European Union it is not beneficial to stop at this stage. That is why, interested parties have to continue the process until gaining positive results. In addition, for security of Europe as a whole, European Union in distinction to Minsk group of OCSE and UN, has powerful economic, financial and political means and for this reason its interest in resolution of the conflict is preferable for us.

Nurani Kasumova

ARMENIA'S RELATIONS WITH RADICAL REGIMES OF MIDDLE EAST AND PROBABILITY OF "JOINING" OF ARMENIAN-AZERBAIJAN AND ARABIAN- ISRAELI CONFLICTS

Notorious "religious factor" in Garabagh conflict continues to be one of the subjects most discussed by media out of the region. Regular adoption by Organization of Islamic Conference the resolutions in which actions of Armenia - in fact, absolutely fairly - are evaluated as aggression, up to now stays as a powerful "feedback" of various cliché about "Moslem solidarity" on the one hand and constant speculations of Armenia about "Islamic fundamentalism" on the other hand. Over such peculiar background the theme of very close relations of Armenia with Moslem countries such as radical countries - Iran, Syria, Saddam's Iraq and such moderate countries as oil emirates of Persian Gulf, could not go to the second plan - facts in reality were very different to existed stereotypes and cliché.

Analysis of Armenian external policy and diplomacy shows that in high spheres of Armenian political establishment the attention to the Middle East increases. This confirmed, in particular by reaction of official Yerevan to condemnation of its actions by Organization of Islamic Conference. Let us remind: June 25-27, 2002 in Khartum of Sudan there was held a meeting of Council of

Foreign Ministers of countries-members of Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC). According to "Trend", our country was represented by Vilayet Guliyev, head of Foreign Affairs Ministry. At this meeting, as "Trend" agency was informed in Embassy of IRI in Azerbaijan, the situation after terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 in the USA was discussed, as well as situation in the Middle East, Chechnya, Kashmir problem, Armenian-Azerbaijan conflict and Cyprus. Other discussed issues also included contemporary economic problems in Islamic countries, issues related to activity and perspectives of Islamic Development Bank, World Trade Organization, expansion of trade relations between Islamic countries, problems of economic and humanitarian assistance to developing Moslem countries, etc. There were adopted several resolutions concerning Azerbaijan with some accusing Armenia as aggressor in Daglyg Garabagh conflict and decisions to help Azerbaijan in restoration of historic monuments, etc.

Previously in Yerevan they "played death" to traditional resolutions of OIC, where Armenia was recognized as aggressor-country, especially due to a negligible real impact of those documents on policy of Kuwait, UAE, Iran, Syria and other countries. But in this case, Yerevan dared to make public "reassuring". Dzyunik Agadjanyan, press-secretary of Foreign Ministry of Armenia, said to "Arminfo" Agency without any "diplomatic mist" that resolution on "recognition of aggression of Republic of Armenia against Azerbaijan Republic" adopted at the meeting of Foreign Ministers of member countries of OIC will not have any serious impact on process of regulation of Daglyg Garabagh conflict. According to her statement, such resolutions are not new and adopted by this organizations starting from 1992. Countries-members of OIC confess that these actions are of formal nature and proceed from idea of Islamic solidarity, said press-secretary. Dzyunik Agadjanyan outspokenly comments the situation: "Armenia continuously informs friendly countries -member of OIC about its approach in some issues. This is reflected in positions of these countries while problem discussion in instances, which play more important and definitive role for Armenia as a whole and the process of regulation of Daglyg Garabagh conflict, in particular." After translation of this from diplomatic language it means: resolution of OIC it is just the piece of paper, they voted and forgot. In any case they will cooperate with Armenia, not Azerbaijan. If to take into account rates of development of cooperation between Armenia and Iran, Syria, Emirates, when there are no reasons to doubt in statements of pzunik Agadjanyan.

During the same period newspaper "Azg" issued in Yerevan and which is very close to "spurk parties" and government officials, published a large paper with very eloquent title: "Relations with the USA are important, relations with Iran - are more than crucial". According to "Azg", "Armenian-Iranian cooperation should not be jeopardized in aim to satisfy Washington". "USA for Armenia is the important country, but not more important than Iran, - writes "Azg". - Iran is the

only friendly neighbor. Deepening cooperation with Iran proceeds from interests of Yerevan. Iran also does not have a lot of friendly neighbors. Thus, Yerevan is also vitally important for Tehran". In fact, in "consular note", compiled for the USA citizens, which visit Armenia, it is noted that on the highway which connects Yerevan to Iranian border intensive freight traffic is observed.

Relations of Armenia and Syria also have a long history and significant role in this belongs to a large and "well organized", according to officials from Yerevan, Armenian community in Damascus. Probably, it is not the least important that Levon Ter-Petrosyan, the current president of Armenia is the descendant of Syrian Armenians and was born in Syrian town of Aleppo. It should be also noted that at earlier stages of Nagorno-Karabakh conflict namely Syria was frequently mentioned as one of the countries from which the "breaded" came to Karabagh. Opinion about the bases of this relationship can be derived from "exchange of comments" during Armenian visit in 1997 by Parliament Delegation from Lebanon with Nabikh Berry, speaker of Lebanon parliament as a head - shortly after Benjamin Netanyahu, the Israeli prime-minister visit to Baku. At the joint press-conference of Babken Araktsyan, then speaker of National Assembly of Armenia and its Lebanon counterpart Nabikh Berry, the close attention was paid to situation in the Middle East, especially to relations between Turkey, Israel and Azerbaijan in addition to "protocol" phrases such as "Lebanon and Armenia are tied by traditional friendly relations" and this visit "is fruitful not only for parliamentary, but for Armenian-Lebanon relations as a whole" according to head of Armenia's Parliament. Another fact stated at the press-conference included the resolution adopted by Lebanon Parliament for so-called "Armenian genocide" with a definite role of Nabikh Berry and this was reminded to journalists by Babken Araktsyan. Babken Araktsyan underlined that "Armenia" always stated that for regulation of Middle East conflict it is important to strictly implement principles written in UN documents. Taking into account contemporary situation in Lebanon it is not possible to allow violation of the resolution N 425 of UN Security Council". According to Nabikh Berry the solid basis for cooperation of two countries consists not only in traditional friendly relations, but also in vital issues as Karabagh conflict and issue of south of Lebanon, which today suffered attack of Israeli armed forces. He also noted that while closer Israeli-Turkish cooperation the Middle East problems touch interests of Armenia and Iran. Answering questions of journalists about regulation of Armenian-Azerbaijan conflict he added that the only way is expression of opinion of Karabagh population through referendum, which must be held under the aegis of UN. "If the nation will define its destiny by referendum, the Parliament of Lebanon without a second of hesitation will accept that decision" - assured the audience the speaker of Lebanon Parliament. He did not exclude probability of creation of defense union

Armenia-Lebanon-Syria: "If we will be forced to resist, as defending countries we should unite as unite the attacking countries'.

"Protocol" part of the visit was also interesting. During Echmiadzin visit by Lebanon speaker, the Katalikos of all Armenians - Garegin I underlined that Armenian community in Lebanon is one of important branches of Armenian Diaspora. According to spiritual leaders of Armenians, Lebanon and Syria are the countries in which most of western Armenians found asylum after "genocide". Nabigh Berry, in his turn reminded that Garegin the First has spent 18 years in Lebanon, of these 15 years coincided with war-time and appreciated his activity during that period.

Speaking in Parliament of Armenia, Nabigh Berry underlined importance of Armenia's role in the Middle East. He said that the Middle East conflict today transfers to Arabic countries to neighboring countries of the region, including Armenia and Iran. He expressed his confidence that Israeli-Turkish union threatens the region's present and future, as well as world security and stability.

Earlier Armenia was visited by Raslan Allush, Minister of foreign affairs of Syria. During his meeting with Ara Saakyan, the vice-speaker of Armenian Parliament, he noted: "Today Armenia faces danger of being under pressure of great powers. A document may be submitted to Armenia, which threatens physical existence of Garabagh Armenians as a whole." Press-release of National Council of Republic of Armenia cites Vice-speaker, who states that Azerbaijan today does not and can not guarantee safety of Armenian population of Garabagh. Answer of Syrian diplomat also deserves attention. "In such situation the serious guaranties are necessary, in other case the problem cou'd not be resolved" -said Raslan Allush.

But the real sensation had brought the final press-conference. While speaking before journalists about results of its visit, Raslan Allush made very promising statement: "Syria is not the supporter of close relations of Turkey and Israeli and considers that this threatens equilibrium of safety in the region". According to Syrian diplomat the aim of "military block of Turkey-Israel" consists in desire to rule in the region and pressure Syria and expand their influence over countries of the Middle East. Vardan Oscanyan, the first deputy Foreign Minister of Armenian Republic added that any union created against the third country is unacceptable. In addition, R.AUush noted that it is required to make clear the speculations about adjoining to this union of ... Azerbaijan, since such information was derived from Turkish newspapers. According to him, we can not believe speculations about cooperation of Syria-Iran-Iraq published in newspapers, which describe this cooperation as military alliance. Deputy Minister is of opinion that this means making an attempt to justify creation of military alliance of Turkey-Israel.

Soon after such unambiguous statement of Raslan Allush, the foreign Minister of Iraq - Mohammed Said as-Sahhaf made statement at the meeting with Syrian trade delegation that "strengthening of relations between two brotherly countries in all spheres of activity answers the interests of Arabic nation" according to citation of Information Agency of Iraq (INA). Mohammed Malki, the head of Syrian delegation noted that "Syrian businessmen have a strong determination to strengthen economic ties with their Iraqi brothers and are ready to submit to Iraq all required according to UN decisions". At the same time the influential Iraqi newspaper "Babel" (Babylon) called for close Iraqi-Syrian relations, ... in order to resist increasing military cooperation between Israel and Turkey.

It is known that agreement on Syrian-Armenian parliamentary cooperation was signed in 1993. M.Mushantat, secretary of National council of Syrian Arab Republic while his Armenia visit in autumn of 1996 commented possibility of military cooperation of Syria and Armenia by request of correspondents of "Noyan Tapan" and firmly stated that these two countries cooperate in all spheres. Moreover, if we refer to history of Armenian-Syrian relations of the period, when independent Armenia did not exist, we can remember that the capital of Syria - Damascus together with Athens was mentioned among addresses which were visited by Akop Akopyan, the "founder and father" of ASALA while other radical Islamic groups promised to fight with Turkey for its cooperation with Israel and they simultaneously fostered friendship with Armenian counterparts. Namely, in the Bekaa valley controlled by Syrian forces was taken a snap of Armenian priest and PKK leader - A.Odjalan, who also cooperate with Armenian forces for a long time, as well as with terrorists of any kind.

About military cooperation of Armenia and Syria - implemented however through the "third country" also wrote observer of newspaper "Republic of Armenia" - Vartan Grigoryan, cited by our newspaper "Why Turkish make noise?" on July 29, 1996. In fact, Grigoryan commented Armenian-Greek agreements signed by Levon Ter-Petrosyan in Athens, including agreement about military cooperation. At the same time, he noted that "even in August of the last year (1995 - H.) the Greece signed similar agreement (about military cooperation - H.) with Syria and this year as a response for Turkish-Israeli agreement on joint use of military airports on the territories of Turkey and Israel, Greeks and Syrians are also agreed about joint use their airports". This already allows to evaluate steadily developing cooperation of Armenia and Syria as part of more complicated political processes, which probably show that with becoming the south of Europe, Caucasus stopped to be the north of the Middle East, where there are bounded historic ties and pretensions, territorial disputes, the struggle for sphere of influence and frequently very freely interpreted "rules of game".

Since that time a lot has changed in the region, but not relations of Armenia with Middle Eastern regimes. Moreover, the significant role now plays "moderate governments", such as Emirates. Armenia's Embassy in UAE are active since spring of 2000 and even prior to its opening the representatives of both countries stated the high level of cooperation in many spheres, including political, economic and cultural spheres. We may remember that in the end of 1990-ies the scientific institutions of UAE involved with studying of problems in Caucasus expressed readiness to consider as basis the Armenian version of events of 1915 and on the Persian Gulf coast was displayed a "documentary" shot in Yerevan.

Pro-Armenian policy implemented by UAE authorities is a rule for Arabic world rather than exception. According to Armenian sources the Arabian scientists thoroughly study genocide of Armenians. Newspapers wrote about arrests; of ethnic Turks in Syria blaming them in espionage. We have to especially note contacts of Arabian and Armenian terrorists. Notorious Monte Melkonya, which was born in California and died in Garabagh and former adjutant of Akop Akopyan undertook a series of terrorist I attacks while being in the "KSAMEPP" - "Committee of Solidarity with Arabian and Middle East political prisoners". The only fact of its existence brought up a certain considerations. It is known, that Armenian terrorists took part in many actions held by; Arab radical groups, including capture of Israeli sportsmen during Munich Olympic Games. Contacts of ASALA with Hezbollah, Islamic Jihad and other groups have been confirmed. Kuwait spent a large amount of money for repair of roads network in Armenia - and transport infrastructure has a primary role for military potential of any country. Besides, through that period almost all Armenians were concerned with construction of roads Goris-Khankendi. As usually said in such cases: No comments.

Finally, in the spring of 2002 the summit of League of Arabic countries was attended by kilik Armenian Katalikos Aram the First. Thus, Charles Aznavour hardly "traded by air", when he said in his interview to "Literaturnaya gazeta" that Arab sheikhs have a deep respect to Armenian Diaspora.

Despite that in the West and in Russia some politics up to now consider "Islamic solidarity" as powerful political factor the analysis of "Middle Eastern" realities shows that this is not true. Cooperation between Turkey and Israel on the one hand and outspoken anti-Turkish statements of Arab leaders on the other are the realities of die Middle East, as well as constant appeal of Palestinian leaders to "Islamic solidarity".

Today it seems that the intention is to create some alliance against Turkey, Israel and Azerbaijan.

It is difficult to say now what has played the leading role: historically developed good relations between Turks and Azerbaijani with Jews, which later has grown into cooperation of these countries and Israel, or "historic offences"

kept since the period when Arab countries were within Ottoman Empire, or positions of Armenian communities, which are respected by Arab sheikhs as said Charles Aznavour to correspondent of "Litgazeta", or the struggle for leadership in Islamic world. However, facts are the stubborn thing. Today's relations between Armenia and Syria are not just the bilateral relations, but a regional policy.

Indeed, the tactics "enemy of my enemy is my friend" was invented long ago and it is not surprising that it is applied by countries, which have a deficit of allies. However, the interest of Middle Eastern countries, probably is not limited by this. Armenia is also a channel for secret delivery of Russian arms as was recently proofed by arms transportation at first to Armenia and then to the North Iraq to PKK bases.

The question is: whether in Armenia it is understood what are the results of such policy? Evidently, due to the readiness to make alliance with any party with the only aim to put a spoke in wheel of Azerbaijan or Turkey, the Armenia may turn to be involved in the Middle East conflict.

Rafik Safarov

ETHNO-POLITICAL CHANGES IN WEST AZERBAIJAN IN XIX-XX CENTURIES

It is known, that in the XI - start of XIX centuries in all areas of Azerbaijan state Gregorian Armenians constituted minority. They constituted minority in Caucasian territories of the state. Here Gregorian Armenians included Armenians and Albanians strongly influenced by Armenians and which populated areas of Nakhchyvan, Zangezur, Lori, foremountain areas of Garabagh, Ganja and Gazakh.

Population of Chukhursaad according to data of Ottoman census and taking into account my corrections due to unaccounted local Shiites in 1590 (provinces of Irevan and Nakhchyvan) constituted 120000 people (77.5% of Azerbaijani, 22.5% of Armenians) and in 1728 (the same provinces + Shuragel) - 183000 people, of these 77.5% Azerbaijani and 22.5% Armenians. Among population of Garabagh area (provinces Garabagh, Ganja, Shamshadil and Lori) in 1728 there were 69% of Azerbaijani and 31% of Gregorian Armenians. According to my evaluations in Shuragel 27000 Azerbaijani and 2700 Armenians had lived.

Comparison of data of cameral descriptions of 1832, 1842, 1852, 1863 and in 1873 with lists of families made in 1886 and census of 1897 recovered that census of 1832 unaccounted 45% of population of Chukhursaad and 50% of Pambak-Shuragel. Analysis of incomplete statistical data, account of internal and

external migration allowed to define a quantity and ethnic composition of Chukhursaad population and its provinces: in 1801 - 247000 people (161000 Azerbaijani, 41000 Kurds and 45000 Armenians, in 1826 - 299000 people (188000 Azerbaijani, 52000 Kurds and 58000 Armenians) and in 1832 - 357000 (143000 Azerbaijani, 19000 Kurds and 193000 Armenians). A special value has change of ethnos ratio in Pambak-Shuragel: in 1801 of 51000 people the 87.2% were Azerbaijani, 12.8% Armenians; in 1826 of 21000 people 27.5% were Azerbaijani and 72.5% Armenians. The major cause of radical change of population content is emigration in 1801-1813 of over 6000 Azerbaijani families to Kars and Irevan and migration of 1500 Armenian families to previous location of those Azerbaijani in 1804-1810 and 1823.

In the end of XVIII- start of XIX centuries the Caucasus, which was within the sphere of military and political interests of Russia, underwent political, as well as constant demographic changes, which followed Russia's interference into Moslem countries. From military-strategic considerations many thousands of Armenians were directed into bordering Moslem territories and located in most important directions: Akhaltsisk, Shuragel, Irevan, Nakhchyvan and Garabagh.

Sharp change in demographic balance of Chukhursaad took place in 1827-1831. Throughout of 1827-1828 up to 78000 Moslems died and emigrated. 5.7 thousand Azerbaijani families and 2.3 thousand Kurdish families went to Iran, the rest went to Turkey, including 1 thousand Azerbaijani families and 2.6 Kurdish families. Instead of them in 1828-1831 into Chukhursaad there were migrated up to 140000 Christians - Armenians (62000 from Iran and 78000 from Turkey), which constituted 2/3 from a total number of Armenian migrants to South Caucasus - not less than 200000 (75000 from Iran and 130000 from Turkey).

Analysis of location of Armenian migrants on the territory of South Caucasus have shown that in area of conjugation of Pambak-Shuragel, Lori, Gazakh and Irevan the compact ethnic territory of Armenians was generated, which later in 1918-1921 will become a basis for generation and widening of Armenian state up to its present borders.

Contemporary Armenia consists of Azerbaijani provinces of Irevan (without Surmali and Sadarak), Pambak-Shuragel, Daralagyaz, Agbaba, Zangezur (most portion), Gazakh (mountain areas) and Lori. In 1826 Azerbaijani and Kurds constituted 70% and Armenians - 30% of population of Armenia (within present borders). In provinces Moslems were in the following proportion: 76% in Irevan, 87% in Pambak-Shuragel, 100% in Agbaba, 97% in Daralagyaz. Approximately 80% of all territory of Armenia was populated by Azerbaijani. Due to sharp change of ethnic composition throughout 1827-1831 a number of Armenians increased in Irevan almost up to 59%, in Pambak-Shuragel up to 96%, in Daralagyaz up to 41%, in Zangezur up to 69% and in Lori up to 90%. In total

across Armenia the figure reached 66% while decrease of a number of Moslems down to 33%.

Prior to collapse of Transcaucasian Republic in 1918 the population of Armenia, including Armenian refugees constituted 1271200 people (931000 Armenians, 290000 Moslems). During three years ruling of dashnaks the population of Armenia by the end of 1920 were 722000 people (691000 Armenians, 10000 Azerbaijani). In 1918-1920 the human losses in Armenia were 549000 people, including 280000 Moslems, 240000 Armenians and 29000 of other non-Moslem population (Russians, Greeks, Yazidi and others). One of the basic reasons of death was unprecedented policy of Armenian leaders to annihilate and exterminate the Moslems. Only in Zangezur (within borders of 1914) through 1918-1920 up to 65 thousand Moslems were killed.

Sovietization of Armenia and establishment of friendly Soviet-Turkish relations led to return back to Homeland of 70 thousand Azerbaijani and 3 thousand Kurds from Azerbaijan, Iran and Turkey. In 1920-1940-ies a ratio of Azerbaijani in population of Armenia were stable - 10-10.3%. In 1937 Kurds-Moslems from areas of Armenia, which bordered with Turkey, were deported to Kazakhstan.

In Soviet plans of annexation of Turkish territories the Soviet Armenia was in most profitable position from military-geographic position- to the east from Turkey. Withdrawal of Azerbaijani-Moslems from Armenia was envisaged in plans of Soviet Government for strengthening of Armenian foothold. Prior to deportation of 1948-1953, in Armenia in 1946-1947 there were about 110-115 thousand Azerbaijani (10.2% from a total number of population). Anti-Azerbaijani policy started since 1935 from mass renaming of Azerbaijani toponyms, became open and constant practice since 1960-ies. Pulling out of Azerbaijani influenced their specific weight in 1950-1980-ies decreasing from 6.1% to 5%. Expelling of 175-180 thousand Azerbaijani and Kurds (according to my own evaluations), accompanied by violence and killing of 226 people along 11 months of 1988.

**CHANGE OF IDEOLOGICAL ORIENTATIONS AND
GARABAGH CONFLICT**

1. After collapse of communist ideology the dispute continues about whether it is necessary to develop new ideology or it is sufficient to declare our adherence to western values: market economy, liberal democracy, civil society, human rights, etc.

2. The dispute intensified in Azerbaijan especially after 1993, in some cases consciously, and in other cases the Soviet ideology is reanimated unconsciously. It is expressed in attempts to fulfill a total control over society (in dithyrambs for KGB and professional security officers, first of all those of high rank) and in dictate of state machine, which identify itself with society, and in obligatory glorification of the "leader" and continuing upbringing of people in paternalistic spirit (everything in the state depends on "father" or "grandfather" like in daily life everything depends on "uncle") and in dividing of society into healthy and destructive forces, and finally, in obligatory image of enemy without which such ideology could not exist.

3. Idea of "enemy" is applied as obvious and assuring "explanation" of causes and moving forces of any crises, especially under conditions of chronic irresolution of Garabagh conflict. In fact, the absence of serious considerations about this idea, which goes back to archaic, mythological perception of the world allows authorities to "zombie" (transfer into obedient instrument of manipulation) the public consciousness. Let us show some reasons of such attitude.

4. First of all, people unwanted by authorities very easily and upon necessity are included into a group of "Armenians". In some cases these may be human rights activists, in other cases this can be any person, which tells "foreigners" (foreigners and foreign organizations) about shortages and, finally, these may be opposition leaders most dangerous for authorities. People are used not to think and the effect of crowd comes into force, which is easily exited and is disappointed with the same easiness. The latter constitutes the aim of authorities: divert the people from failures of government.

5. Secondly, unconsciously extending the idea of "enemy" for any ethnic Armenian, we actually announce ethnic war, which contradicts to our declarations for giving the autonomy to Daglyg Garabagh population, which means that the population independently from ethnicity is recognized as citizens of Azerbaijan.

6. Thirdly, the war in Iraq must be comprehended from viewpoint of

collapse of Russian-Soviet approach of conducting the war and Russian-Soviet war ideology: struggle for every inch of the territory (unnecessary "highs", which were "heroically" won by Soviet soldiers), volunteer battalions, patriotic phraseology about love to the Motherland and fostering of hatred to "enemy", etc. Today any war is won by professionalism, including professionalism of military experts and professionalism of soldiers. Professionalism of soldiers envisage necessary military training, adequate psychology, which today requires not false patriotic rhetoric, but distinct pragmatic conditions, which must be clearly understood and implemented by soldiers in order to efficiently fulfill their mission.

7. One may object that parallels between the USA and Azerbaijan like parallels of Garabagh war and Iraqi war are absolutely incorrect. Nowadays, in all spheres of activity around the world, including military construction, the success may be gained by the nation, which is able to comprehend and implement values of civilized world and behind which the Sense is hidden and not the unintelligent hysteria and exited false patriotic crowd.

Taking into account all the said above we have to accept as a mistake the thesis frequently expressed here: Garabagh is separately, the rest of our internal problems are separately, democracy is separately, in respect of Garabagh issue we must be united as a fist, however in other spheres of life we can adhere to various opinions. The, democracy, and consequently ridding of Soviet ideological stereotypes is the only way, which leads to success in Garabagh issue. That is why, the idea of "enemy" borrowed from old and usual Soviet ideological set does not strengthen us, but on the contrary brings the turmoil and neurasthenia.

Rasim Musabekov

GEOPOLITICAL CHANGES AFTER 9/11 EVENTS AND PERSPECTIVES OF SETTLEMENT OF ARMENIAN - AZERBAIJAN CONFLICT

1. Changes, which took place around the globe after terrorist attack of 9/11, significantly influenced perspectives of settlement of conflicts in South Caucasus and Daglyg Garabagh, in particular. Anti-terror operation started by the USA and its allies temporarily diverted attention of authority of this superpower , as well as other great and regional powers from local conflicts in Caucasus. On the other hand, necessity to fulfill anti-terror operation strengthened practical interest of the USA and NATO to the South Caucasus. That is due to passing of important communications through Georgia and Azerbaijan, which proper operation is required for fulfillment of military and humanitarian actions. The reflection of this is suspension by initiative of George Bush administration of controversial Article

907, which prohibited humanitarian help to Azerbaijan through state institutions. The ban put previously on supply of military materials into Azerbaijan and Armenia was cancelled. This opens way for American-Azerbaijan cooperation in the sphere of safety and modernization of local military infrastructure. Washington sanctioned the program for thorough support of Georgia (the sum is over 60 million dollars) for modernization of its military forces. The arrival of the first American military division of special forces is expected here. Increasing military presence in the region of the USA and its allies by NATO may become additional stimulus for strengthening stability and safety in the region. Although it is the Georgia in the first place of Western and American interests, Azerbaijan constitutes even more value for Washington due to its geopolitical location on the coast of Caspian sea, which is rich by hydrocarbon resources, and its border with Iran.

2. It must be noted that Armenian-Azerbaijan conflict potentially is the most explosive among the conflicts in South Caucasus. Although the region is in periphery, it is located in Europe and therefore causes concern of leading powers and international organizations on the continent. After localization and taking control over situation in former Yugoslavia they strengthened attention to Nagorno Karabakh. Because Armenian Azerbaijan conflict prolonged for 15 years, in case of absence on any results in its resolution may lead to break of ceasefire and restart of military actions. Nobody is interested in such course of events. Everyone understands that a new war will distinguish from that of 1992-94 by its scale, a number of applied military technique (there are about 50-70 thousand soldiers in armies of both sides, many hundreds of armored vehicles and artillery, salvo fire units, aviation, etc.). It would be hard to localize it only by Nagorno Karabakh line of front, and consequently, the probability of indirect and may be direct involvement into the conflict of Russia and Turkey is high (in case of catastrophic defeat of Azerbaijan or Armenia). And this may lead to problems of global scale. Thus, efforts of the USA and European countries to ease the tension in South Caucasus and avoid possible complications are justified.

3. Establishment of peace in the region is the necessary condition for involvement of foreign corporations in ventures in the region and simultaneously open way for them into the Central Asia. Concluded contracts for oil and gas production in the Caspian sea shelf from "Azeri-Chirag", "Shahdeniz" and other fields, as well as for construction of oil pipeline Baku-Tbilisi-Jeyhan and gas pipelines Baku-Erzurum envisage investments in amount of US \$12-15 billion. In case of probable restart of military actions there is a certain danger for such large investments. However, western countries do not want to postpone these projects because by developing oil-gas fields in Caspian basin they intend to decrease dependence of their economies and consumers on prices dictated by OPEC. Behind intensification of activity of American diplomacy the personal motives are

also traced. It is commonly known that interests of petroleum business are also close for family of President Bush and for many powerful members of new administration as Dick Cheney and Condoleezza Rice.

4. Position of European Union, represented in Minsk group of OSCE by France, is mainly shared by the USA. It must be noted that it seems as Paris is ready to satisfy interests and desire of posses by serious stimulus and real levers to influence conflicting parties. It is driven by considerations of great-power prestige and intention of Jacques Chirac, head of state to gain the support of a That is why, from Baku the position of Paris as a mediator in process of settlement of Garabagh conflict, does not look as neutral and trustful. Political forces and public organizations in Azerbaijan continuously demand to replace the France as a co-chair of Minsk group by neutral and objective representative of Germany.

5. Although Russia become weaker both from economic and military points of view and loses its positions across post Soviet territories, however, Moscow keeps serious levers to influence the situation in the region. For new leaders of Kremlin swamped in Chechnya, complication of situation in South Caucasus today is undesirable. Most of all, to its interests suites prolongation of present situation: "no peace, no war" or, as a minimum, do not allow restart of military actions. Because any radical change of situation may lead to worsening of its geopolitical positions, both in respect of Azerbaijan and Armenia. However, in Kremlin they also understand the impossibility of infinitely prolonging negotiations. Moscow actively collects information from the first hands in order to have thorough and clear conception on perspectives of negotiations process. The evidence of this is appearance of Vyacheslav Trubnikov, the first Deputy of Foreign Minister (ex-chief of external investigation of RF) together with Gribkov, Russia's official representative in Qwest and during recent visit of Minsk group co-chairs to the region.

6. By many evidences Moscow expects failure of efforts Minsk group in order to offer to conflicting parties its own plan of settlement. It is not clear yet, what will be offered by Russia for resolution of Armenian-Azerbaijan conflict. Most probably, the intermediate solution will be proposed (liberation of 4-5 regions adjacent to railway in exchange of strengthening of ceasefire regime and restoration of transport communications and economjl contacts). It can be expected that Russia upon consent of Baku and Yerevan only (without corresponding resolution and mandate of OSCE) will offer to deploy its own military forces as peacekeeper in territories liberated from Armenians. Thus, important strategy task of establishing strict control of Moscow over two South Caucasian countries can be implemented. At the same time, Putin, the Russian leader, may dress himself by laurels of peace supporter in addition to strengthening of Moscow's position in South' Caucasus.

7. Recent interview of Vladimir Kazimirov, competent and informed ex-representative of RP in Minsk group, to newspaper "Nezavisimaya gazeta" (November 24, 2001) also indirectly evidences that Russian initiative consists in stage-by-stage plan of regulation of Garabagh problem. There are at least three reasons for this. First of all, a whole former experience, and in particular ineffectiveness of the latest attempt of mediators as France and the USA, have shown that there is no perspective for package resolution of Armenian-Azerbaijan conflict. Secondly, making al cardinal decision may deprive Russia of ability to play further by Armenian-Azerbaijan contradictions used in order to closely tie both conflicting countries to Russia. Thirdly, under these circumstances Moscow is hardly interested in further erosion of principle of territorial integrity (due to difference of its interests with interests of the West in respect of Kosovo, internal problems with Chechnya and other autonomies). That is why the conflict settlement version insistently supported by Yerevan and consisted in annexation of Daglyg Garabagh to Armenia or acknowledgment of Daglyg Garabagh independence, in fact has no chances to gain open support of Russia. Mr.Ryabov, the Russia's Ambassador in Baku at the press-conference devoted to 10 year anniversary of establishment of diplomatic relations between Azerbaijan and Russia, has' expressed idea about necessity to return to stage-by-stage version of regulation of Garabagh conflict.

8. In spite of superficial-optimistic statements of Kocharyan administration, this country is still gripped in economic crisis. Initiated projects of regional cooperation, primarily in the spheres of communications and energy, pass sideways. Armenia, because of stubbornness and shot-sightedness of its present provincial authority sentences itself to geopolitical deadlock. In Yerevan there is a clear concern related to geopolitical changes in the region and around the world. This is evidenced by a special South Caucasus due to strengthening of military and political influence of the USA and its ally -Turkey. Armenia, by inertia insists on priority of revival of economic cooperation and attemptslo pass the resolution on necessity of participation of unrecognized "DGR" representatives in peace negotiations as fully legitimate participant. However, they also understand that Azerbaijan will hardly agree with any concessions in these issues.

9. Public organizations of Azerbaijan and even the part of governing elite are categorically against the policy of unilateral concessions and demands the strengthening of the army in order to be able to defend the country and liberate occupied territories by use of military actions in case of unsuccessful peace negotiations. Previously, Washington and Ankara are abstained us from such actions because Russian support to Armenia would lead Azerbaijan to failure in military resolution of the conflict. However, increasing military presence of the USA and Turkey in South Caucasus impedes Russian interference on Armenian side and increases chances of Azerbaijan. Strengthening of our military potential

even without demonstration of readiness to use it may be enough for bringing Armenians back to reality which indeed believe to their military superiority. Namely this and not the demonstrative refusal of mediation of Minsk group can bring the process back into the constructive plain of international law.

10. It would be naive to expect speedy changes in regulation o

Armenian-Azerbaijan conflict and normalization of relations between Baku and Yerevan. Hostility, which separated two countries, and mutual disbelief were accumulated through decades. However the progress of regulation process is possible through stage-by-stage regulation. Namely, overcoming of Armenian aggression results may create favorable background for seeking and considering mutually acceptable solution of most difficult issue - status of Daglyg Garabagh. Azerbaijan wholly went its way to compromise. Now it is Armenia's turn. Washington and Moscow possess by active levers of pressure on Yerevan. Almost half of the budget of this country are formed due financial support of foreign, mainly, western donors. Support of Russia are not limited to actual subsidizing of Armenian military forces and border guard units by Moscow together with use of mechanisms of joint defense and safety. About value of Russia's economic assistance evidences also the fact of restoration of energy block of Mitsamor NES (Nuclear Energy Station) and delivery of nuclear fuel for its continuous work. Only due to NES work Armenia went out from severe energy crisis.

Thus, the situation in respect of Armenian-Azerbaijan conflict is unstable and absence of progress in peace negotiations increases possibility of use of military actions. This contradicts to interests of great powers and therefore there is a hope that by their joint efforts it will be possible to elucidate Armenians. However, Azerbaijan must be prepared to the worse and consequently no measures for strengthening of defense system would be excessive.

Rena Mirzazadeh

GARABAGH CONFLICT REFLECTED IN GENDER ISSUES

Over May 18-20, 1998 the Conference devoted to topic "Women's rights - human rights. Women and armed conflicts" was held in Baku. The Conference was jointly held by UN, UNIFEM, UNHCR and Azerbaijan government.

Representatives of about 13 countries attended the Conference. Representatives of one of the major parties of Garabagh problem, i.e. Armenian Republic, were also among attendees. Conference participants considered 3 principles of activity program adopted at Beijing conference:

- role of women in civil society building and in military conflicts;
- violence against women;
- rights of women, rights of refugees and forced migrants as human rights, their returning back to homelands and other long-term problems.

These problems, taking into account situation in 13 participating countries, were considered as vital topics of the conference.- All attendees underlined that they will inform their governments and public on all considered subjects. Attendees also gained consensus in respect of development of subregional and regional contacts system by assistance of UN. Goals of subregional conference consist in the following:

- sharing experience acquired in prevention of violence against women in family, society, at national and international levels;
- creation of forum for cooperation and regional dialogs
- reach consensus in future activity.

The final result of the Conference was the adoption of activity program which defines strategy and mechanism of Baku Declaration. These documents were prepared for national and regional levels. UN agreed to assist in implementation of long-term program "Struggle against violence and cooperation system for strengthening of women's role in peace building". Goals of this program are given below:

1. Strengthening of role of women in prevention of military conflicts and establishment of peace in the region.
2. preparation of activity plan for prevention and liquidation of violence against women.
3. Defend rights of women, including refugees and forced migrants.

Baku Conference also considered the problem of hostages and attention was drawn to the destiny of about 330 women and 60 children. Non-governmental organization "Baku Association of Azerbaijani women" delivered a report at Geneva office of High Commission for Human Rights of UN. It must be noted that over 100 juridical documents were adopted due to refugees and forced ' migrants problems though the period of conflict.

The period since 1994 is the period of ceasefire. Despite a number of attempts to reach the peace agreement, there is no any result yet. Conflict parties, with mediation of international organizations, can not gain any progress at a large number of meetings held by government and non-governmental organizations.

A special attention should be paid to cases of rape, sexual abuse, forced pregnancy, beatings and humiliation suffered by women, the most vulnerable

portion of population from occupied territories. The Article 116 of Beijing Platform is written in order to oppose such cases. The resolution for liberation of women commissioned to Secretary General of UN at the 39th session of UN, held in 1995 and adopted as a priority task at the IV World Conference, has not been implemented up to now. Its term has been prolonged 4 times (at the 40, 41, 42 and 43rd sessions).

In 1998 the Department for refugees, forced migrants and migration at the Cabinet of Ministers hold a special survey, which covered all regions of the Republic. Based on distributed questionnaire the education, employment, health and ages of refugee and forced migrant women were analyzed. According to acquired data employment rates of these women were unequally distributed across the regions and constituted 30% in total with most of them being in rural areas. Of these 16.4% are teachers, 12.35% are nurses, 7.6% are those involved in sphere of culture, 41.1% - involved in agriculture, 15.6% are others.

In general, among refugees and forced migrants 419171 are women. Of these 120265 are refugees and 298906 are forced migrants.

Total	Number		Percentage	
	Refugees	Forced migrants	Refugees	Forced migrants
41917	120265	298906	28.7	71.3

The state program for resolution of problems of refugees and forced migrants has been adopted in 1998. However, this program can not be implemented without assistance of international humanitarian organizations and foreign countries. At the same time, we have to note activity of international organization such as UNHCR, WFP, UNICEF, OXFAM, UNDP in order to help refugee and forced migrant families.

Nationality of refugees and forced migrants is divided as following: 399058 Azerbaijani, 375 Russians, 1902 Kurds, 17677 Turks and 159 of other nations.

Of refugee and forced migrant women 15878 are of high education, 19384 have completed secondary professional schools, 45397 incomplete secondary, 75065 primary school and 58059 people of other education. Statistics shows that they have high potential for development.

Ages: 40597 up to 6 years old; 73632 are up to 7-17; 121619 are up to 18-49; 63060 people are over 50 years old.

According to family content: 29484 are mothers in large families; 4253 mothers of martyrs; 16948 women who are the only parent in family; 3595 single women and 114229 are girls.

Figures clearly show that these women's lives sharply changed under conditions of military conflict. According to "Human rights of women" written in Articles N210-223 of Beijing Platform the conflict deprives them of their homes, work places, education, marriage under peace conditions and opportunity to develop as a human. This part of population needs more attention and care.

A large number of these women are family heads by themselves and single women. Reality shows that most of these refugee and forced migrant women are struggle with poverty and unemployment in order to go back to normal lifestyle, to preserve their professionalism, education while being ill, feeling as elderly at younger ages, living helpless and under psychological stress. Especially young girls among them are devoid of prosperous life and face social evils and hardships. They devoid of rights shown in Articles 259-285 of Beijing Platform devoted to rights of "Girls". Most of them urgently need education, medical care, food, clothes and information. However, it also must be noted that these women and girls cordially believe in peace efforts of the government and wait for the day when they will return to their homeland.

Rovshan Allahverdiyev

HISTORY AND UNDENIABLE FACTS OF DAGLYG GARABAGH (IN ARMENIAN SOURCES)

While analyzing history of Daglyg Garabagh it is evident that this area is eternal territories of a land named Azerbaijan. Thus, in Urartu sources the west portion of Garabagh was named Urtekh-Urtekhini. Later name of this place as Artsakh is a derivative from Urtekh. Artsakh is not the Armenian name of this area, most probably this word of Iranian origin and means west portion of the world. Local sources describe this area as the part of Albania with population consisted of uties, sodi and aynians. Even Udines in their letter to Tsar Peter I wrote: "we are agqans and by ethnicity we are uties". As A.C.Mnatskanyan describes in his works udins are one of Armenian kins and their language is the Armenian language from ancient times. However, I.M.Dyakonov wrote: "because the ancient Armenian language is not related to the language of local population in Armenia plateau ... it is obvious that this language is brought here from other places". He also writes that first bearers of the Armenian language were nomadic tribes, which did not have class society and have subsidiary farming. It is shown in sources that Armenians came to this area of Caucasus after occupation wars of Artaksiyan and Zondiyan, i.e. probably after the II century B.C. No doubt, Armenian ethnos is not indigenous for this area. They originated from

Upper Euphrates valley, approximately in the first half of the I century B.C. Taking into account all said above we may come to conclusion that through that period the population of Artsakh consisted of Albanians and the area was Albanian territory. This fact is confirmed by Leo, S.Yeremyan, A.Sukiasyan and they write that the right band of Albania - Artsakh and Utik districts are Albanian territories.

At the start of the I century, during the Roman-Sassanid wars Albaniya succeeded in preserving of its independence. Colonization and Armenization of these territories happened later. About invasion of territory of present Daglyg Garabagh by Armenian feudals also wrote academician I.Orbeli. Academician S.Yeremyan wrote about "Armenization" of population. From political point of view Daglyg Garabagh during the I century was the subject of Albanians, during the VII-VIII centuries it was the subject of dukes -miranides. As a result of Arab occupation during the VII century Albanian kingdom collapsed. This period gave the start to tragic events fulfilled with participation of Armenian Church in order to gradually destroy Albanian ethnos and turn population of Daglyg Garabagh into Grigorian confession with their further Armenization. However, Albanian ethnos continued its existence and in the DC century Albanian kingdom partially was restored, especially on territory of Artsakh. Existence of Khachin principality over XII-XIII centuries in Artsakh and Utik regions, which were the part of ancient Albania, has been confirmed by I.A.Orbeli. This principality, which sovereign is also called as "monarch of Albania" was thrived during the rule of Hasan Calal (1215-1261). Namely during his rule the Gonzasar monastery was built, which later was turned into capital church of Albania. Through the middle ages the Daglyg Garbagh region was within the Garabagh beylerbeylik. Later, at the start of XVIII-XIX centuries it was within Garabagh khanate.

Further increase of a number of Armenians in Daglyg Garabagh is also confirmed by Armenian writer S.Yeremyan. During the II Russia-Iran war (1826-1828) when there were no doubts in victory of Russia, H.Lazarev proposed a draft project to tsar government. According to that project on March 21, 1828 by decree of tsar Nicolas the administrative unit "Armenian province" was established. Based on Turkmenchay agreement signed between Russia and Iran, Armenians were free to settle in this area. No doubt, during that period Azerbaijani population of Garabagh significantly outnumbered Armenians. According to official data from 1810 there were located 12000 families in "Garabagh province". Of these 2500 families were Armenians. These data are confirmed by "Annexation of Eastern Armenia to Russia" ("Prisedineniye vostochnoy Armenii k Rossii", vol.1, p.562) published in Yerevan in 1979. It must be noted that Armenian monarchs of Garabagh in fact were previous Albanians. None of Garabagh monarchs surnames belong to Armenian kins (nakharars). They originated from local feudals which were not Armenians. To the end of the quarter of XIX century Armenians constituted an absolute minority in Garabagh. In 1866 in Tiflis the description of

"Garabagh province" was published, which reflected the description of Garabagh khanate made by Magilevsky, Councillor of State and Colonel Yermolov. According to this document there was a city of 90000 citizens and over 600 villages in Garabagh khanate, of these only 150 were Armenian villages. In Shusha there were 1048 people, of these 474 were Armenians and in villages there were 12902 Armenians and 43311 Azerbaijani. All this happened after merciless terror against Garabagh Azerbaijani which were forced to migrate into Khorasan province of Iran during the rule of Nadir shah (in 30-ies of the XVIII), which is also proved by V.Ishkhnyan. Thus, in Narodnosti Kavkaza (published in Petrograd in 1916) he wrote: "A part of Armenians who live in Daglyg Garabagh is indigenous population, the successors of ancient Albanians. For them the land of Azerbaijan was the asylum from pursuits and threats". In 1978 in former town of Mardakert the monument was built devoted to 150th anniversary of Armenians migration into this region of Azerbaijan.

Seyidaga Onullahi

"AZERBAIJAN'S GARABAGH", "ARRAN GARABAGH" IN CONTEMPORARY SOURCES IN PERSIAN

For the last period in Iran a series of papers devoted to Garabagh were published in Persian. One of them is the book of 251 pages under the title "Garabagh" by the author Mohammed Hafizzadenin published in autumn of 2001 in Tabriz. The book consists of 24 chapters titled "Garabagh", "Garabagh and Armenians", "Armenian tricks and displacement of Moslem population of Garabagh", "Betrayal of Russian tsar and Armenians", "Great Armenia and mass killings of Moslems", etc.

The author on the basis of sources dated from various periods in respect of "Arran Garabagh" name proves by various facts that due to location of Garabagh in Arran territory of Azerbaijan it is called "Arran Garabagh" in ancient times.

In addition, Azerbaijan's Garabagh title is met for the first time in XIV century work of Hafiz Ebru "Zeyli came et-tevarix-i Reshidi". Hafiz Ebru while describing events of 749 by Hijra (1348) for the first time mentioned term "Azerbaijan Garabagh". The author wrote that Melik Ashraf was in Azerbaijan Garabagh in H.749 (1348) and Great Amir Ciday from Tiflis visits Melik Ashraf in Azerbaijan Garabagh (Hafiz Ebru, "Zeyl-i Cami et-tavarix-i Reshidi", p.227). V.Minorsky, who notes that the term Garabagh is the Turkish word also wrote: "Garabagh was used for the first time in "Nuzuet ul-qulub", the work written by

Hemdulah Qezvin. Most probably, it is related to a name of Turkic tribe, which has no any traces today. Thus, existence of the name Garabagh in various places, such as in north of Nakhchivan, in the north of Urmiya, Garabagh in west of Qezneyn of Afghanistan, Garabagh on the bank of Araz river in South Azerbaijan and other places proves that this was the name of Turkic tribe. Armenian historian Richard Hovanesyan in the volume of his work "Armenian Republic" noted that Garabagh district is the location of Moslems on territory of South Caucasus (Mohammed Hafizzadeh, "Garabagh", p. 138). Turk monarchs from period of Atabeyler rule to Gadjars during winter months always went to Garabagh. Teymur himself and his son Shahrukh held a congress in Garabagh-Arran. Teymur went to hunting in Agdam and Agdjhabedi. Long time ago Nizami Ganjevi wrote in his couplet about the fascinating beauty of this region of Azerbaijan:

Ze dorrachu- tiuvu, kebki, tezerv
Ne bini toui saye-ye bidi-serv.

Translation:

Shades of willow and cypress trees,
do not devoid of turaj, partridges and pheasants.

In the first half of the XV century Bedr Shirvani wrote:
There is a red wine in Garabagh,
100 people may feel drunk by a single glass of it.
Send me garabagh wine till I
wash my body by red water.

Bedr Shirvani in his poems also mentions Yevlagh:
How to pull myself as silk to Eresh spring
For my heart to be calm of passers-by
To make a monument from Yevlagh's sorrow in my breast
(Bedr Shirvani. Divan.Moscow, 1985 (in Persian), p.235, 274,
335,358,485).

In H.824 (1422) Xace Nizameddin in his couplet in Persian wrote:

Der Qarabag ferace to do ceshmest mera,
Ker yek ab gerayed, ez deger abe Eres.

Translation:

Being apart from you in Garabagh is two eyes for me

From one the tear drops and from other the water of Araz (Fesih Khevafi, "Muemel-i Fesihi, p.248).

Grounding on available sources Mohammed Hafizzadeh wrote: "Territory of western Azerbaijan which is now called as Armenia, never was Arran (warm place)". Geographically Arran is the area situated between Iran and Kur. In all sources there is mentioned not Armenian Garabagh, but "Iran Garabagh". As we already mentioned earlier the term "Azerbaijan Garabagh" also was used in sources.

Map published in Europe in 1618 and republished with comments by Mohsun Ferzane in Tehran in 1994 shows Azerbaijan's towns in north of Araz, in surroundings of Garabagh and other places of Azerbaijan. In the map, Azerbaijan is indicated as Atropatena. The map is devoted to Garabagh, however there is no indication about Armenians and their rule over Garabagh.

In 1358 Tevekkulu Ibn Bezzaz in his completed work "As-safa" describes Garabagh Moslems and in all cases uses "Arran Garabagh".

It says: Sheikh Sefiaddin went to Garabagh in order to advise Moslems. In this case, he did not mean Armenians, but talks about Moslem Turks: "Because Sheikh Sefiaddin himself is the Turk and son of Turk".

Unknown Venice merchant went to Tebriz and Garabagh through 1507-1520 for the first time used term "Garabagh" and mentioned that population in town Kenar is involved with weaving silk. Unknown merchant wrote: "Ismayil moves forward for the first time, it is the region of 1000 mile area. There is a large fortress named Kenar. Most of the villages known for silk are located in that region. That is why those silks due to belonging to area of Kenar were named Kenri". (travel of Venice merchant to Iran (Sefename -ye Venezian der Iran, translation into Persian of Doctor Manuchehr Emiri, Tehran 1349 (1970), I print, p.424). Name of the region - Kenar is also not the Armenian word. Even back to 720 areas of Arran, Mugan and Shirvan were populated by Khazars (Hamdullah Qezvini "Nuzuet el-qulub", p. 284).

Thus, Daglyg Garabagh province as it can be seen from its name was the part of ancient Azerbaijan and historic Garabagh region.

**AZERBAIJAN-ARMENIAN CONFLICT AND POLICY OF
UN AND OSCE: RESULTS FOR THE 10 YEAR PERIOD**

1. Prior to collapse of USSR the UN and OSCE (until January 1, 1995 SSCE) did not interfere into Azerbaijan-Armenian conflict. It was considered that ethnic-separatist conflicts are internal affairs of USSR and that is why international organizations strictly adhered to the policy of non-interference. With collapse of USSR at the end of 1991 the UN and OSCE became actually involved to process of regulation of the conflict. Azerbaijan and Armenia were accepted into OSCE on January 30-31, 1992. They became members of UN on March 2, 1992.

2. The first mission of UN for collection of facts arrived to Caucasus in March of 1992 after start of a large-scaled attack of Armenian armed forces. Sayrus Vens, former state secretary of the USA was elected as a head of that mission. The mission was also involved in support of mediation efforts of OSCE in Caucasus. The first mission of OSCE (then CSCE) was sent to the region February 12-18, 1992. That mission, headed by Karel Svartsenberg, former chairman of International Helsinki Federation, gave CSCE the leading role in regulation of the crisis.

Extraordinary session of OSCE Council, held in the end of March of 1992 was the first attempt to stop escalation of the conflict in Daglyg Garabagh. The Council made several decisions, including intention to hold peace conference in Minsk under aegis of OSCE and participation of 11 countries (Azerbaijan, Armenia, Byelorussia, Russian Federation, France, Italy, Sweden, Czechoslovak Federative Republic, Turkey and the USA). Mario Rafaelli was assigned as a chairman of Minsk conference. Approximately at the same time, Armenian armed forces captured Shusha (May 8) and Lachin region (May 17), which sharply deteriorated the situation and was in fact a step forward to escalation of war. All attempts to preliminary negotiations for Chairman of OSCE assigned France, Russia and the United States as the co-chairs of Minsk conference. They prepared 3 version (stage-by-stage and package versions in 1997, "common state" (1998) of conflict settlement.

Conclusions:

1. OSCE aimed to play the leading role in resolution of regional conflicts and the UN supporting this initiative of OSCE in fact handed over

functions of mediator for resolution of Azerbaijan-Armenian conflict. Although OSCE has not any experience in resolution of territorial disputes up to now.

2. Unfortunately, while working out versions for resolution of the conflict the OSCE did not define important moments: it has not been made clear which country is the initiator of military actions, which country is the aggressor and which country from the start of the conflict blocked all reasonable proposals expressing ultimatums. Namely, such approach of OSCE created a situation of military stalemate and brought peace negotiations to deadlock.

3. The process of making decisions by Security Council of UN is more flexible than ponderous systems of voting of regional organizations such as OSCE, NATO based on consensus or unanimity. But UN is simultaneously involved in resolution of many old regional conflicts (Angola, Salvador, Cambodia, Sudan, Sri-Lanka, etc.) and this involvement consists in maintaining of peace, strengthening peace agreements and not the process of reaching of peace agreements. Yugoslavia is regarded by West European countries as priority task of UN. Most portion of UN budget was spent for regulation of Yugoslavian conflict, which decreased financial base for international interference in other parts of the world.

4. Major shortage of UN in settlement of conflicts is dependence on world and regional powers. This is clearly observed in dual approach of UN to evaluation of events happened in conflict zones:

- In distinction to resolutions for former Yugoslavia, in resolutions of Security Council for Nagorno Karabakh there were no indications about illegal interference of Armenia in internal affairs of Azerbaijan. There were no decisions about sanctions against Armenia. There was not even a mere request to withdraw its troops from Azerbaijan in distinction to Bosnian case, when such appeals were made to Croatia.

- Attempts to change demographic composition of Abkhazia, including settlement there of people from other areas, was also condemned. There was no similar condemnation for Nagorno Karabakh. Security Council expressed only "its serious concern in respect of displacement of a large number of civilians in Azerbaijan Republic". In distinction to this, the Council acknowledged "right of refugees and displaced people, suffered from conflict (in Abkhazia) without preliminary conditions to return back to their houses under secure conditions". In Abkhazian case the Council rejected any decision based on results of so called ethnic cleansing.

Security Council, condemning some events at the same time did not react to other events: actions of Abkhazia side were condemned, but it was avoided to give evaluations to actions of Armenian side.

**ABOUT THE PROBLEM OF TERRITORIAL
DISPUTES IN SOUTH CAUCASUS**

The history of borders and territorial changes in the South Caucasus through 1917 to 1920 constitutes a large scientific interest. Chosen chronology is not accidental. This period is between the October revolution of 1917, which led to fundamental changes and creation of Transcaucasian Federative State and the period of proclaim of three independent states and Soviet Russia invasion into the South Caucasus.

Gaining the power by Bolsheviks in Russia resulted in collapse of administrative-territorial system of South Caucasus developed through the XIX century. Strategic value of this region has attracted the attention of countries nearby (Russia, Iran, Turkey) and faraway (England, USA, Germany) and to a some extent influenced creation of new borders. The process of outlining of new borders was one of the complex issues in relations between three independent countries: Azerbaijan, Armenia and Georgia. This process was complicated by heritage of Tsar Russia, i.e. the unconformity of administrative-territorial order and national composition of Transcaucasus. Planned policy of both Tsar and Soviet Russia in respect of administrative -territorial order gave its positive results and allowed Russia to totally establish in 1922 its influence in the South Caucasus.

The issue of borders and territories, which turned the Transcaucasus into the hotbed of war at the beginning and the end of XX century, does not lose its actuality at the beginning XIX also. Taking into account present political situation in the Caucasus the historic experience of that period may be useful while resolution of some issues, including territorial.

Russia's Bolshevik government announced "Declaration of rights of Russia's nations" on November 2, 1917. Article 2 of that document stated "The right of nations of Russia to free self-determination including the right for separation and proclaiming of independent state." On November 20, the same government in its "Appeal to Moslem workers of Russia and the East" states: "Build life of your nation freely and without any barriers".

As a result of declaration and appeal from February 23, 1918 the Transcaucasian Seym - legislative body of South Caucasus on April 22 proclaimed this region as independent federative republic. However, the Russia does not recognize the Transcaucasus Seym and continuing to regard South Caucasus as its own territory on March 16, 1918 concludes in Brest-Litovsk the separate peace with Germany. According to articles of this peace agreement all Caucasus was the subject of German-Turkish occupation and the south-west of the region - Kars, Batum, Ardagan annexed to Turkey. Despite the protests of Transcaucasian Seym

the Turkey by April 14, 1918 invades all indicated territories underlining that Transcaucasus did not proclaim itself as independent state. Simultaneously, starting from March 14 there was held a peace conference in Batumi with participation of representatives from Turkey and Caucasian countries. One of the major issues was the issue about borders and territories. It is stated in declaration of Transcaucasian delegation: "About the territory of Transcaucasian state, which includes the following provinces: Baku, Elizavetpol, Erivan, Tiflis, Kutais, regions of Batumi and Kars; districts of Sukhumi and Zagataly. The issue about Dagestan district and Chernomor province is still open until delegation of their representatives to Transcaucasian Seim."

Georgia had left the Seim on May 26, 1918 and this resulted in disintegration of Seim and proclamation of three independent states -Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia. The major problem after the disintegration of Seim consisted in defining the borders between neighbor countries. Because Gumri (Aleksandropol) was captured by Turks, Armenia appealed to Azerbaijan government with a request to annex Erivan to Armenia in order to make it the capital of Armenia. During negotiations held in Batumi on May 29, 1918 the Azerbaijan delegation, taking into account that confederation between Armenia and Azerbaijan is possible in the future (2, p.45) has agreed to annex Erivan and Echmiadzin to Armenia stipulating 4 that the Armenia will stop to claim for mountain areas on Garabagh. Thus, west border of Azerbaijan was limited by lake 1 Geyca, which turned into frontier area between Azerbaijan and Armenia. The eastern part of lake with status "Geyca" was \ included into Azerbaijan.

In Batumi on June 4, 1918 Turkey signed peace agreement with each of South Caucasian countries. The result of Batumi conference consisted in annexation to Turkey of the following areas: Batumi and Kars districts, Akhalkalaks and Akhaltsiks districts of Tiflis province and Surmali district of Erivan province. " Territorial dispute between Azerbaijan and Georgia over Borchaly, Tiflis (Karayazy) and Sygnagh districts of Tiflis province did not lead to war. The parties agreed to discuss territorial issues at the international congress to be held in Istanbul. The dispute over Zagataly district was peacefully resolved and on June 26, 1918 Georgia agreed to annexation of Zagataly district to Azerbaijan.

Relations between Armenia and other republics of South Caucasus were more complicated due to its claims for neighboring territories. Armenia, having Erivan and Echmiadzin as a "present" from Azerbaijan, did not reject its claims for mountain areas of Garabagh. On the contrary, continuing the war with Azerbaijan and Georgia and having the protection of some countries, it started to claim for Surmali, Borchaly, Akhalkalak, Gazakh, Zangezour and other territories populated mostly by Azerbaijani-Moslems. Armenia not just occupied territories of neighboring countries, but totally exterminated local population.

In fact, fulfilling "ethnic cleansing" Armenia prepared the basis for so-called "Great Armenia". To ground their territorial claims Armenians implemented active propaganda attempting by any means to prove belonging of indicated territories to Armenia. During period of organization of Istanbul conference they prepared the map of "Great Armenia", which later, during the Paris peace conference was submitted as official document. According to this map, territory of Armenia extends from Black and Caspian seas to Mediterranean. Armenian armed forces taking advantage of international situation and themselves used by great powers fulfilled plans of Armenian "theorists".

Turkey on October 30, 1918 as a country defeated in the World War I was forced to conclude Mudrossk peace agreement with England. According to this agreement Turkey pledged to withdraw its forces from South Caucasus and go back to borders of 1914. Region was recognized the influence area of Great Britain. It is interesting that Englishmen explained their claim to withdraw Turkish armed forces from Azerbaijan indicating that Caucasus Islamic Army, which included Turkish battalions, held military actions against Armenian population of Garabagh. Security of Armenian population of Garabagh at that time was one of the major issues of international policy. The opinion of deputy Foreign Minister of Turkey expressed in discussion with A.Topchibahsev, Foreign Minister of Azerbaijan Republic, shows the strength of Armenian propaganda and interests of great powers: "...Armenians and you should peacefully put the end to disputes over Garabagh, as well as other places, if such exist. Do not forget, that in places where Armenians constitute the majority, they will win any way, great powers will support them, especially members of Entente... Do agree that by annexing or rejecting of 5 or 10 villages the Azerbaijan will not be richer or poorer". Topchibashev gave an interesting answer: "Garabagh dispute as it claimed by Armenians is not the issue of 5 or 10 villages; the dispute is about four sandjaks (Garabagh (Shusha), Jevanshir, Jebrail and Zangezur). This is a whole khanate within which the number of Armenians and Moslems may be unequal, but there is no ground to talk about outnumbering of Moslems by Armenians. The latter are not indigenous population here, they are refugees from Turkey after wars with Russia".

It must be noted, that despite Dashnak battalions of Andronik, Dro and Njde attempted to occupy Nakhchivan, Zangezur and some other Azerbaijan territories, Garabagh was the area most desired by Armenia. Starting from 1917, Armenian population of Garabagh with support of Dashnaks armed units of Andronik tried to establish its administrative divisions such as "Small Armenia" in Shusha and Zangezur. As a result, 150 of Azerbaijani villages were looted, part of population was exterminated and the others were forced to flee their locations. Government of Azerbaijan Republic, taking into account the situation, on January 15 of 1919 established interim General-Governance with its center in Shusha and

Kh.Sultanov as a head. The General -Governance covered the territories of Zangezur, Shusha, Jevanshir and Jebraill districts of Ganja province. General-Governor had a large authority. This partially put the end to atrocities of Armenian battalions in the region. At the same time, General Thomson, the head of Great Britain forces in Caucasus announced that Garabagh and Zangezur are given temporarily under the rule of Azerbaijan Republic. The war between Azerbaijan and Armenia continued even after Englishmen demanded from Armenians to obey the resolution of Union's Command and recognition of authority of Azerbaijan Republic in Garabagh and Zangezur.

To regulate the situation in South Caucasus the Conference was held in Tiflis on April 25 of 1919. There was an acute dispute over territorial issues at the Conference. On June 27 Georgia and Azerbaijan signed non-aggression pact. According to Article 4 of the pact the territorial issue between these states must be resolved through agreements and arbitration. Armenia did not join to this pact in hope to expand its borders due to White Guard units of Denikin. By the beginning of 1920 the borders of South Caucasus are relatively stabilized. Supreme Soviet of Paris peace conference on January 11 de-facto recognized independence of Azerbaijan, Georgia and later that of Armenia. But discussion and confirmation of state borders were postponed until clarification of international status of these states. Later, due to occupation of the region by Bolsheviks the issue was removed from agenda of Paris peace conference.

Thus, betraying and aggressor policy of Armenia toward other South Caucasian countries (Azerbaijan, Georgia, Araks-Turk Republic and South-West Caucasian Republic) did not allow the existence of Caucasian confederation and the region was regained by Russia. Attempt of Armenia to change by use of force the borders of Transcaucasus for its own benefit came into new phase with Bolsheviks coming to power. Armenians tactics had changed, but the aim was the same. Starting from December 1920 and by support of Soviet government, Armenians started steadily and "peacefully" expand their territory on account of Azerbaijan territories. Armenia in 1918 at the moment of proclaiming of Ararat state had territory of 9 thousand sq. km and now has 29.8 thousand sq. km. Azerbaijan Democratic Republic had in 1918-1920 the 113.895 sq.km and currently has 86.6 sq.km. In 1988, Armenians taking favor of "perestroika" policy and support of M.Gorbachev again expressed territorial claims for Daglyg Garabagh. As a result of open aggression they occupied 20 % of territory of Azerbaijan.

**PROLONGATION OF GARABAGH CONFLICT
INFLUENCES GLOBAL AND REGIONAL INTEGRATION'
OF SOUTH CAUCASUS**

Remaining unsolved the Garabagh conflict negatively influences economic state of the South Caucasus countries and also independent development of their global and regional relations. One of the reasons of this has been tight relations in transportation-communication systems and in network sphere of the Caucasus countries which existed within the former USSR. Because of the Garabagh and other Caucasian conflicts transportation routes to different directions have been put under a blockade.

In the west of Azerbaijan passing through Nakhchivan AF Turkey and towards Europe transportation systems has been blockaded by Armenia. As a result, hard social-economic situation developed in Nakhchivan AR, which lasts up to now.

In the same direction blockaded Baku-Julfa-Islamic Republic of Iran railway makes great difficulties for the North-South global transport corridor project building which is intended for a long time.

Functioned in Baku-Tbilisi-Black Sea direction the Eurasian transport corridor which passes only 25-30 kilometer distance away from Armenian borders is considered very dangerous.

As it is known prolongation of the Garabagh conflict creates impediments for the internal and external integration of the South Caucasus region. These difficulties consist of 2 groups:

- 1) Difficulties related to the Caucasus global integration;
- 2) Difficulties created in connection with the integration development of the regional countries.

The Caucasus global integration problems emerged lately as a result of proclaiming of independent countries, rich in strategic oil-gas resources and looking for the ways out to the foreign markets.

As it is known taking a favorable geostrategical position between the Caspian, Black Sea and Sea of Azov, situating in internationally significant road junction to the West-East and North-South directions, having its good nature and resort-recreation resources and discovered oil-gas fields the Caucasus-Caspian region has turned to the Great Powers center of interests in our modern world. Especially if the Azerbaijan's position weakens by any reason in this conflict it may give more serious results for the Caucasus and Middle Asia regions.

However, Azerbaijan's geographical location is considered as strategically supporting point. From this point of view, Azerbaijan may be called a plug, which controls a tan full of natural riches such as Caspian Sea and Middle Asia. That is why the Great Powers endeavor to keep under their control this strategically important area.

Azerbaijan constructs the oil pipeline through Turkey, which is a friendly country and thus positively influences economic and political sphere of new states in Middle Asia. With such activity Azerbaijan impedes Russia's territorial claims and that is why it is exposed to an intensive pressures. But Iran carefully approaches the issue of strengthening and development of Azerbaijan, since it may intensify separatism of ethnic Azerbaijanis who live in its territory, i.e. more than 20 million people. From this point of view Iran's jealousy does not become limited with Azerbaijan.

The indicated factors are not a negligible subject in occupation of Azerbaijan territories by Armenia. Certainly this includes other factors, that is, the terms which not allow Europe and Turkey to enter the Caucasus and Middle Asia regions.

First of all Armenia's aggressive, terrorism and separatism policy in Caucasus caused to turn the region commonly to the hotbed of the conflict. Firstly in Garabagh, then in Abkhazia and now in the North Caucasus the bloody conflicts, slaughter of civilian population, economic destroys, terrorism, blockades and atrocities took place and all these models are implemented in Daglyg Garabagh.

Continuation of the conflict impedes the Caucasus cooperat» with the European political and democratic structures. Having great possibilities to use foreign military bases without any control, Armenia creates danger not only for the Caucasus countries but also for the West-East global relations.

Armenian aggressive policy may keep it away from tha Caucasus economic unity and create difficulties in realization of great projects which Western countries try to carry out in this region.

In the center of these serious geopolitical processes, projects and economic programs taking place in Caucasus is Azerbaijan with its transit position and oil-gas deposits. Comprehending this advantage and high potential of the country, Armenian aggressor and their stalwart protectors do not want to set free Azerbaijan and at any price try to keep back its progress and hold in the sphere of their influence.

The pressure against Azerbaijan creates hurdles for Caucasus's progress. However, connecting main water and land ways oi Caucasus, having strategically important fuel deposits as oil and gas, Azerbaijan if allowed for free progress of economy may commonly give a push to prosperity of the region.

The Caucasus internal integration, choosing efficient routes of the Europe-Caucasus-Asia (TRASECA) transport corridor can play an exceptional role in this matter.

The Caucasus countries can take more profits on economic; relations and even deep integration which will be to establish between themselves.

Teymur Novruzoglu

"ARMENIAN PROBLEM" IN DESTINY OF ARMENIANS

What is the "Armenian problem"?

For the outside world it is the common problem of liberation of ancient, talented Christian Armenian nation from slavery and oppression of neighboring Moslem nations.

In fact it is an excuse to use from time to time the deceived Armenians by leading states of the world for their own benefit. However, Armenians consider the issue as "national aim" consisted in establishing of mythic "Great Armenia from sea to sea". And with proceeding of time they indicate seas which are at longer distances than before!

Just for the last 120 years "Armenian problem" has been risen insistently three times.

The first time, it has been risen during the war between Russia and Iran as a secondary problem. Armenians in this war have shown themselves as catalyst, which injected the tension. It is known that this bloody war ended by division of territory of Azerbaijan into the south and north portions along the river Araz.

Armenian problem was "resolved" by withdrawal of Armenians from Iran, i.e. they were settled on the territory of Northern Azerbaijan in Garabagh.

The second time the "Armenian problem" was risen during the decay of Great Ottoman Empire. It has been risen by Russia in order to create internal animosity in Turkey and division of territories in aim to capture a largest possible portion. All major European countries participated in this process. "Armenian problem" risen by Russia were given from hand to hand for a few times. England, Russia, France and USA, even Young Turks have used Armenians from the start to the end of war in their own purposes and in the end they threw them away. Armed Armenians, in their turn exterminated civil population of Turkey in aim to withdraw Turks from Turkey.

The process resulted in vanishing of Ottoman Empire. Its territories were divided between countries-participants of war. Turkey became the Republic. Only Turks lost several million people in this war. Armenians, which showed maximum activity in extermination of Turks, lost 300 thousand people. (They consider this as genocide).

Armenian problem was resolved by withdrawal of Armenians from Turkey into Lebanon, Syria, Europe, USA and Caucasus. Russia allocated most of Armenian refugees and displaced people on the territory of Azerbaijan, precisely in area of Irevan khanate and Garabagh.

The third time "Armenian problem" was risen at the start of collapse of Soviet Union.

During that period Azerbaijan nation, encouraged by liberation movements of Eastern European countries and especially of Baltic Republics, have risen to struggle for separation from Russia. However, Russia did not want to lose Azerbaijan and oil of Baku. As always, Russia decided to make Azerbaijan obedient by use of Armenians. Once more "Armenian problem" has been risen and Armenians fell into this trap with enthusiasm.

Informed from Moscow about the close collapse of Soviet Union, Armenians withdrawn 200 thousand Azerbaijani from their locations and started aggression against Azerbaijan with an excuse of liberation of "Daglyg Garabagh" in aim to gain notorious self-determination of Armenians.

Armenia occupied Daglyg Garabagh consisted of five regions, i.e. 227 settlements and seven regions, which were not within Daglyg Garabagh, i.e. 97 settlements. From the start of the war 18.000 Azerbaijani were killed and 50000 wounded. Armenian aggressors totally devastated 800 settlements, 6000 production and agricultural enterprises, 3000 social and cultural institutions, over 107.000 dwellings with area of 9000000 sq.km, 741 schools, 219 infantry and 200 medical centers. On all occupied territories Armenians implemented a total ethnic cleansing. 730.000 Azerbaijani were forced to flee their homes in fear of extermination as it was done in Khodjaly.

Let us, at first, remember how Armenians lived in Azerbaijan during the Soviet Union period. No one will contradict that in Azerbaijan the Armenians lived significantly better than local Azerbaijani.

Across the whole Republic the construction, auto-service, barberies, tailors, shoe fabrics were in the hands of Armenians. Even restoration of Baku fortress was charged to Armenian "masters". In all important government bodies (especially in KGB) Armenians held key positions. Up to now the archives, which show their role in repressions of 1937 and partially identified while the trial of M.J.Bagirov, were not disclosed. It is not accidental that all secret workshops and "public control" were under supervision of Armenians. In fact, in Azerbaijan as a result of genocide of 1905-1920 done by Dashnak Armenians together with

Bolsheviks, the part of population of Garabagh, Shirvan and Baku was exterminated. Armenians withdrawn from Iran and Turkey were settled in hundreds of empty villages. In these villages Armenians lived under better climatic conditions and were richer than local population.

In Daglyg Garabagh, on the territory of Azerbaijan they de-facto lived as Armenian enclave ruled from Armenia. As a result of shortsighted policy of M.J.Bagirovs, H.A.Aliyevs in DGAR there were no notes in Azerbaijani and all management was in the hands of Armenians. However, this was insufficient for them. According to order from Baku, all silk cocoon, spirit for cognac, oak for parquet, white stone and pink marble and other products from a whole Garabagh were sent io Stepanakert for "processing". From Stepanakert produced silk, cognac, oak parquet, stone and marble were sent to Yerevan and further to Moscow as Armenian goods. The profit is gained by this way - Armenians in DGAR were richer than Azerbaijani. Besides, DGAR market was supplied from Azerbaijani villages of Garabagh.

At that moment, collapse of the Soviet Union started. Three Baltic Republics upon agreement started the struggle for separation from USSR.

It would be logical if three Caucasian republics - Azerbaijan, Georgia and Armenia like the Baltic republics would struggle together for separation from USSR. It was possible to separate without any losses and hostility to each other and became independent friendly republics and develop further as European countries.

Unfortunately, situation was different. In Georgia the nationalistic groups intensified their activity under motto "Georgia belongs to Georgians". In fact the Republic disintegrated: Abkhazia, South Ossetia and Adzharia in fact separated. Azerbaijani were terrorized and across a whole Georgia turmoil took place. Armenians devastated Azerbaijani villages and forced to flee 200000 women, children and elderly into Azerbaijan through snowy mountain footpaths. But it was insufficient for them, they decided to annex de jure Daglyg Garbagh to Armenia and started the war. This was the beginning of a big tragedy. To comprehend only initial results of this bloodshed it is suffice to remember the number of people displaced from Armenia. According to data of High Commission for refugees of UN in December of 1988 there were deported 182 thousand people from Armenia. During these events 216 Azerbaijani were killed, of these two were beheaded, 11 burnt alive, 3 were cut into pieces, 1 was hanged, 1 killed by electric power, 49 were frozen in mountains, 29 were smashed by car. Of those killed, 57 were women and 23 children. And it is not the complete list yet. In fact, number of victims is higher.

It must be noted that 730000 refugees for over 10 years shelter in tents in hot days of summer and freezing winter nights. Under such severe conditions children are born and elderly die. However, if we think objectively, Armenians did

not need all this. Russia -yes! Russia wanted to stop decay of Romanovs' empire and now continues the same policy on account of "Armenian problem". Armenians did not understand this! As a result, a serious puzzling problem was created for Azerbaijan, as well as for Armenia and for a whole humanity.

Let us suppose that now is the year 1988. Baltic republics demand separation from the USSR. Looking at them with attention and putting aside their ambitions, the Armenians, Georgians and Azerbaijani might go by the same path - separate from the USSR.

In such case Georgians would not state: "Georgia for Georgians" and all nations of Georgia together with Georgians may build free democratic Georgia.

Armenians would not withdraw 200000 Azerbaijani from Armenia and risen Garabagh issue.

What would happen in this case?

1. Azerbaijan, Georgia and Armenia similar to clever citizens of Baltics would separate from Soviet Union without bloodshed and financial damage.

2. They would be free and friendly countries. This means a lot.

3. Daglyg Garabagh autonomy stayed as it was and even might expand its status. In fact, Azerbaijan never wanted to change status of DGAR.

4. 400000 Armenians living in Azerbaijan might continue to live in Azerbaijan as its citizens with equal rights. Nobody even thought about hurting them.

5. While liquidation of kolkhozes the territories of Armenian villages would be given to Armenians with passports according to the legislation. Armenians would be legal owners of Azerbaijani territories!

6. All small enterprises and workshops would be made private by Armenians which would be their owners.

7. While privatization of large enterprises, plants and fabrics Armenians (they had excessive finances) might take large portion of shares (they also could use money of Armenians abroad).

8. Armenians-foreigners without any fear might make large investments into Armenia and DGAR and the intensive development of Armenia would take place.

9. Oil pipeline Baku-Jeyhan would be constructed through Baku-Garabagh-Armenia-Nakhchivan-Jeyhan (by 2 times shorter).

Income from this oil pipeline would bring money to Armenian state budget and the nation would have workplaces.

10. The gas pipeline Baku-Garabagh-Yerevan would be constructed, which mean gas supply and additional profits.

11. "Silk road" might pass through Garabagh-Yerevan. Only the service might had a large value. And what about communication with a whole world?

12. Azerbaijan and Turkey might communicate through Armenia and

Garabagh. Armenia would intensively develop with its markets full of goods and with possible investments.

13. Population of Garabagh and Armenia would not distribute across the whole world. Today in Armenia there would be 5 mln. people.

14. In aimless and merciless war 16000 Armenians would not die.

Undoubtedly, all this might take place.

And what happened in reality?

Immediately after Armenians knew about collapse of Soviet Union, they were struck by an ancient "national idea" to create "Great Armenia" on the territory of Azerbaijan (and partially Georgia) and:

1. Withdraw 200000 Azerbaijani from Armenia (those who feed Armenians).

2. Taking advantage from turmoil in government of Azerbaijan they occupied 12 regions of Azerbaijan with close participation of Russia. Azerbaijan was defeated and continues to lose now. But let us put this aside. This does not give Armenians anything. Besides, today the world and even most vigilant Armenians know well that this is not the victory of Armenians.

This is their fatal tragedy. Namely:

1. Because of this "victory" Armenians lost 16000 young men. This means one new generation and source for increasing of population.

2. Armenia fell into economic grips and conditions mortal for people. Production has stopped, there were no energy, no money for food and no perspectives for the future.

3. Part of population of Garabagh and Armenia has fled to other countries with "one way ticket". The rest constitute no more than 1 million people - elderly, poor and a gang of blood-suckers.

4. "Heroes of Garabagh" captured the power across the whole Armenia. The country has turned into their corruption basis. All Armenia works for them and there is no way out.

5. Armenia has turned itself into irreconcilable enemy of Azerbaijan. These two nations have lost tens of thousand of people homes and became refugee, living more than 10 years in tents and dying under miserable conditions. Now, nobody from Azerbaijan will forgive Armenians. It is impossible to live in such neighborhood.

6. Armenia lost relation with Azerbaijan and Turkey. Communications are broken, there is no trade.

7. Perspectives of investments from Diaspora turned to be overestimated. On the contrary, they made investments into strengthening of Diaspora, i.e. for Armenians which leave Armenia.

8. Railways across occupied territories are demolished by Armenians

themselves and sold to Iran just as a metal. Azerbaijan is not interested in their restoration. Armenia can not restore. Highways are also destructed.

9. Oil pipeline Baku-Jeyhan is constructed through Georgia (bypassing Armenia). Armenia devoid of large income for state treasury and for people.

10. Baku-Yerevan gas pipeline stays just in dreams. There is no gas, no energy!

11. "Silk road" passes through Georgia! Armenia lost communications with Europe and the world.

12. Armenians quite clearly understand that rich Azerbaijan with 8 million population won't give its territories. All 12 regions will be liberated from Armenian occupants and 1 million people will return to their own homeland.

13. If this will require the start of the war, the rest of Armenia's and Daglyg Garabagh population will disperse. As a result, today there is no the former Armenia. It is in catastrophically hard situation.

Thus, we can see that Garabagh problem liquidated the perspective of development and existence of a whole Armenia.

There is a question, whether among Armenians there are no sober-minded people? Whether they can not comprehend the fatality of ephemeral national idea of supremacy and no perspective of current situation in Armenia?

Garabagh problem despite its winning shine has tuned into an unbearable load for Armenia, which pulls it downward. The further - the deeper!

And what is about Ter-Petrosyan? He understood this and distanced from fatal policy. Why they could not stop the nation? In my point of view (I am acquainted with Armenians of highest rank) this is impeded by the following factors.

1. The major enemy of Armenians is fanaticism. Any nation is prone to make myths from its past. It is understandable. However, no nation in the world creates "history" for itself, as Armenians do. Historians of Armenia together with Grigorian church created incredibly fantastic story, according to which:

a) Armenians are the most ancient nation of Arian origin and most clever, cultural, talented and heroic nation around the world. This brings Armenians to the thought about their supremacy exclusiveness and permissiveness.

b) Armenians were the first who adopted the Christianity, distributed it and defended from Hebrew and Moslems, risking by their lives. This frequently leads to unjustified defense of Armenians by naive Christian state officials.

c) Armenian history describes them as unfortunate and suffered from genocide of Turkic nations and thus creates hatred towards Turkic nations.

d) Mythical image of "Great Armenia" so deeply entered into the process of children upbringing that even sober-minded Armenians believe into possibility of the idea.

2. The second unluckiness of Armenians is their ideological leader -

"Dashnaksutun" party. This party being terrorist organization by its nature, develops "national ideas", theory and methods of international terror and wars, grounds hatred towards neighbors, creates terrorist groups of fanatics, periodically collects money from all Armenians and fulfills one-time money collection from "wealthy" and finally, rules all processes upon its own desire. No Armenian, irrespective of residence, can not avoid the punishment of this powerful party in case of violation of obedience. Dashnaksutun party leads the nation in direction, which it considers appropriate!

3. The third unluckiness of Armenians is Grigorian church. This is the church, which in distinction to all Christian churches, has taken the rule over national issues, ideology, history, script, education, upbringing and attitude to other countries. This church brings up the people in spirit of superiority, creation of "Great Armenia", genocide of Turkic nations, etc.

The fourth and most harmful unluckiness of Armenians is subjection of nation's destiny to Russian Empire. They think that Russians love Armenians as unlucky, suffering people and help them from humanitarian considerations, in the name of God. In fact, Russia needs Armenians only for its own unlimited purposes, Middle Eastern challenges and Caucasian problems. This can be seen from the history of "Armenian problem" described by V.Gurko-Kryajin in Large Soviet Encyclopedia.

Summarizing all said above it can be noted that:

- a) As long as national idea about creation of "Great Armenia" exists, there will exist national-religious fanaticism.
- b) As long as Dashnak party exists, Armenians will not be able to freely think and act in respect of national issues.
- c) As long as Armenia is related to Russia and Russian Empire exists, Armenia will not have independent foreign policy.

Unless all indicated factors will not be removed Armenians will not refuse from that mistaken path. This means, that we have not to wait for peaceful liberation of our territories.

The only possible way to restore our borders is war. We have to seriously prepare to war.

**ARMENIAN CLAIMS FOR NORTH
AZERBAIJAN TERRITORIES IN THE I HALF OF XX CENTURY**

Russian empire, which supported Armenians starting from the beginning of XIX century, assisted them in implementation of their desire to establish their own state. During the World War I tsar of Russia Nicolas II while his talks with Ambassador of France speaking about Armenians said that he "will give them at least the autonomy" and kept his word by signing on January 11 of 1917 the decree on Turkish Armenia. Despite that Bolsheviks, which came to power after October 1917 revolution, did not recognize decrees of tsar Nicolas II, they recognized decree on "Turkish Armenia" on December 27 of 1917. On December 16 of 1917 V.Lenin assigned S.Shaumyan as an extraordinary commissar in Caucasus. He was sent to Baku to lead Bolshevik movement, impede any attempts to give autonomy to local Turkish-Moslem population of Azerbaijan and fulfill his historic mission for implementation of "Turkish Armenia" decree. In March of 1918 after signing of Brest-Litovsk agreement the Bolsheviks Russia recognized Gars, Batum and Ardahan as territories of Turkey and this changed territory on which indicated decree was applied. In March-April of 1918 Turkey had restored its political authority in Ardahan, Gars and Batum provinces. Armenian military units, which within the Russian army in Caucasus fought against Turks and were disgracefully turned out of Anadolu, had started invasion into Irevan, Nakhchivan and Garabagh regions where ancient Turk Moslem population of South Caucasus was settled. At the same time, Armenians, which rely upon assistance of Bolshevik Russia and having serious support in Moscow, fostered plans to separate Baku province from Azerbaijan, especially Baku and its surrounding districts which was the oil producing region of the world, and make them as independent Armenisized province of Russia. Joint policy implemented by Bolsheviks and Armenians during Baku Commune under the leadership of Shaumyan consisted of three tasks: 1) decrease Turk-Moslem population of Baku exterminating them and forcing to flee; 2) separate Baku from Azerbaijan de- facto and de-jure; 3) increase Armenian population of Baku. Shaumyan, who threatened by failure of Russian policy in South Caucasus said that if Baku will be announced a capital of Azerbaijan the "South Caucasus will be lost for Russia". Cruelty of S.Shaumyan can be seen from his statement that he can "provide security of only those Moslems which recognize Soviet power". A.Japaridze, internal affairs Commissar of Baku Commune said "if I were confident that Moslems believe me I would help them". S.Shaumyan without hiding his intentions said that in 1918 we

deliberately fulfilled massacre because if "Musavat won, Baku would be announced the capital of Azerbaijan". In 1918 G.Checherin, Russian foreign affairs Commissar, announced at one of official meetings that "Baku district will always be within the Russia". This meant absolute devoid of Azerbaijan of Caspian sea coasts.

Due to complicated political situation, M.Resultzadeh, chairman of National Council of Azerbaijan Democratic Republic (ADR) located in Ganja and Foreign Minister M.Hajinsky signed friendship agreement with Ottoman empire on June 4, 1918. This agreement was a necessary step for introduction of Azerbaijan into international community and for preserving of territorial integrity of Azerbaijan. Military operation started on June 11 of 1918 by disarmament of Armenian armed units in Ganja ended with liberation of Baku on September 15 the same year. Fatali khan Khoysky, chairman of Council of Ministers of ADR, on September 15 of 1918 on occasion of liberation of Baku sent a telegram to Nuru Pasha, the Commander of Caucasus Islamic Turk Army:

"The nation is grateful to you...". Turk-Moslem population of South Caucasus become independent in May 1918 and newly established Azerbaijan government attempted to politically solve issues of borders. As a result of Batum conference in May 1918 Azerbaijan government signed an agreement of three newly established states. On May 29 of 1918 a new state Ararat (Armenia) was established with 10 thousand sq.km area and capital Irevan city, which historically was the territory of Azerbaijan. But this benevolent action of Azerbaijan even more enticed Armenians. They considered that it was the right moment for implementation of idea of "Great Armenia" and made broader territorial claims to Azerbaijan. Armenian Dashnaks making territorial claims for Garabagh, Nakhchivan and Zangezur, which historically were territories of Azerbaijan, at the same time started ethnic cleansing policy in these territories. Gangs of Andronik, Dro and Njdeni fulfilled genocide against civil population in Zangezur, Nakhchivan and Garabagh. Ethnic cleansing policy implemented through 1918-1920 in newly established Ararat republic resulted in drop of Turk-Moslem population from 575 thousand people to 10 thousand in 1922.

Armenian Dashnaks settled in mountain portion of Garabagh at their Congress held in July and September of 1918 announced the independence of this region. Andronik reinforced its positions in one of the areas of Zangezur and established here Armenian province with "capital Gorus". Later he attempted to establish "small Armenia" with "capital in Shusha". In order to prevent territorial claims to Azerbaijan and attacks of Armenian Dashnaks against local Turk-Moslems the Council of Ministers of ADR at the meeting on January 15 of 1919 decided to establish General-Governor of Shusha, Jevanshir and Jebrail districts. Temporary position of General-Governor possessed by extraordinary authority. Khosrov bey Sultanov was assigned as a General-Governor. By resolution dated

February 28 of 1919 of Ministers Council of Azerbaijan Democratic Republic the temporary General- Governorate was established for Nakhchivan, Ordubad, Sherur-Dereleyez and Vedibasara regions. Behram khan Nakhchivansky was assigned as General-Governor and Kerim khan Irevansky and Haci Mehti Bagirov were assigned as his assistants.

In objection to the General-Governorate of Garabagh, organizations of Armenian Dashnaks in Garabagh at their V Congress held in April of 1919 discussed attitude towards Azerbaijan and made a decision not to recognize any government institution related to Azerbaijan government.

Territorial claims of Armenian Dashnaks to Azerbaijan had turned into military invasion. Population of Azerbaijani villages unable to resist Armenian invasion was forced to flee their homes. In October of 1919 Armenians devastated 110 large Turk-Moslem villages of Zangezur. About 60 thousand people from those villages took refuge in Garabagh. Armenians brought 7 thousand troops from Dilijan and a large number of troops from Yeni Beyazid district of Irevan province into Zangezur. A large number of Armenian armed units were deployed in order to occupy Garabagh. According to peace agreement signed on November 23 of 1919 in Tiflis, Azerbaijan and Armenia had to withdraw their troops from Zangezur.

Despite that due to this agreement Azerbaijan withdrawn its troops from Zangezur, Armenia did not withdraw its troops, on the contrary strengthened them. In two months period from signing of peace agreement other 40 villages of Zangezur were devastated and population was killed.

On March 22, 1920 at 3 a.m. Armenian Dashnak insurgent units attacked Azerbaijan's troops deployed in Shusha, Khankendi, Askeran, Khodzaly and Terter. Azerbaijan armed forces counterattacked from Agdam to Askeran on March 29. Attacked undertaken by Agdam unit was strengthened by Zagatala infantry forces, Shirvan regiment and Terter cavalry regiment. Agdam armed unit attack on April 3 defeated Armenian forces and liberated Askeran and Khodzaly and entered Shusha on April 5. Fierce battles took place over April 9-11 nearby Keshishkend in surroundings of Shusha. In these battles Armenian Dashnak forces in Garabagh had shocking defeat and their bases were liquidated. Armenian armed forces unable to resist Azerbaijan army had sent their families to Zangezur and attacked Azerbaijani villages by small units. Agdam armed forces defeated Armenian armed units activated in some areas. Armenian forces entered Gaybali village and put to fire its part at night from April 18 to 19.

At the beginning of 1920 successful operations of Red Army in North Caucasus encouraged Armenian armed forces and starting from January 1920 Armenia intensified their attacks. Soviet Russia led provocative policy against Azerbaijan Democratic Republic. Encouraging Armenians for making territorial claims to Azerbaijan, Russia pushed them to war against Azerbaijan in Zangezur and Garabagh provinces. As a result a large portion of Azerbaijan army was

involved in battles in Garabagh and Zangezur. Until the end of April 1920 the Azerbaijan army fought for preserving of territorial integrity of Azerbaijan.

It can be seen from historical sources that the XI Army attempted to occupy Baku in order to separate it from Azerbaijan and announce a territory of Russia. However, later Lenin refused from this idea. According to his order M.Tkhachevsky, the Commander at the Caucasus front in his telegram sent on April 23 of 1920 to the XI Army Commander M.Levandovsky said: "As amendment to our resolution N 490, I order that the final aim of the Army is not only Baku province, but a whole Azerbaijan".

From revolution of April of 1920 to 1933 assignment of the first Secretary of Central Committee of Azerbaijan CP (b) from representatives of non Turkic nations provided continuation of territorial claims of Armenians to Azerbaijan. In 1929 three villages of Zangilan region were illegally given to Armenia. Through these years the mountain area of Gazakh district - Dilijan district was also given to Armenia despite the will of Azerbaijan nation.

Statement made by N.Narimanov resulted in annexation to Armenia of 4504.5 sq.km area of Zangezur, i.e. these areas were given as a present. As a result of this irresponsible statement Azerbaijan lost 11 thousand sq. km. These included Zangezur, Sherur-Dereleyaz and Goyce provinces.

By the decree of Azerbaijan Central Committee dated from July 7 of 1923 Daglyg Garabagh Autonomous Region was established in Azerbaijan SSR. Territory of DGAR constituted 4372 sq.km in Garabagh region of Northern Azerbaijan and included Shusha and Khankendi and 115 villages, 52 villages of Jevanshir district, 30 villages of Garyagin district and Galaderesi village of Gubadly district.

Moscow supporting Armenians, in 1931 adopted a resolution to move Armenians from foreign countries to the South Caucasus. As a result, thousands of Armenians were moved from Middle East and Balkans. Armenians were settled in villages in which in 20-30-ies of XX century Turk-Moslem population settled and in places of German colonies created at the end of XIX and start of XX century. Ten thousands Armenians were settled not only on the territory of DGAR, but also instead of deported Germans in villages of Ganja, Shamkir and Samukh regions. Armenian Dashnaks serving within political and administrative organizations of Soviet power and Soviet army in aim to implement ethnic cleansing deported and fulfilled mass killings of hundreds of thousands innocent Moslem Turks. They developed a special plan for deportation of Azerbaijan population through 1941-1945 to Middle Asia, Kazakhstan and Siberia. Then their dirty plans failed, Arutyunov, the First Secretary of Central Committee of Armenia's Communist Party, in autumn of 1945 proposed to annex DGAR to Armenia SSR and sent proposal to the Central Committee of Communist Party (b) of USSR. As a result of Azerbaijan government activity the impudent claims of

Armenians were not executed. In two years the supporters of Armenians in Moscow pushed the Council of Ministers of USSR towards adoption of resolution for "Move of members of kolkhoz and other Azerbaijani population into Kur-Araz plain of Azerbaijan SSR" on December 23 of 1947. According to this resolution 150 thousand Azerbaijani were forced to leave their homeland in Armenia SSR through 1948-1950.

If during Azerbaijan Democratic Republic the territory of Northern Azerbaijan constituted 114 thousand sq.km, after the coup of April 1920 it was 86.4 thousand sq.km. "Resolution" of territorial issues unilaterally, in Dashnak-Bolshevik manner during Soviet era led to appropriation of 27599 sq.km area of our Motherland by Armenia.

Valeh Bakhshaliyev

RESTORATION OF MORAL VALUES IS THE HISTORIC NECESSITY

For the past years the "troubled times" left deep traces in the life of our nation. The war, occupation of Garabagh, economic and political constrains do not allow to taste the joy, moral and psychological satisfaction from restored independence and related processes.

In 1992 Milli Majlis (the Parliament) adopted the law for reinstatement of our language and making it the only official language and this was a serious historic event. Regaining of nations name as Turkic nation made it possible to remove some historic misunderstandings and restore our history of several thousand years. However, in this case the violence is not acceptable, those who do want to stay "Azerbaijani" must have the right to do so. In our point of view, today in Azerbaijan along with Turks, Lezgins, Talish, Tat, Avars and other ethnicities there are those who do feel themselves as Azerbaijani and they do live as a one nation. Azerbaijani, which formed for the last 70 years of the XX century by Soviet regime and ideology, can not be rejected or blamed. Some intelligentsia pouring water onto mill of our enemies, repeatedly expressed ideas in mass media and television channels about "young and inexperienced Azerbaijani nation". That is why a part of population represented by those intelligentsia may naturally be attributed to young Azerbaijan "nation".

On the other hand, one of the blameful issues is problem of alphabet. Thrice change of our alphabet for the last 100 years is considered by most people

as painful and tragic event. But I would like to touch this problem in other, a bit wider aspect. Ill-disposed neighbors sometimes blame us for absence of our own alphabet and are proud of having ancient alphabet and being "civilized" nation. However, upon analyzing it can be seen that use by Armenians of their own alphabet does not evidence their culture.

On the contrary, absence of our, i.e. Turks own alphabet proves our being more cultural and developed nation. First of all, existence of ancient Turkic alphabet is known from history (monuments of Orkhon-Yenisey are undeniable proofs of existence 1400 years ago of Turkic alphabet, phonetic rules of artistic and scientific works and a long development period -A.Rajabov, Y.Mamedov. Orkhon-Yenisey monuments, Baku, 1993). On the other hand, up to the beginning of the XX century in Azerbaijan (in the broad sense - in the Great Turkistan) the Arabic alphabet was used for several hundreds of years. There is a question: whether use of Arabic alphabet brings a pride to the nation or proves its imperfectness? Is it possible to blame Englishmen, Germans, Spanish or French for use of Latin alphabet? What was the reason of use of Latin alphabet by these nations?

It is known that during the Middle ages there were two centers of civilization: centers conditionally named as West and East. In one of these civilization domains the Latin alphabet was adopted as a common communication mean, while in the other it was the Arabic alphabet. It must be noted that at that period these two cultural centers developed separately from each other. This is proved by the same discoveries made by western scientists 200-300 years after Moslem scientists. That is why, nations which had certain state attributes, culture and created large cultural and scientific works had to select one of these alphabets and join to one of these cultural centers. Naturally, Azerbaijan Turkic nation had to apply Arabic alphabet. I think that it is obvious that the nation, which did not have any communication at the state level and solved the problems by sending letters from one village to another, the nation which did not have any statehood stayed out of these great cultures and preserved its own local alphabet.

Are there any positive effects of our switch to the Latin alphabet in the 1920-ies, then switch to Cyrillic and today once again to Latin alphabet? I think there are. It has been mentioned earlier that nations, which consider themselves as cultural and possessed statehood traditions to a some extent, had to join Western or Eastern cultural domain. However, through the history Western culture (science and technology) took dominance over the Eastern culture and at the start of the XX century the Western culture was hegemonic around the globe. In this case according to considerations given above it was correct to switch to Latin alphabet. Similar to Turks of Turkey. But in our country the situation was a bit different. USSR was a closed and totalitarian empire. Through 70 years period within this empire the scientific, cultural, technological and economic progress took place.

Our switch to Cyrillic was a major stimulus for being within that local, closed cultural domain. Today, there is no USSR already and a whole world irrespective of our desire, progresses towards the Western culture, science, technology and economy. It is not possible to stay outside this culture, Latin alphabet, for clever nations, including us - Turks. Switch of other nations, such as Russians, Japanese and others to this alphabet is inevitable in the near future. It is important to pay attention to another problem. Change of alphabet is more difficult and painful for educated nation. But, for our community these are temporary difficulties and they will be resolved soon.

Temporary occupation of our territories mars undergoing historic processes and does not allow to properly evaluate all innovations and achievements. However, due to interdependence of all existed problems we have to remove their causes and liquidate their consequences.

CONTENTS

Ahmed Gashamoglu, *doctorate in philosophy*
Systematized approach to regulation of Garabagh conflict

Akif Naghi, *candidate of historical sciences*
About necessity of use of military force

AH Abasov, *doctorate in philosophy*
Garabagh conflict - as a national problem

Ali Mamedov, *candidate of historical sciences*
Mass displacement of Armenians from Ottoman empire and Iran into North Azerbaijan

Almaz Zulfaligyzy
Garabagh during the Azerbaijan Democratic Republic

Arif Yunusov, *candidate of historical sciences*
Deportation Of Azerbaijani from Armenia through 1948-1952

Ariz Geozelov
About some aspects of ideological conflict over Daglyg Garabagh between Armenia and Azerbaijan

Aydin Balayev, *doctorate in history*
Problem of efficiency of public diplomacy use in Garabagh process

Azad Tagizadeh, *candidate of mathematics and physics*
"Public diplomacy", or how and what can be discussed to aggressor

Azad İ sazadeh, *military expert*
Role of military psychology factors in resolution of Garabagh conflict

Chingiz Sultansoy, *political observer*
National inferiority complex and Garabagh problem

Eldar İ smayilov, *doctorate in history*
Garabagh knot: in retrospective perspective prism

Etibar Akhundov
About information war

Farhad Mamedov
Armenians claims for Daglyg Garabagh reflected in some historical sources

Fazail Ibrahimli, *doctorate in history, member of parliament*
April (1920) invasion and social and political situation
in Garabagh province of Azerbaijan

Fikret Nabiyev, *candidate of historical sciences*
Garabagh in the context of geopolitical interests of modern world

Firdovsiyya Ahmedova, *candidate of historical sciences*
Garabagh war and psychological state of Azerbaijan society

Fuad Mamedov, *doctorate in philosophy*
About cultural approach to resolution of Garabagh conflict

Geyret Guliyev, *candidate in historical sciences*
Ceasefire: establishment, development and crisis

Hasan Guliyev, *political observer*
Conflict in geopolitical context

İsrafil Mamedov, *candidate of historical sciences*
Ideological-organizing bases of Armenian separatism and national chauvinism

Ismayil Musa, *doctorate in historical sciences*
Azerbaijan-Armenia agreement and conference (1919)

Kamal Ali
Journalists went to Armenia and Daglyg Garabagh should be punished not forgiven

Kamil Salimov, *doctor of legal sciences*
International peacekeeping operation to force for peace- real path for resolution of Garabagh conflict

Kemale Huseynova
Genocide of Moslem Turks through 1905-1906 in Garabagh

Kerim Shukurov, *doctorate in historical sciences*
Dynamics of population and ethnic composition of Daglyg Garabagh Autonomous Republic

Leyla Aliyeva, *political observer*
The conflict and development of statehood

Leyla Yunus, *doctorate in political sciences*
Armenian potential for peaceful settlement of the conflict

Lyatifa Mamedova, *candidate of political sciences*
Anti-Azerbaijan activity of Armenian extremists in Garabagh (1918-1920)

Maryam Orudjlu, *candidate of historical sciences*
Facts on ethnic changes in Garabagh expounded in Russian sources

Mubariz Ahmedoglu, *political observer*
Democracy, Stability and Development in Caucasus

Nasib Nasibly, *doctorate in historical sciences, member of parliament*
Realistic approach to Garabagh problem

Natavan Kerimova
European Union interest in regulation of Daglyg Garabagh conflict

Nurani Kasumova, *political observer*

Armenia's relations with radical regimes of Middle East and probability of 'joining" of Armenian-Azerbaijan and Arabian- Israeli conflicts

Rafik Safarov, *candidate of historical sciences*
Ethno-political changes in West Azerbaijan in XIX-XX centuries

Rahman Badalov, *doctorate in philosophy*
Change of ideological orientations and Garabagh conflict

Rasim Musabekov, *political observer*
Geopolitical changes after 9/11 events and perspectives

of settlement of Armenian -Azerbaijan conflict

Rena Mirzazadeh, *doctorate in philosophy*
Garabagh conflict reflected in gender issues

Rovshan Allahverdiyev
History and undeniable facts of Daglyg Garabagh (in Armenian sources)

Seyidaga Onullahi, *doctorate in historical sciences*
"Azerbaijan's Garabagh", "Arran Garabagh" in contemporary sources in Persian

Shamyl Mehdi
Azerbaijan-Armenian conflict and policy of UN and OSCE: results for 10 year period

Sitare Mustafayeva
About the problem of territorial disputes in South Caucasus

Tapdiq Hasanov, *doctorate in geography*
Prolongation of Garabagh conflict influences global and regional integration of South Caucasus

Teymur Novruzoglu, *candidate of technical sciences*
"Armenian problem " in destiny of Armenians

Tofiq Hasanov, *candidate of historical sciences*
Armenian claims for North Azerbaijan territories in the I half of XX century

Valeh Bakshaliyev, *doctorate in technical sciences*
Restoration of moral values is the historic necessity

Organization of Liberation of Garabagh

Proceedings of conferences held under the topic
"Garabagh yesterday, today and tomorrow"

I 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 13

Publishing House of businessman Namig Habibov