

**GEVORG STEPANYAN\***

*Doctor of History, Professor*

*Institute of History NAS RA*

*sasun-07@mail.ru*

DOI: 10.54503/1829-4073-2022.1.5-31

**THE “GREAT AZERBAIJAN” PROJECT IN THE  
PAN-TURKISH CONCEPT OF THE MUSAVATISTS, YOUNG  
TURKS AND KEMALISTS\*\***

**Key words:** Pan-Turkism, Young Turks, “Great Azerbaijan”, the Musavat, kemalists, Eastern Transcaucasia, genocide.

***Introduction***

After the recent Artsakh war in 2020 both the Republics of Armenia and Artsakh, appeared in the most complicated conditions where multi-polar military, political factors and ongoing geopolitical developments make them face new challenges. The outlines of these challenges with various parallels are related to the historical, political realities of the past. Thus, within the frames of this study, against the historical background, we shall reveal the prehistory of the issue and the present implications.

***The Origin of Pan-Turkism and its Ideological Essence***

It is common knowledge that still in the 70s and 80s of the 19<sup>th</sup> century Pan-Turkism emerged as an ideology among the Muslim peoples of Russia. The

---

\* Հոդվածը ներկայացվել է 05.02.22, գրախոսվել է 26.03.22, ընդունվել է տպագրության 25.04.22:

\*\* Հետազոտությունն իրականացվել է ՀՀ ԿԳՄՍՆ Գիտության կոմիտեի տրամադրած ֆինանսավորմամբ՝ 21T-6A163 ծածկագրով գիտական թեմայի շրջանակում:

“ideological smithies” were such organizations as “Turkish Yurdu” and “Turkish Hearth” established in the Russian cities of Ufa and Kazan (the founders were Ismail-bek Gasprinsky considered as the “father” of the ideology, Ali Hussein Zade<sup>1</sup>, Ahmed-bek Aghayev, Fuad Kyoprulu, Yusuf Akçura and others)<sup>2</sup>. The ideology having originated in Russia to fight the czarist policy of Christianizing and alienating Muslims, initially aimed at increasing their national self-awareness, in other words “to protect the Sharia from the Russian encroachment and save the Muslims from the looming danger of Christianization”<sup>3</sup>.

At the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century the Pan-Turkish ideology was also popularized in the Ottoman Empire, when many of the above-mentioned well-known figures of Pan-Turkism moving to Turkey, settled in Constantinople and other cities<sup>4</sup>. Ali Hussein Zade the representative of the Russian Pan-Turkism was the first to have moved to Constantinople (1889)<sup>5</sup>, and his poem “Turan” became the initial “bugler” in the Ottoman capital<sup>6</sup>. Yusuf Akçura was one of the well-known ideologists, the proponent of nationalism, ethnicism and Turkification. He is also considered the theoretician of the ideology of Pan-Turkism as he authored its political doctrine and plan<sup>7</sup>. One of the most outstanding representatives of Pan-Turkism, the student of Ali Hussein Zade (the latter is considered as the founder of the ideology in the Empire), the most famous ideologist of Turkism, the founder of the organization “Turkish Hearths” (“Türk Ocağı”), the editor of the Turkish magazine “Turkish Homeland” (“Türk Yurdu”) and the follower of the Young Turks’ movement, Mehmet Ziya (later he took the name Gökalt – “the hero of the sky”) was the ringleader of Turkish nationalism. His ideology of Turanism and

---

<sup>1</sup> Ali Hussein Zade was born in Salian town, in the vicinity of Baku (see **Փաշայան** 2014, 23–24).

<sup>2</sup> See **Зареванд** 1930, 38; **Аршаруни, Габидуллин** 1930, 13. It should be noted that such European Orientalists-Turkologists as Arminius Vambery (Hungarian), Leon Davis Kahun (English) and Arthur Lomeli (French), who were all of Jewish origin, played a great role in the formation of Pan-Turkism and its propaganda. With their works they tried “to substantiate” the linguistic, cultural, genetic similarities found in the Turkish-Tartar peoples (see **Բեգիջանյան** 1995, 48). According to the Turkish author Doğan Avcioğlu, Jews were the founders of Pan-Turkism (see **Սարգսյան** 1983, 13).

<sup>3</sup> **Զարեանի** 1987, 13:

<sup>4</sup> **Зареванд** 1930, 42–43, 50, see also **Զարեանի** 1987, 16, 18, 20.

<sup>5</sup> See **Զարեանի** 1926, 25.

<sup>6</sup> See **Պողոսյան** 1990, 8.

<sup>7</sup> **Зареванд** 1930, 42.

Pan-Turkism was completed in the work “The Bases of Turkism” (it was originally published in 1923). The work was visionary, becoming the theoretical basis of the developments in the external and internal policy pursued by the Ottoman Empire and thence by the Republic of Turkey<sup>8</sup>. According to Ziya Gökalp’s doctrine, the ideology of Pan-Turkism was to be put into practice through a three-stage system. The **first** was Turkism with the abandonment of the ideology of Pan-Ottomanism. The latter entailed the Turkification or extermination of non-Turkish peoples within the borders of the Ottoman Empire. When the Turkification of the Empire was completed, the second **stage** followed, consisting in the creation of a Pan-Oghuz state. The Pan-Oghuz state was to include Turkey, Transcaucasia, the Turkish speaking countries of Central Asia and Iranian Atropatene and their subsequent annexation to the Ottoman Empire. In the **third** stage the dream of creating a Turanian Empire was to be fulfilled. The Empire would stretch from the Mediterranean to the Pacific Ocean and cover the territories lying between China and the Arctic Ocean<sup>9</sup>. Due to active propaganda, Pan-Turkism based on uniting all the Turkish speaking peoples in one state led by Turks, infatuated the whole Turkish society of the multi-ethnic Ottoman Empire.

In June, 1908, after Young Turks’ Ittihad (Committee of Union and Progress) seized the power through military coup, more favorable conditions emerged for the large-scale propaganda of the ideology of Pan-Turkism<sup>10</sup> which finally became part of the state policy<sup>11</sup> when Young Turks abandoned Pan-Ottomanism and Pan-Islamism altogether, adopting Pan-Turkism as its official ideology (including the latter in the agenda of state policy) at the 4<sup>th</sup> convention of the party held from September 29 to October 9, 1911 in Thessaloniki.

In the years of the First World War, 1915–1916 the mass genocide of more than 1.5 million Western Armenians perpetrated by Young Turks with Imperial Germany’s complicity can be regarded as the first step towards the realization of Pan-Turkism, i.e. Turkification with its true essence manifested. Nonetheless, with the appropriation of Western Armenia the “Armenian wedge” was not eliminated from the cherished idea of Pan-Turkism.

---

<sup>8</sup> See a comprehensive historical-philological study on Ziya Gökalp in Սաֆարյան 2001, 1–6, Սաֆարյան 2016, 86–93.

<sup>9</sup> Зареванд 1930, 89–92. See also Խուրշուդյան 1995, 34.

<sup>10</sup> See Սաֆրաստյան 2011, 138.

<sup>11</sup> See Зареванд 1930, 68–69. Cited in Ավետիսյան 1996, 3. Авакян 1999, 13–18.

***The Ideological, Political Bases of the Project “Great Azerbaijan”: the Methodology of its Implementation***

The First World War created favorable conditions for the realization of Pan-Turkish ideology. One of the theoreticians of Pan-Turkism the writer Ömer Seyfettin on November 11, 1914 after the Ottoman Empire's involvement in the war, claimed: “This war is fought for the ideal of the nation, at the same time it is a war for religion. That is why we will save our brothers, the Turks from the Russian oppression, who share religion and language with us, thus, accepting them in our political borders. We will firstly seize the Caucasus from Russians, and then move to Turkestan to our homeland, where more than 50 million Muslims live”<sup>12</sup>. These aggressive plans received a great response in Baku, the Pan-Turkism centre of Transcaucasia<sup>13</sup> and were obviously encouraged by the Musavat (Equality) which was formed in October, 1911 due to the ideological influence of the Ittihad party. The motto of the Musavat was “Turkification, Islamization, Modernization”<sup>14</sup>, and since 1913 the main ideologist and the torchbearer of Pan-Turkism Mahammad Amin Rasulzade<sup>15</sup> was the party's<sup>16</sup> leader. Highlighting the ideological and practical similarities between the Ittihad and the Musavat along with the covert aims of this partnership, Constantinople's newspaper Chakatamart wrote: “During the world war the Musavat fully adopted the political course of the Ittihad, i.e. inspiring the Muslim population of the Caucasus with the spirit of Pan-Turanism and Pan-Islamism, making them envisage a union among all the Islamic states, starting from Constantinople and ending with India”<sup>17</sup>.

Thus, despite the defeats that the Young Turks suffered in the Russian-Turkish front, despite the advances of the Russian army in Western Armenia, the plan to conquer the Caucasus and create a Turanian Empire underwent a new development in the ideological “kitchen” of Young Turks. It is notable that in the

---

<sup>12</sup> Ömer Seyfettin 1958, 21–22 as cited in Ավետիսյան 1996, 3.

<sup>13</sup> Ջարեանի 1926, 23:

<sup>14</sup> Пәсәфов 2007, 29–38; Векилов 1998, 28.

<sup>15</sup> See Дубинский-Мухадзе 1968, 207.

<sup>16</sup> See Саркисов 1960, 204, see also Барсегов 2008, 232. On more details about the cooperation between Young Turks and the Musavat see Ավետիսյան 1991, 43–64.

<sup>17</sup> Misak Torlakian's 40<sup>th</sup> trial for the assassination of Javanshir held by the British tribunal Հակատամարտ, 5.10.1921.

light of creating “Great Turan” at minimum the formation of a Pan-Oghuz state was seen crucial. Hence, in their undertakings of bringing that plan to fruition, the Young Turks worked out a somewhat known military-political concept – the artificially created “Eastern Caucasian Muslim” formation, which was to be named “Azerbaijan”. On this basis, the creation of a new state stretching from the Black Sea to the Caspian Sea (from Batumi to Baku) – “Great Azerbaijan”, as part of the Ottoman Empire would become feasible. As one of the first components of the creation of the Pan-Oghuz state, it was to become a bridge between the Ottoman Empire and all the Turkish speaking peoples<sup>18</sup> of the Caucasus and Central Asia. This would help realize to the full the far-reaching plan of uniting all the Turkish speaking nations under the “Pan-Oghuz state’s” flag, thus, creating “The Great Turan”. Therefore, the program of “Great Azerbaijan” would become the ideological and political basis for the Pan-Turanian Empire. Ruben Ter-Minasian, a knowledgeable author in the events of the time, in his scientifically and theoretically accurate, valuable study “Armenia and Azerbaijan” that chimed with the current events, concluded: “Whether one likes it or not, to the north east of Armenia a new “nation” came into existence, which aims to create a **united Azerbaijan, the majority of them consider themselves “Azerbaijani Turks, whereas the minority – “Azerbaijani”** (emphasis is ours – G.S.)”<sup>19</sup>. Revealing the essence of Pan-Turkish ideology Academician Lendrush Khurshudian stressed out that the Azerbaijani factor was to some extent a constituent of the Turkish one. “There is not such a nation as the Azerbaijani. The Azerbaijani are in fact Turks, descending from the Oghuz Turkmen tribes, and the Pan-Turkish ideologists relied on this reality for the creation of the Oghuz state”<sup>20</sup>.

It is more than obvious that this plan being of pivotal significance for the Pan-Turkish ideologists was to be realized through the physical extermination of Eastern Armenians. Their objective was to annihilate the “Armenian wedge” “forced” between the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish speaking peoples<sup>21</sup> of Transcaucasia and Central Asia. According to the ideologists of Pan-Turkism, both Western Armenians and Eastern Armenians were equally seen as obstacles for the creation of “Great Turan”. Turks planned to annihilate Armenia through the

---

<sup>18</sup> «Թայմս»-ի մի նոր յոդվածը, Յառաջ, 19.06.1920: See also Зареванд 1930, 92.

<sup>19</sup> Ռուբէն 1927, 72:

<sup>20</sup> Խուրշուդիան 1999, 100–101:

<sup>21</sup> See Зареванд 1930, 13.

### **The “Great Azerbaijan” Project in the Pan-Turkish Concept...**

---

extermination of Armenians that were in between the Ottoman Empire and Baku<sup>22</sup>.

Remaking the political, administrative map of the Caucasus, the genocidal alliance of Young Turks and Musavatists devised a plan according to which, the governorates of Gandzak, Yelizavetapol, the southern part of Yerevan governorate along with the southern part of Tiflis governorate, Georgia and some southern areas of Dagestan were to be included in the so-called “Great Azerbaijan”. Thus, an attempt was made to entirely seize away Artaskh and Syunik from Armenia, Nakhichevan and Sharur from Yerevan governorate, the governorates of Yerevan and Etchmiadzin, Surmalu along with the foot of Masis stretching up to the governorate of Kars. In other words, a territory of 50.520 sq. km<sup>23</sup> was to be seized from Armenia. According to the map made by Enver pasha and Tapa Cermoyev, one of the leaders of the union “The United Mountaineers of the Caucasus” the total territory of “Great Azerbaijan” was to make 140.000 sq. km<sup>24</sup>. After the Turkish army’s conquest of Baku, on September 22, 1918 the map of “Great Azerbaijan” was at one point illustrated in the government affiliated daily “Yeni gün” (A New Day) published in Constantinople. In this map compiled with the spirit of Pan-Turkism the ethnographic picture of Transcaucasia was utterly changed. Armenia as such did not exist on the map, while the allocation of Armenia was represented by a few islets. In stark contrast to this, “Great Azerbaijan” was portrayed as an expansive state of the Caucasus<sup>25</sup>.

Fed by the villainous ideology of Pan-Islamism and Pan-Turkism, by order of the Young Turks, the Musavat was feverishly trying to prepare the acceleration of the Turks’ advances towards the Caucasus. After the Revolution of February, 1917<sup>26</sup> the Musavat’s affiliation to Turkey became even more apparent. At the first Pan-Russian congress of Muslims held from May 1–14, 1917 in Kasan M.E. Rasulzade driven by the long-cherished dream of Pan-Turkism claimed: “At present the Turkish nation has the greatest and most powerful influence on the

---

<sup>22</sup> **Խուրշուդյան** 1995, 34–35:

<sup>23</sup> **Ռուբէն** 1982, 183–184:

<sup>24</sup> **Փ.ժ. Լա Շրնէ** Դրօշակ, 12.02.1992:

<sup>25</sup> «Հորիզոն», 30.10.1918, see also **Խուրճնյան** 1989, 37–38: Another map of “Great Azerbaijan” was published by the Ministry of Social Affairs of Azerbaijan in the yearbook *Адресь-календарь Азербайджанской Республики на 1920 г., на тюркскомъ и русскомъ языкахъ* (1-ый год издания): под редакцией **А.И. Ставровского**, Баку, 1920.

<sup>26</sup> **Балаев** 1998, 31.

international, Islamic brotherhood. We Turkish-Tartars are the children of this nation (Turkish) and are proud of it. Of 30 million Russian Muslims 29 belong to the Turkish nation. The free Turkish-Tartars of Russia must unite”<sup>27</sup>. The ardent proponent of Pan-Islamism, the Ittihad party (the namesake of Young Turks’ Ittihad) of Russian Muslims was formed in September, 1917 and led by Kara-bek Karabekov<sup>28</sup>, carried out more potent activity in Baku. Hence, due to the collapse of the central government, with Turks’ help and under their aegis, the Musavat explicitly tried to grab the opportunity and through the genocide of Eastern Armenians put into practice the Pan-Turkish plan of creating the new state of “Great Azerbaijan”. According to the evidence of a document, “Turkish officers joined their efforts with the National Muslim Committee to create Muslim statehood in the Eastern Caucasus”<sup>29</sup>. In this respect, it is worth mentioning that the issue of creating “Great Azerbaijan” led to an internal discord and disagreement in the public and political circles of the Caucasian Tartars. The discrepancies between groups divided them into two wings. The discord among them mainly referred to the issues on the borders of the state and the political direction of its government. In this respect, of great interest are Tigran Nazarian’s (the editor of the journal Taraz published in Tiflis) noteworthy, substantially evidenced observations and revelations that were published on the eve of Batumi Treaty conference. Answering the question concerning the goals the Caucasian Tartars pursued in realizing the Pan-Turkish plans, T. Nazarian introduced the following significant information: “In regard to the Turks of our country it should be stated that they also are divided into two wings. Some of them want to create an independent state of Azerbaijan, consisting of Gandzak and Baku governorates, Dagestan, a part of Yerevan governorate (the province of Nakhichevan) and Persian Azerbaijan (Tabriz-Khoy-Salmast-Vormi-Kurdistan) under Turkish sway, that is why they are dissatisfied as Turkey wants to seize the province of Nakhichevan from Azerbaijan, whereas the other wing strives to join the whole of Transcaucasia to Turkey, except for Georgia, expanding its borders up to the Caucasus Mountains”<sup>30</sup>.

---

<sup>27</sup> **Զարեան** 1927, 107:

<sup>28</sup> **Միքայելեան** 1923, 165:

<sup>29</sup> **Ավետիսյան** 1991, 47:

<sup>30</sup> **Նազարեան Տ.** Քաղաքական դրույթներ, Մշակ, 2.06.1918 (20.05.1918):

---

### The “Great Azerbaijan” Project in the Pan-Turkish Concept...

---

Thence, proceeding with his observations consistent with the political state of affairs of the time, T. Nazarian emphasized: **“The first wing does not want to join Turkey as they know pretty well that under the Turkish sway they are to be forced to provide army. Besides they would be oppressed and deprived of the possibility of development, security and benefits they enjoyed under the Russian dominion”**<sup>31</sup> (emphasis is ours – G.S.).

Thus, summing up the two above-mentioned approaches we can notice that they are in fact opposed to one another in terms of political orientation and in essence. The disagreements mainly concerned the issue of future political stance on Turkey. The **first** group favored the formation and preservation of a state on the grounds of allied ties with Turkey under its guardianship. The **second** one consistently supported the idea of becoming Turkey’s adjunct.

The first step taken towards the creation of “Great Azerbaijan” was the proclamation of Young Turks and Musavats on May, 28 1918 in Tiflis, about their Pan-Turkish plan of establishing<sup>32</sup> the artificially born “Eastern Caucasian Muslim Republic” which was up until then non-existent in the Caspian region, on the left bank of the Kur. The denomination of the latter was based on the historical name of the Persian governorate Atropatene-Atrpatakan Adarabaigan (New Persian) – Azarbaijan (in Arabic), which in the Turkish version was called “Azerbaijan”<sup>33</sup>. The

---

<sup>31</sup> **Նազարեան Տ.** Քաղաքական դրույթներ, Մշակ, 2.06.1918 (20.05.1918):

<sup>32</sup> See **Սիմոնյան** 1991, 305. The fact that the “new growth”, trying to find its political place on the map of Transcaucasia, was also known under the name of “Eastern Caucasian Muslim Republic”, was evidenced in the report that the military figure, chief-lieutenant Heribert von Laris sent to Berlin on June 15, 1918. It said: “Turks obviously want to join the Northern Caucasus, Dagestan included to the Eastern Caucasian Muslim Republic, which is called Azerbaijan here” (**Ավետիսյան** 1997, 285).

<sup>33</sup> Not a single geographical name or state with the name “Azerbaijan” has ever existed in eastern Transcaucasia. Professor Art. Abeghian, a philologist and historian, stated straightly: “Before the war (refers to WWI – G.S.) a state called **Azerbaijan** and a nation under the name of **Azerbaijani** never existed. The old Russian statistics only acknowledged “Eastern Transcaucasia”, “Governorates of Baku and Gandzak” which replaced the khanates of the same names under the Persian dominion. The tribe that made the majority in that region was either known as **Tartar** or just Muslims in the old census (**Աբեղեան** 1928, 135). After the dissolution of the Transcaucasian Seim on May 26, 1918, due to the Young Turks’ scheme and support, the Caucasian Tartars’ “national” Council (Rasul Zade being its leader) on May 28, in Tiflis proclaimed a new “state”. With the help of the very name it aimed to make territorial claims to the historical, north-western Persian governorate of Atropatene-Atrpatakan (it had originated from the name of Media’s satrap Atropates in the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC) –



usage of that name pursued the following far-reaching goal – with the help of the same name to make territorial claims, annexing the region of historical Iran to the newly created formation which would become “Southern Azerbaijan”. This would put into practice the Pan-Turkish plan of creating “Great Azerbaijan”<sup>34</sup>. The fact that the Persian governorate of Azerbaijan was of special strategic significance for the Pan-Turkish plans was evidenced with well-grounded facts by Zarevand in his works: “The Azerbaijani plan is to firstly join the Persian Atrpatakan to their state, then convert the Caucasus into **“Great Azerbaijan”** (bold – G.S.)”<sup>35</sup>. Having a clearly devised plan and adequate resources and succumbing to their bellicose ideas, the Turkish Musavatists resorted to practical steps.

The Ottoman Empire having re-conquered Western Armenia, in the spring of 1918 invaded Transcaucasia in four directions. According to the military plan put forward by Enver pasha, the objective of the 1<sup>st</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Turkish military troops was to conquer the governorates of Tiflis and Yerevan, while the 2<sup>nd</sup> troop under the command of the general-lieutenant Nuri Killigil pasha<sup>36</sup> was to conquer Baku<sup>37</sup> and, through committing a genocide of Eastern Armenians, realize the idea of creating the “Oghuz State” the cornerstone of which was the formation of the new state “Great Azerbaijan”.

Turks’ invasion into Baku was encouraged by the puppet government of Musavatists<sup>38</sup> settled in Gandzak that sought after the existence of the artificially born state “Great Azerbaijan” on the map.

The defense of Baku, occupying a special place in the military actions of WWI, was of decisive significance not only for the Armenians in the governorates of Gandzak-Yelizavetapol and Baku but also for the further fate of the newly created Republic of Armenia. As a result of the Armenian army’s four-month self-defense combats full of unimaginable feats, at the expense of numerous victims

---

Adarabaigan (New Persian) – Azarbaijan (in Arabic) which in the Turkish version was called “The Democratic Republic of Azerbaijan” (see Swietochowski 1985, 129). On more details see Էնաեթոլլահ Ռէզա 1994, Ասատրյան, Գևորգյան 1990, Galichian 2010, 35.

<sup>34</sup> Бартольд 1963, 703.

<sup>35</sup> Ջարեանդ 1987, 166:

<sup>36</sup> Nuri pasha, being Enver pasha’s stepbrother within a short period of time was ascended from a centurion to the rank of general-lieutenant (see Ռ՛վ է Նուրի փաշա, Ժողովուրդ, 13/26.11.1918).

<sup>37</sup> Հարությունյան 1984, 174–175, 207:

<sup>38</sup> Юджин 2018, 452, see Балаев 1998, 107.

### **The “Great Azerbaijan” Project in the Pan-Turkish Concept...**

---

the Turkish troops were “glued” to the region of Baku up until September 15, while the Ottoman Empire’s capitulation was looming. Thereby, the Turkish army failed to enclose the Republic of Armenia and carry out the Pan-Turkish plan of exterminating Armenians downright. Averting the planned assault on Artsakh, Syunik and Yerevan, the heroic battle of Baku played a decisive role in the defense of the newly created Republic of Armenia<sup>39</sup>. After fierce fightings, Baku was seized on May 29, through implementing the strategy of the conquest and appropriation of Constantinople in 1453. Intending to make Baku an administrative unit for this artificially born new formation called “Azerbaijan”, Absheron peninsula was given to them as a gift. To be more precise having no interconnection with the ethno-religious origin, civilization processes or city building of Baku whatsoever, through the machination of appropriating the toponym “Azerbaijan” as their ethnonym, Baku was granted to the descendants of the nomadic Turk-Oghuz tribes – Tartars who had invaded from Trans-Altaic steppes and were still groping their way in search of national identity (even up to now), and only at the end of the 1930s started calling themselves “Azerbaijani”. On September 15–17, 1918, with the explicit consent and support of the Musavatist government (F. Khan-Koyski being its president) in the person of the Minister of Home Affairs Behbud Khan Javanshir and the appointed chief of police Bahaeddin Shakir<sup>40</sup> (a theoretician of the Ittihad, one of the principal criminals of the Western Armenians’ genocide) the Turkish Army massacred more than 30000 Armenians, robbing their property<sup>41</sup>.

The following noteworthy fact evidences that the massacres of Armenians perpetrated by Young Turks and Musavatists was preplanned. Thus, when at the beginning of September-October, 1921 at the English tribunal’s trial (chaired by Major Frisby) of the Armenian avenger Misak Torlakian (who had neutralized B. Javanshir, one of the butchers of Armenians), a participant of the 1918 heroic battle of Baku, Grigor Amirian, a member of Armenian Revolutionary Federation, publicized the coded telegram that Javanshir had sent to the mayors of Nukhi, Aresh, Shamakhi. In the telegram the criminal ordered: “This is a holy war for

---

<sup>39</sup> Ստեփանյան 2009, 53–64, Ստեփանյան 2019, 421–432, Ստեփանյան 2021, 103–118:

<sup>40</sup> Дадрян 2007, 450.

<sup>41</sup> Իշխանեան 1920, 185, see also Հայաստանի ազգային արխիվ (from now on ՀԱԱ), 1267, g. 2, q. 94, թ. 96–99. See also Нерсисян 1982, 524.

uniting all the Turkish peoples. Armenians are an obstacle on our political path towards India. It is necessary to exterminate Armenians, to walk over their dead bodies. Show no mercy to anybody, comply with your orders”<sup>42</sup>. It undoubtedly entailed the planned monstrous genocide of one segment of the Armenian population. The noteworthy fact in the document is that the order of the Musavat leader is strikingly similar to the secret orders of Talaat pasha – the Minister of Internal Affairs, sent to the heads of governorates during the massacres of Western Armenians.

***“Great Azerbaijan” in the Pan-Turkish Plans of Kemalists and Musavatists***

The genocidal policy of the Musavatist authorities contributed to Mustafa Kemal Pasha’s (formerly a Young Turk in the Ottoman Empire, later known as Atatürk) nationalistic movement<sup>43</sup> (milli) formed at the beginning of spring, 1919. The objective of the movement was the preservation of territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire after its defeat in WWI. It should be noted that the formation of the Kemalist movement was planned, formed and guided by different circles of Young Turks’ “Progress and Union” party<sup>44</sup>. Mustafa Kemal’s views, principles and modus operandi were anchored on Z. Gökalp’s ideology of consolidating the “Turkish”, “Oghuz” “Turkmen” and “Turanian”, which was closely interconnected with the agenda of the Pan-Turkish concept<sup>45</sup>.

Being well-aware of the role that Azerbaijan could play in expanding in the Caucasus, the Kemalists, following the example of Young Turks, intended to make it a stronghold, and through their practical policy promoted the idea of creating “Great Azerbaijan”<sup>46</sup>. Hence, for reinforcing the Turkish-Musavatist ties, the Kemalists thought the participation of the Azerbaijani military representatives<sup>47</sup> in the activities of the two congresses held on July 28 – August 6, 1919 in Karin (Erzurum) and on September 4–11, 1919 in Sivas (Sebastia) to be of paramount

---

<sup>42</sup> Ճակատամարտ, 5.10.1921, see also Պեհպուտ խան Ճիվանջիրի սպանիչ Միսաք Թողաքեանի դատավարութիւնը անգ. Զինուորական ատենանիւն առջեւ, Աթէնք, 1936, 141–142, see also Աւօ 1970, 107–111.

<sup>43</sup> Ամատունի 1941, 107–111:

<sup>44</sup> In connection with Kemalists’ and Young Turks’ activity based on similar ideology and world view see Մելքոնյան 2018, 152–165.

<sup>45</sup> Սաֆարյան 2012, 10, 24:

<sup>46</sup> Սիմոնյան 1991, 315–316:

<sup>47</sup> Зареванд 1990, 122.

importance. At these congresses alliance between Kemalists and Musavatists was forged<sup>48</sup> and pointed at Armenians in the first place. For executing their genocidal and belligerent activities the ruling circles of the Ottoman Empire were in constant touch with the Musavatist government of Baku. In the late 1919 Halil pasha, one of the butchers of Armenians reinitiated his activity to create a united front of Pan-Islamism and Pan-Turkism and support the Kemalist movement in their efforts to save the Empire from falling to pieces. At that time Nuri pasha, another executioner of Armenians enjoyed a carte blanche in Azerbaijan. Nuri pasha was in charge of the committee “Turkish Nation’s Delegation”<sup>49</sup> that was closely interconnected with the Musvatists. In those days the newspaper *Ittihad* published in Baku wrote about the premises of merging between the Kemalists and Musavatists: “From now on the fate of Turkish people is connected with the fate of Azerbaijani Muslims”<sup>50</sup>. Thus, at the end of WWI, in September, 1919 the Azerbaijani delegation headed by the speaker of the Azerbaijani Parliament Alimardan bey Topchubashov, a well-known proponent of Pan-Turkism, to bring the question of the creation of “Great Azerbaijan” to its final solution, introduced a memorandum at the Peace conference of Paris held on February 19, 1919 under the title “The Azerbaijan Republic in the Caucasus”. Having utterly groundless territorial claims, the memorandum aimed to complete the realization of the concept “Great Azerbaijan” in practice. The Caucasian Tartars’ desire to solve the strategic problems of Pan-Turkism at the expense of Armenia and Georgia, had turned their territorial claims unimaginable; the claims covered a territory starting from Gandzak and stretching to Kars, including the territory between the Kur and Arax rivers which was the cradle of Armenians. The memorandum and the appended map<sup>51</sup> highlighted all those territories to which Azerbaijan made claims. The latter stretched from Batumi to Baku (“Azerbaijan from sea to sea”), covering a large geopolitical zone. Hence, in the 9<sup>th</sup> section of the memorandum “The Structure of Caucasian Azerbaijan: Administrative Units” written with expansionist intentions (in the memorandum Azerbaijan was called in that way) the so-called “Caucasian Azerbaijan” included not only the governorate of Baku, situated on the left bank of the Kur, but also the governorates of Kars

---

<sup>48</sup> ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 275, ց. 5, գ. 184, թ. 67 շրջերես, see also *Զարեան* 1926, 169.

<sup>49</sup> *Սարգսյան* 1992, 23:

<sup>50</sup> *Յանաջ*, 19.06.1920:

<sup>51</sup> See the map in the appendix.

and Batumi, the provinces of Nakhichevan, Sharur-Daralagyaz, Surmalu, Nor Bayazed, Etchmiadzin, Yerevan, Alexandropol being constituents of Yerevan governorate. From Yelizavetapol governorate provinces of Gandzak, Jivanshir, Nukhi, Aresh, Shushi, Jabrail (formerly known as Jrakan), Zangezur, from the governorate of Tiflis some part of Borchalu, Tiflis, Sghnakh, Akhaltskha provinces along with the Okrug of Zakatala, from the region of Dagestan the Okrugs of Kyurin, Samur, Ghaytagh-Tabasaran and the city of Debend with its regions were seen as part of it<sup>52</sup>. Accordingly, the territory of “Great Azerbaijan” designated by Enver pasha and Tapa Cermoev made 140.000 sq. km<sup>53</sup>, while in this case it was to cover 150.184,88 sq. km<sup>54</sup>. As they say the appetite (in this case the wolfish appetite) comes with eating.

Certainly Azerbaijan’s illegitimate, expansionist claims were not considered seriously at the conference. Simon Vratsian in regard to Alimardan bey Topchubashov’s expansionist aspirations wrote: “According to Alimardan bey Topchubashov’s plan introduced at the Peace conference, Armenians were left with approximately 10.200 sq. km. of territory, the rest was claimed for Azerbaijan. In Azerbaijani nationalists’ opinion Gandzak, Karabakh, Zangezur, Nakhichevan, Sharur some part of Yerevan province, Surmalu, Kars, Olti, Ardahan, were to become part of Azerbaijan, which according to a treaty of friendship was to join Turkey”<sup>55</sup>. To put it another way, Turkish-Musavatists intended to force Armenia to go back to the borders of Batumi Treaty of June 4, 1918, according to which the territory of the newly independent Republic of Armenia was to make about 12.000 sq. km<sup>56</sup>. Herein, the following observation is of great significance. The fact that in the period of Musavatist government (May 28, 1918 – April 28, 1920) Azerbaijan did not have clearly delimited borders and territory<sup>57</sup>, while at the same time it made unjustified territorial claims to the areas

---

<sup>52</sup> See **Барсегов** 2008, 545, see also **Топчибашев Али Мардан Бек** 2015, 440–441, 457–460.

<sup>53</sup> **Փ. Ժ. Լա Շընե** 1992, 41–42:

<sup>54</sup> **Топчибашев Али Мардан Бек** 2015, 443.

<sup>55</sup> **Վրացեան** Հայաստանը և իր հարեանները, Դրօշակ, Փարիզ, 1925, սեպտեմբեր:

<sup>56</sup> **Վրացեան** 1982, 156:

<sup>57</sup> On November 19, 1918 AliMardan bey Topchubashov meeting the Colonel Tamploy, representative of the English military forces in the Ottoman Empire, at the Pera Palace hotel in Istanbul in response to the question on how many kilometers their country covered, he answered 85–95.000 sq. kilometers (see **Топчибашев Али Мардан Бек** 2015, 92).

### The “Great Azerbaijan” Project in the Pan-Turkish Concept...

---

that did not belong to it and were out of its control, in particular, originally Armenian territories of Artsakh, Zangezur and Nakhichevan is evidenced at the fourth session held on December 4, 1920 by the Committee of 5 of the League of Nations, (elected by the Assembly and chaired by A. Haneus) when the latter introduced a substantiated resolution in regard to rejecting Azerbaijani petition for membership to the organization<sup>58</sup>. The decision was based on the following arguments:

“It is hard to decide the exact size of the territory upon which the government of this state (the Republic of Azerbaijan – G.S.) exercises its power”.

“It is impossible to set the exact boundaries of Azerbaijan because of arguments concerning its boundaries with its neighbouring countries.

The Committee decided that the provisions of the charter do not allow in the current conditions to admit Azerbaijan to the League of Nations<sup>59</sup>.

However, this did not mean that the Musavatist government abandoned its expansionist, Pan-Turkish policy in Transcaucasia. Failing to seize and appropriate the Armenian territories via diplomatic machinations, Musavatists instructed by Kemalists aimed to realize their plan resorting to the old weapon of their arsenal, i.e. to the new massacres of the indigenous nations, Armenians in particular.

The extermination of the indigenous population in eastern Transcaucasia still occupied a significant place in the realization of the Pan-Turkish program of “Great Azerbaijan”. Numerous facts evidence that succumbing to their expansionist, Pan-Turkish ideas and following the example of the Ottoman Empire, the Musavatists planned to appropriate the homeland of the original population of the Lezgin peoples (namely Lezgins, Udis, Avars, Tsakhurs, Budughes, Qrizes,) along with the ethno-spiritual motherland of Armenians, Tats, Talish, and transform it into a “homeland” for a homogenous Shia population, consisting of new-come nomadic Turkish-Oghuz tribes, i.e. Caucasian Tartars<sup>60</sup>. It should be noted that in the process of implementing their policy of ethnic cleansing, estrangement, displacement, deprivation of homeland, violent

---

<sup>58</sup> Նոր պետությունները և Ազգերի Լիգան, Մշակ, 3.02.1921, see also **Hovhannisyan** 2004, 28–29, see also **Бадцеров** 2008, 592–593.

<sup>59</sup> **Бадцеров** 2008, 593.

<sup>60</sup> «Թայմսի»-ի մի նոր յօդաձև, Յառաջ, 19.06.1920:

conversion to Azerbaijani, the Armenian ethnic element<sup>61</sup> was seen as the main target because of being a hard-to-break nation.

For that purpose they started to devise new genocidal plans in Baku. Therefore, the Young Turks' policy of exterminating Eastern Armenians was handed over to the Musavatist government<sup>62</sup> as "heritage". In other words, in the name of the artificially created formation "Azerbaijan", the Azerbaijani identity was built on the basis of xenophobia, Armenophobia in the first place. The correspondent of the newspaper Mshak rightly stated: "The two-year existence of Azerbaijan consisted in nothing else but political machination and perpetration of massacres of Armenians. The ruling party Musavat along with the scarce intelligentsia for the most part were only "fed" by the Pan-Turkish and Pan-Islamism ideas. Thus, the mere goal of their existence was the policy of exterminating Armenians"<sup>63</sup>.

The massacres of Baku Armenians in September, 1918 were only a prelude to those genocidal actions that were more coordinated and continued with greater vigour all over the left bank of the Kur mainly populated by Armenians. If the extermination of Western Armenians was carried out by Teşkilât-Mahsusa along with its scum, then the Musavat following in the footsteps of Young Turks created and directly instructed the organization Cəlladları komitəsi (Committee of Executioners) in Baku, acting for the same purpose<sup>64</sup>. The committee Milli (National)<sup>65</sup> in Shamakh also had an explicit anti-Armenian orientation. All the above-mentioned once again testifies to the fact that in 1918–1920 during the massacres of Eastern Armenians, Musavatists had a close ideological and practical cooperation<sup>66</sup> firstly with Young Turks then with Kemalists. By and large as a result of Turk-Musavatists' genocidal policy in 1918–1920, in such areas having a large Armenian population as Gandzak-Yelizavetapol governorate, the provinces of Nukhi (Shaki), Aresh (lying on the left bank of the Kur) along with Baku governorate, the ethnographic picture completely changed to the detriment of

---

<sup>61</sup> Ստեփանյան 2021, №1, էջ 9–34, Ստեփանյան 2021, № 2, 15–38:

<sup>62</sup> Ստեփանյան 2015, 125–146:

<sup>63</sup> Նազարեթեան Ի՞նչ է Ադրբեջանը (IV), Մշակ, 20.08.1920:

<sup>64</sup> ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 245, ց. 1, գ. 12, թ. 7:

<sup>65</sup> Շամախեցի 1920, 7:

<sup>66</sup> Հովսեփյան 1995, 5–29, Ստեփանյան 2015, 125–146, Դավիթաձյան 2014, 202–211, Բաղդասարյան 2017 4–20:

---

### The “Great Azerbaijan” Project in the Pan-Turkish Concept...

---

Armenians. In the area lying between the Kur and Absheron, by and large, about 117.106 Armenians were killed during the massacres of 1918–1920<sup>67</sup>.

Meanwhile, Azerbaijan took an active initiative to conquer Artsakh, Zangezur and Nakhichevan. Moreover, these territories being originally Armenian were to be seized through the implementation of the policy of exterminating all Armenians. The wave of mass killings and massacres of Armenians became even more wide-ranging. On January 15, 1919 the Azerbaijani government appointed Kh. Sultanov, a notorious Armeno-phob as the General-governor of Shushi, Zangezur, Jebail, Jivanshir; in other words he was commissioned in Gandzak-Yelizavetapol governorate's south-eastern Armenian provinces. Musavatist Azerbaijan backed by Turkey in response to Artsakh-Armenians' national, liberation fight, decided to solve the issue through the absolute extermination of Armenians. Within the period of March 23–26, 1920 by order of the villainous criminal Kh. Sultanov the first blow was landed onto Shushi – the administrative and religious center of Artsakh, the massacres killed more than 10.000 Armenians<sup>68</sup>. Meanwhile, villages of Chardakhlu (formerly known as Khachisar), Banants, Getashen, Suluk in Gandzak province were subjected to massacres and destruction.

Therefore, the internationally acknowledged definition of genocide leaves no reason to doubt that the horrors Armenians were subjected to in Artsakh and on

---

<sup>67</sup> In Nukhi and Aresh provinces out of more than 50.000 Armenians approximately 40.000 were exterminated (**Ստեփանյան** 2002, 23–28). As a result of massacres perpetrated in March-April, 1920 in the villages of Nizh, Vardashen, Chalet about 500 Armenians and Christian Udis from Bun-Aghvank ethnic community were killed (ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 245, ց. 1, գ. 7, թ. 9, see also «Наше время», Тифлис, 1920, 18 апреля, see also **Ստեփանյան** 2002, 27). After the massacres the number of Armenians in the governorate of Baku drastically decreased. According to the data of 1921, the number of the Armenian population made 50.212 in the provinces of Gokcha, Shamakhi, Ghuba, Baku, Lenkoran, Javati (also Jevad) (see **Закавказье** 1925, 152–153). If we compare this number with the number recorded before the massacres (127.318), the great dimension of the losses that were inflicted by Young Turks and Musavatists becomes more obvious. Hence, approximately about 77.106 people were killed of whom 49.927 were put to death only in the city of Baku (Before the massacres the Armenian population in Baku and its industrial regions made 88.673 (see **Իշխանեան** 1920, էջ 17), while according to the data of 1921 it constituted 38.746 (**Закавказье** 1925, 152–153 ).

<sup>68</sup> **Ուլուբաբյան** 1994, 226: Ադրբեջանի ցեղասպանական վարքը. Պատմություն և արդիականություն (իրավաբաղադրական գնահատականից մինչև միջազգային դատարան): Միջազգային առցանց գիտաժողով նվիրված Շուշիի հայ բնակչության ցեղասպանության 100-րդ տարելիցին: Նյութերի ժողովածու, Երևան, 2021:



the left bank of the Kur in 1918–1920 testify to the fact that it was nothing else but genocide. Noteworthy is the fact that the indigenous Armenian population of the area was subjected to genocide in its own homeland in the same manner as Western Armenians were exterminated by Young Turks. Hence, the policy implemented by Turk-Musavatists has to be characterized as the continuation and constituent of the genocide of Western Armenians, as the Armenian Genocide with its geographic expansion (from Cilicia up to Baku) was the outcome of realizing the entire plan of Pan-Turkism.

Thus, the fictitious state “Azerbaijan” that came into existence due to the perpetration of genocide was a Turkish project that under the Ottoman Empire’s guardianship was to become a stronghold for the creation of the new state, i.e. the so-called “Great Azerbaijan”, that would serve as a bridge between the Turkish state and all the Turkish speaking peoples of the Caucasus and Central Asia<sup>69</sup>, which would fulfil the far-reaching plan of uniting all the Turkish speaking nations under the “Pan-Oghuz state’s” flag and support the creation of “The Great Turan”. According to the theoreticians of Pan-Turkism: “Azerbaijan has to become a fortress for the great homeland – the large and powerful Turan”<sup>70</sup>. This is what the famous political figure of Pan-Turkism M.E. Rasulzade wrote back in the day: “Not only “Turkish Turkey” is considered “Turan” but also “Turkish Azerbaijan”, “Turkish Turkestan”, etc.”<sup>71</sup>.

On April 28, 1920, with M. Kemal’s active support Musavatist Azerbaijan became Sovietized<sup>72</sup>. In no way did the Sovietization avert the Azerbaijani ruling circles’ policy of Pan-Turkism disguised under the Soviet veil. The Russian-Turkish “heartfelt and sincere treaty of friendship” signed on August 24, 1920 along with the first congress of Eastern Nations initiated by Comintern on September 1–8, 1920 in Baku highlighted even more visibly the anti-Armenian intentions and the cooperation between Kemalists and Bolsheviks. It was apparent that the war against Armenia and the plan of joining Azerbaijan to Turkey was on the Pan-Turkish agenda. In 1920 Turkish newspapers openly wrote: “Azerbaijan was an inseparable part of the Turkish body and is now falling into its mother’s

---

<sup>69</sup> Յառաջ, Երեւան, 1920, յունիսի 19, also see **Зареванд** 1930, 92.

<sup>70</sup> **Ավետիսյան** 1996, 3:

<sup>71</sup> **Расул-Заде** 1930, 31.

<sup>72</sup> **Սահակյան** 2007, 200:

### **The “Great Azerbaijan” Project in the Pan-Turkish Concept...**

---

arms”<sup>73</sup>. On September 23, 1920 the Kemalists waged a war against Armenia as it was impossible to neutralize the threat of the Sevre Treaty (August 10, 1920) without defeating Armenia on the battlefield. In the conditions of massacres committed against Eastern Armenians and heavy territorial losses, the Sovietization of Armenia was accomplished (December 2, 1920) due to the efforts of Kemalist – Bolshevik alliance<sup>74</sup>.

After the Turkish-Armenian war, with a flagrant breach of the international law, the aggressive Treaties of Moscow (March 16, 1921) and Kars (October 13) were signed between the Kemalists and the Bolsheviks, and this alliance was seen as one of the first steps towards the creation of “Great Azerbaijan” at the expense of the Armenian historical territories. Soviet Russia, flattering Kemalist Turkey, which in Russia’s estimates would be one of the first countries to follow the route of Socialist development, and sacrificing the national interests of Armenia to the “interests of the world revolution” ceded the originally Armenian region of Kars along with its Surmalu province to Ottoman Turkey, while in the name of “guardianship”<sup>75</sup> Bolshevik Russia gave away Sharur – Nakhichevan to Soviet Socialist Azerbaijan. This, as a matter of fact, paved a way for Pan-Turkism. Thence, on July 5, 1921 by illegitimate resolution of the Russian Communist Party (Bolshevik) of Caucasia, Armenian Artsakh<sup>76</sup> was annexed to Soviet Socialist Azerbaijan. In 1920–1921 with Russia’s complicity the annexation of ancient Armenian territories to Azerbaijan practically contributed to the realization of the plan of “Great Azerbaijan”. It was only possible to preserve Syunik thanks to the liberation fight, which is mainly connected with the talented military commander Garegin Ter-Harutyunian’s (Garegin Nzhdeh) self-sacrificing activity.

Hence, after the irreparable losses that Armenia suffered due to Moscow Treaty (March 16, 1921), the Soviet government of Azerbaijan, having inherited Young Turks’, Musavatists’ and Kemalists’ heinous modus operandi, playing the “International” out of tune, on state level continued its villainous, aggressive policy. As a result, after the Yerevan treaty signed between the Republic of Armenia and the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (December 2, 1920), due to illegal demarcation and occupation, the territory of the Armenian Soviet

---

<sup>73</sup> Բալթուրյան 1990, 58:

<sup>74</sup> Հոհրաբյան 1997:

<sup>75</sup> Հոհրաբյան 2010; Марукян 2021, 3–19.

<sup>76</sup> Ուլուբաբյան 1994, 243–244:

Socialist Republic was reduced from 47.000 sq. km<sup>77</sup> to 29.8000 sq. km<sup>78</sup>. Contrary to this, at the end of May, 1918 springing out of nowhere, the newly born “Azerbaijan”, up until then unknown to history and covering only 42.850.62 sq. km.<sup>79</sup> on the left bank of the Kur, expanded its territory mainly due to the annexation of the originally Armenian lands (the Armenians’ homeland Artsakh, almost all of Utik including Gardmank, the region of Nakhichevan, Syunik provinces of Kashatagh, Kashunik, and Kovkasakan, the eastern provinces of Paytkaran), and in 1926 became 85.363 sq. km<sup>80</sup>. As R. Ter-Minasian pointed out: “Currently the territory on the right bank of the Kur, making up 25.000 sq. km (up until the borders of the Araks) was seized by Azerbaijan, half of which belonged to the formerly Armenian provinces of Syunik, Artsakh, Gardman, the other half - to Aghuank (Caucasian Albania)”<sup>81</sup>.

### **Conclusion**

Still back in the 70s – 80s of the 19<sup>th</sup> century Pan-Turkism emerged as an ideology among the Muslim peoples of Russia, also penetrating the Ottoman Empire at the end of the century. The Young Turks’ Ittihad (Committee of Union and Progress) coming to power in June, 1908, abandoned Pan-Ottomanism and Pan-Islamism altogether, adopting Pan-Turkism as its official ideology. According to the project devised by one of the founders of Pan-Turkism Zia Gökalp, the first stage, i.e. the Turkification of the Ottoman Empire was to be realized, followed by the second stage at which a “Pan-Oghuz State” was to be created. The state was to include Turkey, Transcaucasia and Iranian Atrpatakan. The first step to the creation of the “Pan-Oghuz State” was the Young Turks’ carefully planned conquest of Baku on September 15, 1918 which was aimed at making Transcaucasia a “homeland” for the descendants of Turk-Oghuz nomadic tribes, i.e. for the Caucasian Tartars that had raided from trans-Altaic plains. In order to artificially create “Azerbaijan” they pursued a policy of subjecting the indigenous peoples of the area (Armenians, Udis, Lezgins, Qrizes, Avars, Tsakhurs, Tats, Talysh, etc.) to massacres and ethnic cleansing, displacement, alienation and

---

<sup>77</sup> Ռուբէն 1982, 104: **Խաչատրյան, Սուքիասյան, Բադալյան** 2015, 18:

<sup>78</sup> Большая Советская Энциклопедия (БСЭ) 1950, 49.

<sup>79</sup> Ռուբէն 1927, 78.

<sup>80</sup> Большая Советская Энциклопедия 1926, 639. Հմմտ. Большая Советская Энциклопедия 1949, 434.

<sup>81</sup> Ռուբէն 1927, 79:

deprivation of homeland. Under Turkey's guardianship the area lying between the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea (from Baku to Batumi) was to become a stronghold for the artificial creation of the new state that proclaimed itself “Great Azerbaijan”. It was to become a bridge between the Turkish state and all the Turkish speaking peoples of the Caucasus and Central Asia, which would fulfil the far-reaching plan of uniting all the Turkish speaking nations under the “Pan-Oghuz State's” flag, thus, realizing the third stage of Ziya Gökalp's plan that consisted in creating “The Great Turan” planned to stretch from the Mediterranean Sea to the Pacific Ocean and cover the territories lying between China and the Arctic Ocean. The rulers of “New Turkey”, the Kemalists claimed by word of mouth to have abandoned the “Pan-Turkism”, however, in fact they inherited the ideologies of “Turkism” and “Pan-Turkism”. Being well-aware of the role that Azerbaijan could play in expanding in the Caucasus, the Kemalists, following in the footsteps of Young Turks promoted the idea of creating “Great Azerbaijan” and intended to make it a fortress for the further development of their ideology.

#### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

**Աբեղեան Ա.** 1928, Մենք և մեր հարևանները (ազգային քաղաքականության խնդիրներ), Հայրենիք, Պոսթըն, 2 տարի, մայիս, № 7, էջ 132–144:

**Աբեղեան Ա.** Մենք եւ մեր հարեանները (ազգային քաղաքականության խնդիրներ), Հայրենիք, Պոսթըն, 1928, 2 տարի, փետրուար, № 4 (64), էջ 96–108:

Ադրբեջանի ցեղասպանական վարքը. Պատմություն և արդիականություն (իրավաքաղաքական գնահատականից մինչև միջազգային դատարան) 2021, Միջազգային առցանց գիտաժողով՝ նվիրված Շուշիի հայ բնակչության ցեղասպանության 100-րդ տարելիցին: Նյութերի ժողովածու, Երևան, «Էդիտ պրինտ», 537 էջ:

**Ազարյան Ա.** 2011, Սիոնիստական շարժման համագործակցությունը երիտթուրքերի հետ, Բանբեր Երևանի համալսարանի. միջազգային հարաբերություններ, քաղաքագիտություն, Երևան, 135.6, էջ 22–28:

**Ամատունի Յ.** 1941, Թուրք Միլիի շարժումը, Հայրենիք, Պոսթըն, ԺԺ տարի, փետրվար, № 4, էջ 107–111:

**Ասատրյան Գ., Գևորգյան Ն.** 1990, Ադրբեջան. յուրացման սկզբունքը և իրանական աշխարհը, Երևան, «Գիտելիք», 23 էջ:

**Ավագյան Ա.** 1995, Պանթուրքիզմի գաղափարախոսության ընդունումը «Միություն և Առաջադիմություն» կուսակցության երրորդ և չորրորդ համագումարներում: Հայոց ցեղասպանություն. Պատճառներ և դասեր: Մաս 3, Երևան, էջ 5–20:

**Ավետիսյան Հ.** 1991, Երիտասարդ թուրքերի և Մուսավաթի համաթուրքական գործակցությունը և հակահայկական ոճրագործությունները 1918 թ., Պատմաբանասիրական հանդես, № 1, Երևան, էջ 43–64:

**Ավետիսյան Հ.** 1996, «Կովկասյան տան» և պանթուրքական նկրտումների հարցի շուրջ, «Իրան-նամէ», № 4–5 (20–21), Երեւան, էջ 3–9:

**Ավետիսյան Հ.** 1997, Հայկական հարցը 1918 թ., Երևան, «Բարձրագույն դպրոց», 433 էջ:

**Աւօ** 1970, Միսաք Թորլաքեան (Յեղափոխական ալպոմ: Ազատագրական պայքարի յուշամատեն), Դ շարք, թիւ 1–4, Պէյրուպ, էջ 84–85:

**Բաղդասարյան Է.** 2017, Հայերի ցեղասպանությունը Ադրբեջանում (1918–1920 թթ.), Ապագա, № 70, Թեհրան, էջ 4–20:

**Բայբուրյան Վ.** Պանթուրքիզմը գործողության մեջ, Գարուն, Երևան, 90.11.12, էջ 58–62:

**Բեգիջանյան Է.** 1995, Համաթուրքականության գաղափարախոսական ուղղվածությունը և հայերի ցեղասպանությունը Օսմանյան Թուրքիայում, «Հայացք Երևանից»: Հայոց Մեծ Եղեռնի 80-րդ տարելիցին: Ռազմավարական և ազգային հետազոտությունների հայկական կենտրոն, Երևան, № 3, էջ 48–62:

**Դավիթավյան Տ.** 2014, Ռազմական համագործակցությունը Ադրբեջանի և Թուրքիայի միջև ընդդեմ Հայաստանի 1918–1920 թթ. «Պատմություն և մշակույթ»: Հայագիտական հանդես, Երևան, № 9, էջ 202–211:

**Զարեանդ** 1987, Միացեալ անկախ Թուրանիա կամ ի՞նչ կը ծրագրեն թուրքերը, Աթէնք, Համազգայինի Վահէ Սէթեան տպարան, 175 էջ:

**Զարեանդ** 1926, Ի՞նչ կը ծրագրեն թուրքերը Միացեալ անկախ Թուրանիա, Բոստոն, 228 էջ:

**Զարեանդ** 1927, Ռուսաստանի թուրանական ժողովուրդները, Հայրենիք, Պոսթըն, 2 տարի, նոյեմբեր, № 1 (61), էջ 100–111:

**Զոհրաբյան Է.** 1997, 1920 թ. թուրք-հայկական պատերազմը և տերությունները, Երևան, «Ոսկան Երևանցի», 366 էջ:

**Զոհրաբյան Է.** 2010, Նախիջևանյան հիմնահարցը 1920 թ. մայիս – 1921 թ. հոկտեմբեր, Երևան, ԵՊՀ հրատ., 428 էջ:

**Էնանթոլլահ Ռէզա.** 1994, Ազարբայջան եւ Առան (Կովկասեան Ալբանիա), Երեւան, «Թիւնիկ», 160 էջ:

**Իշխանեան Բ.** 1920, Բագուի մեծ սարսափները: Անկետային ուսումնասիրություն սեպտեմբերեան անցքերի 1918 թ., Թիֆլիս, տպ. Մամուլ-տնօրէններ՝ Մ. Էփրիկեան եւ Յ. Մալիլեան, 188 էջ:

**Լեո** 1925, Անցյալից. Հուշեր, թղթեր, դատումներ, Թիֆլիս, «Խորհրդային Կովկաս», 480 էջ:

**Խանլարյան Կ.** 2012, «Ադրբեջան» աշխարհագրական հասկացության սահմանումները օսմանյան քարտեզներում, հանրագիտարանային նշանակության հրատարակություններում և դասագրքերում, Վէմ, Երեւան, հոկտեմբեր-դեկտեմբեր, № 4 (40), էջ 145–160:

**Խաչատրյան Կ., Սուքիասյան Հ., Բադալյան Գ.** 2015, Խորհրդային Հայաստանի և ԼՂՀ-ի տարածքային կորուստները 1920-1930-ական թվականներին, Երևան, «Զանգակ-97», 158 էջ:

**Խուրշուդյան Լ.** 1995, Հայկական հարցը (բովանդակությունը, ծագումը, պատմության հիմնական փուլերը), Երևան, ԵՊՀ հրատ., 98 էջ:

**Խուրշուդյան Լ.** 1999, Հայոց ազգային գաղափարախոսություն, Երևան, «Զանգակ», 283 էջ:

**Խուդոյինյան Գ.** 1989, Մի ուշագրավ քարտեզ, «Երևանի համալսարան», Երևան, № 3, էջ 37–38:

**Կիրակոսյան Զ.** 1983, Երիտթուրքերը պատմության դատաստանի առաջ (1915-ից մինչև մեր օրերը), գիրք Բ, Երևան, «Հայաստան», 360 էջ:

ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 1267, ց. 2, գ. 94, թ. 96–99:

ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 275, ց. 5, գ. 184, թ. 67 շրջերես:

ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 149, ց. 1, գ. 46, թ. 2–8:

ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 149, ց. 1, գ. 133, թ. 19:

ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 57, ց. 3, գ. 512, թ. 1–2:

ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 409, ց. 1, գ. 2634, թ. 1–2:

ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 245, ց. 1, գ. 12, թ. 7:

Հայրենիք, Բոստոն, 18.01.1927, № 4473:

**Հարությունյան Ա.** 1984, Թուրքական ինտերվենցիան Անդրկովկաս 1918 թ. և ինքնապաշտպանական կոիվները, Երևան, ԳԱ հրատ., 356 էջ:

Հորիզոն, Թիֆլիս, 30.10.1918, № 222:

**Հովսեփյան Յու.** 1995, Հայերի ցեղասպանությունը Ադրբեջանում (1918–1920 թթ.), «Հայոց ցեղասպանություն. Պատճառներ և դասեր: Մաս Բ, Երևան, էջ 5–29:

Ճիվանշիրի սպանութեամբ ամբաստանուած պ. Միսաք Թորլաքեանի քառասունեօրոյ դատավարութիւնը անգլիական պատերազմական ատեանին առջեւ, Ճակատամարտ, Կ. Պոլիս, 5.10.1921, № 877:

**Մելքոնյան Ռ.** 2018, Երիտթուրքեր-քեմալականներ. գաղափարական եվ կադրային շարունակականություն, «Արևելագիտության հարցեր», Երևան, № 14, էջ 152–165:

**Մինասյան Ն.** 2019, Համայնությունական բնույթի առաջին կազմակերպությունների գաղափարները և նպատակները, Մերձավոր և Միջին Արևելքի երկրներ և ժողովուրդներ, հ. XXXII, պր. 2, Երևան, էջ 249:

Նոր պետությունները եւ Ազգերի Լիգան, Մշակ, Թիֆլիս, 3.02.1921, № 24:

**Միքայելեան Ա.** 1923, Ղարաբաղի վերջին դէպքերը, Հայրենիք, Պոսթըն, Ա տարի, մայիս, № 7, էջ 165:

**Յակոբեան Ա.Ա.** 2018, Աշխարհացոյցեան Փայտակարան նահանգի գաւառների տեղորոշման նոր փորձ («Հայաստանը եւ արեւելաքրիստոնեական քաղաքակրթությունը. Գ»): Ճանաչված հայագետ-կովկասագետ Պավել Չոբանյանի ծննդյան 70-ամյակին նվիրված Հանրապետական գիտաժողով (մայիսի 17–18, 2018): Զեկուցումներ եւ զեկուցումների դրույթներ, Երևան, էջ 236–246:

**Նազարեթեան Ա.** 1920, Ինչ է Ադրբեջանը (IV) , Մշակ, Թիֆլիս, 20.08.1920, № 75:

**Շամախեցի (Հարություն Բաղրամյան).** 1920, Թրքասիրութիւն, թէ թրքամուլութիւն: Ընդդիմախօսական **Եղիշէ ա.-ք. Գեղամեանի** «Տաճիկները Կովկասում եւ Բագուի անկումը» գրքի աղբիւ, Թիֆլիս, 29 էջ:

Ո՞վ է Նուրի փաշա, Ժողովուրդ, Կ. Պոլիս, Ա. տարի, 13/26.11.1918, № 24:

Պէհպուտ խան Ճիվանշիրի սպանիչ Միսաք Թորլաքեանի դատավարութիւնը անգ. Զինուորական ատեանին առջեւ, Աթէնք, 1936, «Նոր օր», 492 էջ:

**Պողոսյան Ս.** 1990, Պանթուրքիզմը երեկ և այսօր, Երևան, «Հակոբ Մեղապարտի անվան պոլիգրաֆկոմբինատ», 79 էջ:

**Ռուբէն** 1927, Հայաստան եւ Ատրպէճան, Հայրենիք, Պոսթըն, Ե տարի, յունիս, № 8 (56), էջ 72:

**Ռուբէն.** 1982, Հայ յեղափոխականի մը յիշատակները, Կ. Է, Թեհրան, 363 էջ:

**Ռուբէն.** 1982, Հայաստան միջ-ցամաքային ուղիներու վրայ, Թեհրան, 185 էջ:

**Ս.,** Յառաջ, Երեւան, 19.06.1920, № 127:

**Սահակյան Տ.** 2007, Ցավալի պայմանագրեր, Երևան, Լուսակն, 531 էջ:

**Սարգսյան Ե.** 1983, Պանիսլամիզմի և պանթուրքիզմի դոկտրինաները երիտթուրքերի ներքին քաղաքականության մեջ, Արևելագիտության հարցեր, Երևան, պրակ 1-2, էջ 5-19:

**Սարգսյան Ե.** 1964, Թուրքիան և նրա նվաճողական քաղաքականությունը Անդրկովկասում 1918 թ., Երևան, «Հայաստան», 537 էջ:

**Սարգսյան Ե.** 1992, Քեմալականների 1920-1921 թթ. արշավանքն Անդրկովկաս և 1921 թ. մարտի 16-ի Մոսկովյան պայմանագիրը, ԼՀԳ, Երևան, № 1, էջ 19-34:

**Սաֆարյան Ա.** 2001, «Օսմանյան մոդելի» քննադատությունը Զիյա Գյոքալփի «Թյուրքականության հիմունքներ» աշխատությունում, Իրան-Նամէ, Երեւան, № 3-7, էջ 1-6:

**Սաֆարյան Ա.** 2012, Զիյա Գյոքալփը և Թյուրքականության հիմունքները, Երևան, ԵՊՀ հրատ., 298 էջ:

**Սաֆարյան Ա.** 2016, Թուրքական գյոքալփագիտության պատմությունից, Երևան, ԼՀԳ, № 2, էջ 86-93:

**Սաֆրաստյան Ռ.** 2011, Օսմանյան կայսրությունում 1890 թթ. կեսերին հայկական կոտորածների գիտական գնահատման հարցի շուրջ, Թյուրքագիտական և օսմանագիտական հետազոտություններ, Կ. VII, Երևան, էջ 134-140:

**Սիմոնյան Հ.** 2009, Հայերի զանգվածային կոտորածները Կիլիկիայում (1909 թ. ապրիլ), Երևան, ԵՊՀ հրատ., 391 էջ:

**Սիմոնյան Հ.** 1991, Թուրք-հայկական հարաբերությունների պատմությունից, Երևան, «Հայաստան», 629 էջ:

**Ստեփանյան Գ.** 2002, Հայերի կոտորածներն ու ինքնապաշտպանական մարտերը Նուխի և Արեւ զավառներում 1918-1920 թթ.: Հայոց ցեղասպանության պատմության և պատմագիտության հարցեր, Երևան, № 5, էջ 23-28:

**Ստեփանյան Գ.** 2008, Հայերի կոտորածներն ու ինքնապաշտպանական մարտերը Բաքվի նահանգում 1918-1920 թթ., ՊԲՀ, Երևան, № 3, էջ 31-48:

**Ստեփանյան Գ.** 2009, Բաքվի 1918 թ. ինքնապաշտպանական մարտերի դերը Հայաստանի Հանրապետության ստեղծման գործում: Հանրապետական գիտաժողովի նյութեր, Վանաձոր, էջ 53-64:

**Ստեփանյան Գ.** 2015, Հայերի կոտորածները Բաքվի նահանգում և թուրք-ադրբեջանական իշխանությունների պատասխանատվությունը (1918 թ. սեպտեմբեր – 1920 թ. ապրիլ), Հայոց ցեղասպանություն-100. Ճանաչումից՝ հատուցում: Գիտական հոդվածների ժողովածու, Երևան, էջ 125–146:

**Ստեփանյան Գ.** 2019, Ռուսոմ Զորյանի դերը Բաքվի 1918 թվականի հերոսամարտի կազմակերպման և նորանկախ Հայաստանի Հանրապետության անվտանգության ապահովման գործում, Գիտական Արցախ, Երևան, № 3, էջ 421–432:

**Ստեփանյան Գ.** 2021, Հայերի էթնիկ գոտիների և ցեղասպանական քաղաքականության իրագործման փուլերն Արևելյան Այսրկովկասում (XI–XX դդ.), Մաս Բ, Գիտական Արցախ, Երևան, № 2, էջ 15–38:

**Ստեփանյան Գ.** 2021, Հայերի էթնիկ գոտիների և ցեղասպանական քաղաքականության իրագործման փուլերն Արևելյան Այսրկովկասում (XI–XX դդ.), Մաս Ա, Գիտական Արցախ, Երևան, № 1, էջ 9–34:

**Ստեփանյան Գ.** 2021, Պաքուի 1918 թ. հերոսամարտի նշանակությունը Հայաստանի Հանրապետության Անվտանգության Ապահովման եւ Կայացման Համատեքստում, Գիտաժողովի նիստեր, Անթիլիաս, էջ 103–118:

«Վիճելի» հոդվածներ, Ալիք, Թեհրան, 1962, սեպտեմբերի 13, № 194:

**Վրացեան Ս.** 1982, Հայաստանի Հանրապետություն, Գ տպ. Ալիք, Թեհրան, 1684 էջ:

**Վրացեան Ս.** 1925, Հայաստանը եւ իր հարեանները, Դրօշակ, Փարիզ, սեպտեմբեր, № 3, էջ 68–71:

**Տէր-Յակոբեան Յ.** 1921, Հայաստանի վերջին աղէտը (անտիպ փաստաթուղթեր, դիւանագիտական գրեր եւ բազմաթիւ պատկերներ), Կ.Պոլիս, տպ. Մ. Տէր-Սահակեան, 126 էջ:

**Ուլուբաբյան Բ.** 1994, Արցախի պատմությունը սկզբից մինչև մեր օրերը, Երևան, «Մ. Վարանդյան» հրատ, 377 էջ:

**Փ. Ժ. Լա Շրնէ.** Ատրպեյճանի Հանրապետությունը, Դրօշակ, Երևան, 12.02.1992, № 22, էջ 41–42:

**Փաշայան Ա.** 2014, Իսլամն Ադրբեջանում. անցյալը և ներկան, Երևան, «Գասպարինտ», 195 էջ:

**Авакян А.** 1999, Геноцид армян: механизмы принятия и исполнения решений, Ереван, «Гитутюн», 110 с.

«Адресь-календарь Азербайджанской Республики на 1920-й г., на тюркскомь и русскомь языкахъ (1-ый год издания), под редакцией **А.И. Ставровского**, Баку, издание мин-ва Призрения, 1920, 335 с.

**Амбарцумян А.** 2017, Область Пайтакаран и гора Сабалан. Филологические и этимологические очерки (этимология названий и происхождение традиций). Международная конференция по арменоведению «Письменные памятники армянского наследия». Сб. докладов и тезисов, ред. – составитель **Д.С. Мкртчян**, СПб., с. 21–40.

**Аршаруни А., Габидуллин Х.** 1930, Очерки панисламизма и пантюркизма в России, Москва, «Безбожник», 141 с.

**Балаев А.** 1998, Азербайджанское национальное движение 1917–1918 гг., Баку, «Елм», 136 с.



- Бартольд В.** 1963, Место прикаспийских областей в истории мусульманского мира. Сочинения, т. II, ч. I, Москва, «Наука», 711 с.
- БСЭ** 1926, изд. 1, т. I, «Советская энциклопедия», 830 с.
- БСЭ** 1949, изд. 2, т. II, «Большая Советская Энциклопедия», 633 с.
- БСЭ** 1950, изд. 2, т. III, «Большая Советская Энциклопедия», 626 с.
- Векилов Р.** 1998, История возникновения Азербайджанской Республики, Баку, «Элм», с. 29.
- Габриелян Р.** 2002, Армения и Атропатена, Ереван, изд-во Российско-армянского (Славянского) гос. университета, 318 с.
- Гасанова Э.** 1966, Идеология буржуазного национализма в Турции в период младотурок (1908–1914), Баку, изд-во Академии наук Азербайджанской ССР, 166 с.
- Геноцид армян в Османской империи 1982, Сборник документов под ред. **М.Г. Нерсисяна**, Ереван, «Айастан», 686 с.
- Давыдов К.** 2020, Геополитическая история Азербайджана: исторического и новосозданного, Тель-Авив-Москва, «Перо», 382 с.
- Дадрян В.** 2007, История армянского геноцида (этнический конфликт от Балкан до Анатолии и Кавказа), Ереван, «Гладзор», 584 с.
- Дубинский-Мухадзе И.** 1968, Шаумян, Москва, «Молодая гвардия», 352 с.
- Закавказье. 1925, Советские республики (Статистико-экономический сборник), Тифлис, «Высший Экономический Совет З.С.Ф.С.Р», 560 с.
- Зареванд.** 1930, Турция и пантуранизм, Париж, "Printed in France", 168 с.
- Марукян А.** Историко-правовой анализ советско-турецкого Московского договора 1921 года «О дружбе и братстве», *ԴՐՀ, Երևան*, 2021, № 1, էջ 3–19:
- Нагорный Карабах в международном праве и мировой политике (документы и комментарий), сост. проф. **Ю. Барсегов**, т. I, Москва, «Кругъ», 2008, 943 с.
- Расул-Заде М.** 1930, О пантуранизме в связи с Кавказской проблемой, Париж, «Издание К.-Н.К.», 67 с.
- Саркисов Е.** Борьба народов Закавказья против турецких оккупантов в 1918 году, «Արևելագիտական ժողովածու», *Երևան*, 1960, № 1, էջ 190–242:
- Сваранц А.** 2002, Пантюркизм в геостратегии Турции на Кавказе, Москва, «Академия гуманитарных исследований. Гуманитарий», 600 с.
- Топчибашев Али Мардан Бек** 2015, Избранное: в 4 томах, т. III, Государственная деятельность 1918–1920. Сост. **Гасан Азиз-оглу Гасанов**, Баку, «Типография Чашьюглу», 607 с.
- Юджин Р.** 2018, Падение Османской империи: Первая мировая война на Ближнем Востоке, 1914–1920, Москва, «Льпина нон-фикшн», 559 с.
- Galichian R.** 2010, The Invention of History. Azerbaijan, Armenia and the Showcasing of Imagination (Second, Revised and Expanded Edition), London/ Yerevan, Gomitas Institute, London, UK., and Printinfo Art Books, Yerevan, Armenia, 124 p.
- Hovhannisyan N.** 2004, The Karabakh Problem. The Thorny Road to Freedom and Independence. National Academy of Sciences of Armenia, Institute of Oriental Studies, Yerevan, «Հայագիտություն», 117 p.

- Swietochowski T. 1985, Russian Azerbaijan, 1905–1920. The Shaping of National Identity in a Muslim Community. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 256 p.
- Ömer Seyfettin. 1958, Yarinki Turan Devleti, Istanbul, Beyazit (Toprak Dergisi) Matbaasi, 120 s.
- Nəcəfov E., Azərbaycan Milli Azadlıq Hərəkatının Xüsusiyyətləri. Elmi Jurnal "Azərbaycan Bu Gün və Sabah", Bakı, 2007, № 5, s. 29–38.

**«ՄԵԾ ԱԴՐԵՋԱՆ» ԾՐԱԳԻՐԸ ՄՈՒՍԱՎԱԹԱԿԱՆՆԵՐԻ,  
ԵՐԻՏԹՈՒՐՔԵՐԻ ԵՎ ՔԵՄԱԼԱԿԱՆՆԵՐԻ  
ՀԱՄԱԹՅՈՒՐՔԱԿԱՆ ՔԱՂԱՔԱԿԱՆՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՄԵՋ**

ՍՏԵՓԱՆՅԱՆ Գ.

Ամփոփում

**Բանալի բաներ՝** համայնությունը, «Մեծ Ադրբեջան», «Մուսավաթ», երիտթուրքեր, քեմալականներ, Արևելյան Այսրկովկաս, ցեղասպանություն:

Համայնությունը, որպես գաղափարախոսություն, սկզբնավորվել է տակավին XIX դարի 70–80-ական թվականներին Ռուսաստանի մահմեդական ժողովուրդների մեջ: XIX դարի վերջերից այն իր տարածումը գտավ նաև Օսմանյան կայսրությունում, երբ դրան լծված գործիչները (Ալի Հուսեյին Ջադե, Իսմայիլ-բեկ Գասպրինսկի, Ահմեդ-բեկ Աղաև և ուրիշներ) տեղափոխվեցին Կ. Պոլիս և այլուր: Կայսրության ներսում այդ գաղափարախոսության հիմնադիրն է համարվում Ջիյա Գյոքալփը: Ըստ նրա, համայնությունը պետության ստեղծման առաջին փուլն է Օսմանյան կայսրության ողջ ազգաբնակչության թրքացումից հետո, պետք է իրականացվեր երկրորդ փուլը՝ համաօղուզական պետության կազմավորումը, որի մեջ էին մտնելու Թուրքիան, Արևելյան Այսրկովկասը և Պարսկական Ատրպատականը: Այդ գործընթացը ենթադրում էր Սև ծովից մինչև Կասպից ծով (Բաթումից մինչև Բաքու) ընկած տարածքում Թուրքիայի խնամակալության ներքո «Մեծ Ադրբեջան» նոր պետության ստեղծումը: Այն պետք է կամրջեր թուրքական պետությունը և Կովկասի ու Կենտրոնական Ասիայի թյուրքալեզու ժողովուրդներին, ինչը տեղավորվում էր Ջիյա Գյոքալփի առաջադրած՝ թյուրքալեզու բոլոր ժողովուրդներին միավորվելու և «Մեծ Թուրան» հորջորջվող պետություն հիմնելու հեռահար ծրագրերի մեջ: «Մեծ Ադրբեջան»-ի

ստեղծման գաղափարը առանձնակի նշանակություն ունեւ մուսավաթականներին, երիտթուրքերին և քեմալականների համաթուրքական քաղաքականության մեջ:

## ПРОГРАММА «ВЕЛИКИЙ АЗЕРБАЙДЖАН» В МУСАВАТИСТСКОЙ, МЛАДОТУРЕЦКОЙ И КЕМАЛИСТСКОЙ ПАНТЮРКИСТСКОЙ КОНЦЕПЦИИ

СТЕПАНЯН Г.

### Резюме

**Ключевые слова:** пантюркизм, «Великий Азербайджан», «Мусават», младотурки, кемалисты, Восточное Закавказье, геноцид.

Пантюркизм как идеология сформировался еще в 70–80-х годах XIX в. среди мусульманских народов России. С конца XIX в. он получил распространение также в Османской империи, когда сторонники этой идеологии (Али Хусейн Заде, Исмаил-бек Гаспринский, Ахмед-бек Агаев и др.) обосновались в Константинополе и иных местах. Основоположником пантюркизма в Османской империи считается Зия Гёкалп. Согласно Гёкалпу, на первом этапе создания пантюркистского государства, после отуречивания всего населения Османской империи следовало приступить к претворению в жизнь второго этапа, а именно – к формированию паногузского государства, в которое должны были войти Турция, Восточное Закавказье и персидская Атропатена. Этот процесс предполагал создание нового государства «Великий Азербайджан» на территории между Черным и Каспийским морями (от Батума до Баку) под протекторатом Турции. «Великий Азербайджан» должен был служить мостом между Турцией и тюркоязычными народами Кавказа и Центральной Азии, что входило в выдвинутую Гёкалпом программу создания государства «Великий Туран» и консолидации всех тюркоязычных народов. Идея «Великого Азербайджана» имела особую значимость и в пантюркистской политике мусаватистов, младотурок и кемалистов.