

CONSEQUENCES OF THE GULISTAN TREATY IN THE POLITICAL LIFE OF KARABAGH*

Nelly Baghdasaryan

Keywords: Russo-Persian war, the Gulistan Treaty, Karabagh, Russia, Nagorno Karabakh, Artsakh, Iran, Principalities (Melikdoms) of Artsakh, the Melik-Shahnazaryans, A. Yermolov, administrative-political, Transcaucasian Committee

The beginning of the XIXth century was marked by new wars for the Tsarist Russia, of which the Russo-Persian war of 1804-1813 had a decisive role in the life of one part of the Armenians being under the Persian rule, i.e. the Armenians of Karabagh[1]. On May 14, 1805 by the treaty signed on the bank of the Kurekchay (Kurak) river Karabagh was annexed to Russia[2]. On October 12, 1813 the Russo-Persian treaty signed in Gulistan fortress of Karabagh marked the victory of Russian weapons; the Kurekchay Treaty was also legally secured by the Treaty. It was signed by Nikolai Rtischev from the Russian side and Mirza Abolhassan Khan Ilchi from the Persian side. Each of the sides having signed the Treaty was committed to adhere to the “Status quo ad presentem” principle, “that is, each of the sides maintained under its rule those lands, khanates and provinces, which are currently under their perfect rule”. According to Article 3 of the Treaty: “His majesty the Shah as a testimony of his sincere friendship to His Highness All-Russian Tsar solemnly both personally and on behalf of the highest heirs to the Persian throne, confirms Russia, in possession of Karabagh and Gandja Khanates, which currently turned into a state carrying the name Elizavetpol, as well as Shaki, Shirvan, Derbent, Quba, Baku and Talish khanates (our statement, NB Talish Khanate is meant) with those lands of this khanate, which are currently under the rule of the Russian Empire, including the whole Daghestan, Georgia with Shoragyal state, Imeretia, Guria, Megrelia and Abkhazia, equally those provinces and lands, which are currently between a definite borderline and the Caucasian line, with the countries adjoining the latter and the Caspian Sea and their nations[3]”.

The summary of consequences of the Treaty in the political history of Karabagh is as follows: The people of Karabagh gained the opportunity of peaceful existence. The undevelopped Persian rule was replaced by the comparatively developed Russian rule. In the face of Karabagh, Russia got a land rich in raw supplies, where a creative and industrious nation had lived, as well as a new credit market. The historic period following the Treaty of Gulistan was marked for Karabagh with a comparatively long-lasting peace. The period of prosperity for Karabagh was followed by famine, emigration, decline of the economic life as a consequence of the Russo-Persian war of 1804-1813. Being protected by Russian weapons and legislation to some extent, the land had turned into a quiet and secure corner.

Nevertheless, besides general consequences, the thorough and objective investigation of the Treaty of Gulistan allows to consider it with its positive, negative or unresolved consequences and evaluate the treaty as a result of analysing historic facts.

a. The comparatively normal living conditions created as a consequence of the Treaty served sufficient ground for the repatriation of the Karabagh population having left as a result of war[4]. The unstable political condition and the war had done their dirty work, in particular with regards to the captivity and emigration of the Karabagh population. A. Ermolov's report addressed to Alexander I dating back to 1817 found in the pages of «Acts» published by the Caucasian manuscripting commission gives comprehensive information about this. The report

* Հոդվածն ընդունվել է 26.02.17:

Հոդվածը տպագրության է երաշխավորել ՄՍՀ պատմության ամբիոնը:

runs as follows: "At the moment of being part of the Russian state Karabagh had had more than 10 thousand families/at the signing of the Kurekchay Treaty-NB/[5]. 5000 families must have stayed in Karabagh, and according to colonel Aser 3080 families... /at the signing of the Treaty of Gulistan in 1813-NB/'. Within three years following the signing of the Treaty 7872 families returned to Karabagh.

Parallel to emigration another process had emerged. The Tsarist government, attracting some families of nomadic cattle breeders, located them in the most important military sights, in order to use them in spying purposes. Ayrum, Baghshlagh villages on the border of South Artsakh further emerged from these stations of Ayrum cattle breeders. In the same way Zeyva, Mollavalatly (Shefeq subsequently), Gurzalar, Todan settlements, which subsequently turning overpopulated, became a mischief for the native possessors of Karabagh, emerged in the same way. The fact that Karabaghian meliks shortly left their native lands and moved to Georgia because of the war, contributed to their unrestricted settlement. With great difficulty and after numerous applications the Melik-Beglaryans' clan of Gulistan were the first to leave Georgia in 1812[6]. After returning they tried to expel the migrants, but they hardly ever succeeded.

"Krunk of the Armenian Land" newspaper writes about the condition established in Karabagh in the 10s of the 19th century:

"Except original Armenia there is sufficient number of the Armenians in Karabagh province as well. They moved gradually from valleys to the mountains. There they were governed by 5 hereditary meliks, who were under Persian control, but the power and superiority of Turk governors in Karabagh deported them in the 18th century. When Russia possessed Nagorno Karabagh, they returned. There are currently only two Melik clans- The Beglaryans and Shahnazaryans" [7]. Along with repatriation the deserted settlements were revived. Jraberd, a number of villages of which flourished especially due to Atabekyan of Van, had been ruined and devastated during the Russo-Persian war of 1804-1813[8].

An interesting and newfound fact of repatriation and the desire to contribute to the prosperity of one's own homeland is documented in the newfound archive data of Matenadaran dated as of April 16, 1830. According to the document, the Indian Armenian wealthy Hovsep Amirbekyan expresses his willingness to find his birthplace Artsakh and Paytakaran and take possession of it. Amirbekyan also adds that he will inhabit here with his family, inviting all the Armenians of India as well[9]. Unfortunately, Amirbekyan's heartfelt desire is not realised.

Thus, nearly a decade after signing the Treaty of Gulistan as a result of the natural growth of the Karabagh people and slow repatriation, by the listing of the Tsarist government in 1823[10], there were 17520 families there. In the mountainous part of Karabagh the number of the population comprised 36,5 thousand people, 30,8 thousand (84%) of which were the Armenians, 5,4 thousand (14.7%) comprised the Tatars, and 0,3 thousand (0,7%) [11] -the Kurds.

Overall, in the mountainous and premontane regions of the lands the Armenian population has always predominated. A number of Russian authors of the 19th century highlighted the peculiarities of this location for the population. E. Naumenko was among these authors: "If we separate the mountainous system of the Armenian Gandzak from the Kura lowlands, this line would separate the Armenians and Tatars. The latter occupied the Kura lowland while the Armenians inhabited the whole premontane part with a width of about 30 verst[12].

Its distinctive that in 1823 the fact of cameral listing of the Karabagh province is carefully falsified from the side of the Azerbaijani historiography. In particular Z. Hajieva doubts the results of the population census carried out by P. Ermolov and P. Magilevsky in 1813 in Karabagh, thinking that the listing was conducted on the basis of verbal testimonies, consequently the so-called "Azerbaijani" [13] begs and nayibs generally giving testimonies, in order to avoid taxes had hidden the names of their followers, or, according to Hajieva, "the number of the Azerbaijani population would comprise not 80% (an indicator which doesn't exist-NB), but tangibly more[14].

The Azerbaijani version of cameral listing differs from the real one in that a number of village names populated exceptionnaly by the Armenians were deliberately omitted. This fact is however differently presented by Kh. Khalilova, As the latter claims: "Those Azerbaijani villages inhabited by Armenian families are enlisted as Armenian villages[15].

We consider the below-mentioned[16] to be a successful manual having contemporary strategic sounding for the Armenian nation in the post-Gulistani period and created as a result of long-term and complicated processes. After signing the Treaty of Gulistan Aghvani Catholic Church fell under the rule of the Russian Empire, and if earlier Armenian Aghvani religious leaders had actively participated in the political life, under the circumstances of the establishment of the Russian rule the circles of their functions had to be limited to religious, educational and instructive activities, especially under the strict supervision of the Tsarist authorities. In those conditions even church leaders didn't cease to care about social-political issues concerning the Armenians of Artsakh.

In 1830 Baghdasar Hasan Jalalyan acquired the rank of Metropolitan and Gandzasar Primacy[17] Having a good reputation and morality he had the courage to conduct trials of muslim nomads, which seemed insurmountable at first sight. The far-sighted patriarch referred the matter beyond the power of local sovereign administrative bodies and solved it in the higher authorities of Russian legislature.

As a result of legal proceedings having lasted for around two decades Metropolitan was able to liberate the lands belonging to Gandzasar, Amaras, Khotavank monasteries having been seized by muslim beks and unexpected nomads, especially by Qolan tribe[18]. In order to realize the depth of the value of what had been done it is sufficient to note that the lands belonging to Khotavank "occupy a place as large as Artsakh" [19]. These illegally occupied farms were stretched across 140,0 dessiatina[20], while according to "Mshak", the territory of lands liberated from various semi-nomadic tribes and the Kurds of Qolan tribe comprised 196438 dessiatina[21].

Our investigations allow us to claim that if under the circumstances of the khanate regime's arbitrariness the above-mentioned undertakings would be sentenced to failure, after the establishment of the Russian rule under the circumstances of prohibitions upon the Armenian Church, in particular those created by "positions", it would have been impossible to implement Metropolitan's projects.

The significance of Baghdasar Metropolitan's activity is obvious from the viewpoint of the present, especially the national-liberation struggle, with the view of restoring the historic heritage, as the nomads inhabiting these lands, could habitually claim direct possession of these lands too.

Those consequences of the Gulistan Treaty, which were either unresolved or had essentially negative influence on Karabagh from the political viewpoint are necessary for investigation reasons.

a. The Russo-Persian war and the Treaty of Gulistan Treaty didn't stop boundary disputes.

Moreover, they aggravated intergovernmental relations between the two states. Among boundary discrepancies the issue[22] of returning several areas to Persia, including Karabagh, was frequently mentioned.

On July 29, 1816 Alexander I in his decree addressed to the Commander-in-Chief of the Russian armed forces of Georgia, General A. Ermolov mentioned that the Persians had demanded to restore all the occupied areas or cede several districts for money compensation "The wishes of the Persian court will be satisfied in every sense, if we return Talysh, Karabagh and Gandzak khanates[23] out of our occupied lands". According to him, "I wonder if it were not possible to find any means to satisfy the needs of the Persians via Talysh and Karabagh khanates?". The Emperor added: "It would be more useful for us to exchange lands acquired on the other side of Araks with Yerevan and Nakhijevan?" [24].

Because of the limited opportunities provided in the article we leave aside the details and register only the fact that Karabagh, passing from the Persian rule to the Russian patronage was only a land, a card which could be exchanged by another land, or it is interesting to know that Tsar didn't have the exact picture of the strategical significance of lands being under its rule. While at places the Caucasian governor coordinating and supervising the Russian policy A. Ermolov/ in Treaty with Velyaminov/ thought that ceding Karabagh to Persia would mean ceding Tiflis as well, which had no prospects[25].

The “deal” of ceding Karabagh and some other lands failed due to the concerned party A. Ermolov. Thus, Gulistan Treaty partially stopped the territorial disputes between Russia and Persia. Here the words of V. Potto are worth mentioning: “The Gulistan Treaty was a ceasefire, the silence was deceptive and was only herald for new military storms” [26].

b/ As a consequence of famous political events the Principalities (Melikdoms) of Artsakh weakened in the last half of the 18th century. Despite the expectations after signing the Gulistan Treaty the hereditary prerogatives of Karabaghi nobles (meliks) continued weakening, in contrast to it the role of khan clans became greater.

For the sake of truth it should be stated that the Tsarist Government didn't inspire Armenian leaders, however, the Armenian side merely had some expectations for having been Russian-oriented. The Lazaryans, prominent public and political figures of those times, did not put up with the fact of melikdoms' collapse by any means. It should be stated as well that Minas Lazaryan even in 1806 made attempts to introduce to the tsar the project entitled "Artsakh county" composed by Armenian meliks. The meliks suggested that the mountainous part of Karabagh, the so-called Artsakh county, should be considered a territory under the domination of Russia, which in its turn should have a status of autonomy. According to the project the Armenian leaders had the responsibility to pay the Tsar half of the tax usually paid to Russia, i.e. 4000 quarters (1quarter=16 kg) of grain and 4000 gold. They were also going to increase the number of taxes parallelly to the growth of population. The project, however, didn't run because of various reason: (a) there was a kind of fear among Tsarist officials that meliks might lay the foundations of an independent state, (b) one of the main reasons of the project failure was the foreign policy instability in Russia[27].

The attempts of the Lazaryans directed towards recovering the rights of Karabaghian meliks were in vain. As shown by further events their applications to the corresponding imperial courts, and even to the emperor, did not gain any answer.

The applications of the Melik-Shahnazaryans also addressed to the Russian Empire persuading the aim of restoring their hereditary right was in vain, while after the 1826-1828 Russian-Persian war the representatives of the Melik-Shahnazaryan clan fulfilled the Russian military ranks with hereditary noble status[28]. What refers to the Melik-Israyelyans of Jraberd it is worth mentioning that at the beginning of the 19th century they were gradually leaving the stage of history. A. Maghalyan notices that it was caused by the absence of a male heir among the last representatives of the Melik-Israyelyans[29]. Vani Atabekyan gained the post of the manager of Jraberd in 1814 who consequently gained the title “melik” [30].

It is noteworthy that simultaneously to the fall of melikdom as well as to the attempts of Tsarist authorities to abolish them and their independence, within the framework of unwritten law, they continued being the independent owners of their estates at the same time taking care for the wellbeing of citizens[31]. Travel notes of Mesrop Taghiadyan inform us of the economic potential of Karabagh at the beginning of the 19th century, the fame of outstanding figures and meliks and their notable status. Particularly, it is spoken about the Tarumyans, Melik-Atabekyans of Jraberd, Melik-Hovsepyans and Melik-Beglaryans of Gulistan[32]. The Melik-Pashayans, Mamikonyans, Bahatryans, Yeritsyans, Ulubabyans, Melik-Dolukhanyans and others in comparison with the former powerful clans had less prominence[33].

The treaty disappointed the representatives of the advanced Armenian society who had great expectations with the Russian Empire thinking that they would restore the former glory and power. In fact the opposite occurred. Restoration of melikdom would mean foundation of future independent state. So, having some fears from it Tsarism retained puppet Khan Regime which was abolished when the Empire felt sure enough in the subject domains.

c/ As it was mentioned above the Gulistan Treaty did not meet the expectations of people of Artsakh including their expectation of putting an end to the regime of Khan. Moreover, at the very initial stage of realization of its colonial policy Tsarism considered the regime of Khan a solid foundation.

The situation changed in 1816 when on the decree of Alexander I General Alexei Yermolov was appointed Governor and Commander in Chief of the Caucasian Army. By the arrival in the Caucasus he at once realized the necessity of eliminating arbitrariness and violations of the Khan's regime[34]. He was convinced of it when in 1816 he visited the Persian border of Karabagh[35]. In a letter dated 18th December, 1816 addressed to Sargis agha Grigoryan, Nerses Ashtaraketsi wrote that the deputy came back from Karabagh and informed that khans were ordered not to appoint any judge, tax collector or superior over Armenians, so that one should be an Armenian by nationality[36].

According to A. Yermolov's calculations they expected about 1 million rubles of income in silver from the Karabagh Khanate which was only possible after the overthrow of the Khan's regime[37]. On this occasion he wrote, "The Karabagh Khanate was deserted by the Persian attacks. The population decreased. The soil is fertile. The people are efficient and always support us. We can get great profits from this country in case it is under our administrative control"[38].

Overthrow of the Khan's Regime[39] became a matter of principle for A. Yermolov. It is noteworthy that the matter of the Khan's Regime overthrow became more urgent because of Mehti Ghuli Khan's behavior. Considering Karabagh as his intact property he did not take easy the statistics held by the Russian government and, in general any kind of interference. The incidents connected with the obstruction of statistics showed that Mehti Ghuli felt sure to such a degree in Karabagh that he even tried to oppose to the official orders of the Tsar. Naturally, on the one hand the reality of Mehti Ghuli as a khan of Karabagh was not beneficial; on the other hand it was unpleasant for the Tsarist Government. An internal factor was added to it, i.e. the fear of new owners of lands. The drunkard khan had a bad memory and could deny any kind of Treaty that is why his removal was just a necessity[40]. Without going into details we should note that in 1822 the Khan escaped to Persia[41].

In autumn 1822 A. Yermolov visited Karabagh. In his presence there took place opening of the regional court called "divan" in Shoushi, the entry of the Russian Government was announced, and people expressed loyalty oath to the Russian emperor. The people of Shoushi gave A. Yermolov a souvenir – a steel sword with an inscription about the union of the region[42].

So in 1822 the Khan's regime which had been unfamiliar to the Armenian reality was overthrown, the foundation of which was made in the middle of the previous century. The Khan's regime was replaced by the Russian Regime, the main aim of which was the colonization of Karabagh.

d/ Autocracy: the elucidation of the policy realized towards Karabagh is important and to the point not only for assessing post-Gulistan period but also in terms of precepts of history. Karabagh passed to Russia in the status of a separate administrative-political and legal entity similar to the territories which make part of nowadays Azerbaijan, Daghstan and Georgia. However, as a result of the Tsarism colonial policy completely a different situation is created which is nowadays speculated by Azerbaijani historians. Particularly the fact that the region of Karabagh was artificially included into the list "Muslim provinces" by the Tsarist Government is speculated.

In fact this decision was made neither according to historical, nor according to ethnic division. This was just a synthesis of geographical convenience. As a result of which the region of Karabagh was artificially included into the list of “Muslim provinces”. In that case Karabagh became the victim of the Tsarist traditional policy of avoiding ethnic concentrations, principle of being guided only by geographical factors and management convenience. In the layouts of the administrative reforms of the Russian Empire of the 1813-1917 periods Karabagh was always in the status of a part of a certain administrative unit. In 1828 this happened in P. Sankovsky's, in 1829 in the minister of finances Y. Kankrin's, in 1830 in I. Paskevich's, in 1834 in the minister of military affairs A. Chernishev's reform layouts[43].

It is noteworthy to go into details of the only layout the results of which, most probably, differed to a great extent from the ones mentioned above. On the 19th of May, 1838 the senator of the Transcaucasian Committee P. Gan introduced "the Constitution of Transcaucasian management" to the governor of the Caucasus which was finally approved in August, 1838 by the governor, Y. Golovin. While working out the project there originated an idea of creating one more state as well from the Armenian province and Karabagh region next to the Georgian-Imeretian state and the Caspian state. The idea belonged to Chichagov, one of the Tsarist officials. However, lack of the quantity of officials determined for 2 states, difficulties of communication because of winter, administration expenditure were all the reasons why the proposed project unfortunately remained on paper[44].

According to the administrative division of the 10th April, 1840 Karabagh was renamed “Uyezd of Shoushi” and was included into the Caspian state like Baku, Shamakhi, Ghuba, Derbend, Lenkoran, Nukhi[45]. Transcaucasia underwent a new administrative division on the 14th of December, 1846 which was initiated by the Tsarism Government, i.e. Zangezur and Karabagh with the administrative centre of Shoushi were included into the state of Shamakhi [46], while on the 6th of December, 1859 it was included into the state of Baku[47]. Until the first half of the 60s of the 19th century no change concerning the administrative division of Karabagh was recorded. It again became a matter of discussion in the second half of the 1860s. Taking into consideration that the province of Shoushi occupied approximately 20 000 square km with the population 254 000 people, it was decided to include Zangezur, then a part of the province of Shoushi, into the state of Elizabetpol which was founded on the 9th of December, 1867[48]. In 1868 Gandzak was announced administrative centre of the state of Elizabetpol. Gandzak with the number of its population and other features peculiar to a city yielded to those of Shoushi.

Estimating the content of administrative layouts and decisions of the Tsarism Government we conclude as follows.

Tsarism adhered to the policy of avoiding ethnic concentrations which was vividly expressed in Karabagh where the hope of independent state foundation was alive. The proposal of making one administrative unit out of the Armenian marz and Karabagh remained on paper being explained only by geographical considerations. In fact, because of narrow, self-interested policy of the Tsarist authorities Karabagh and the Armenian marz were not united into one administrative unit.

e/ In order to get well acquainted with the political consequences of the Post-Gyulistan historical period it is also very important to represent the local government policy carried out by the Tsarism. Putting aside all the details [49] of our recent research, let us advert the edict of the 6th December of 1846, which foresaw to stabilize the situation of the privileged class in Transcaucasia, making them useful for the policy carried out by the government. According to the edict, all the territories that were earlier granted for various services and deeds as well as those lands that indisputably belonged to them during the period of joining Russia, started to be considered as the hereditary property of beks, aghas, meliks and others[50].

During the implementation of the above mentioned laws and rules, the Tsarism was pursuing

a quite interesting policy in Karabagh supporting the Muslim higher class, and at the same time assigning the Armenians at important posts of local government.

In order to recreate the real image of this policy, due to the "Caucasus calendar" it became possible to create the list of people occupying posts in local government during the years 1846-1865[51]. The analysis resulted in the following image: though the autocracy defended the interests of Muslim beks in its laws and constitutions, however, it was done in order not to make the latter's adversary in relation to them. Tsarism did not trust the Muslim beks in the governing process, who didn't disgust at being the opponent of Russia once they had a suitable opportunity. The cases of betrayal among the Armenians were excluded; hence the blind faith of the latter's was used by the Tsarism to reinforce its positions. This was the reason why the local government was managed by Russian and Armenian officials.

So the above mentioned policy carried out by the Tsarism was pursuing to create local political balance for strengthening its own positions.

A brief study of the political consequences of the Gulistan Treaty allows to make various observations.

The importance of the Gulistan Treaty was observed by the history within the context of Transcaucasia's joining Russia, giving various evaluations to this political deed- from progressive till the lesser of the evil. According to the historical regularity, the replacement of one undeveloped state by another relatively developed one, that is, the denial of less developed degree by a relatively developed one should be considered progressive. However, despite the regularities, there are certain criteria for estimating historical facts, which allow to tend to the opinion that according to the Gulistan Treaty Karabagh's joining to Russia was the lesser of the evil. In fact this is not a strict and extreme definition, the meaning is clear, i.e. the foreign government can never be absolutely kind, and in the very case the Russian government was the lesser of the evil as compared with the Persian government. Another evaluation would have been given to this international-legal document if the idea of creating an autonomous administrative-political unit in Artsakh had been realized. Eventually within millenniums we have cultural rich and exemplary inheritance, dynasties, in case of people permanently struggling for the observation and restoration of the statehood, joining the Russian Empire (by this we also mean the treaty of Turkmencha) should be simply observed as a new stage, an evitable stage with its positive and negative consequences formed as a result of the development of historical events.

In conclusion it should be noted that the research of the above-mentioned turning period is very important and actual for learning lessons from history as well as for using it by the impartial sides for the actual political procedures.

REFERENCES

1. The administrative-political unit under consideration in the sources of the given period is referred to as "Karabagh", which served a basis for using the above-mentioned toponym a number of times.
2. Լեո, Երկերի ժողովածու, հ. 4, Եր., 1984, էջ 248-251 [Leo, Collected works, volume 4, Y., 1984, p. 248-251.]
3. Ազատյան Հ., Բախտորոշ պայմանագրեր, Եր., 2002, էջ 26-31: [Azatyan H, Fatal Treaties, Y., 2002, p. 26-31.]
4. Ստորև քննարկվող հարցի մասին առավել մանրամասն տե՛ս Багдасарян, Н., Ованнисян Л., Демографические передвижения в Нагорном Карабахе после заключения Гюлистанского и Туркменчайского договоров:возвращения на родину, миграция армян Персии, сборник научных статей, Центра системных

- региональных исследований и прогнозирования ИППК ЮФУ и ИСПИ РАН, Университет Месроп Маштоц, Южнороссийское обозрение, Вып. 77, «Социально-гуманитарные знания», Москва-Ростов-на –Дону, 2013, стр.122-135.[More detailed information about the below-mentioned issue see Baghdasaryan N., Hovhannisyan L., Demographic Migrations in Nagorno Karabagh after signing the Treaties of Gulistan and Turkmenchay: Repatriation, Migration of Persian Armenians, Collected Scientific Articles of the Centre of Systemic Regional Investigations and Predictions of the Institute of Retraining and Raising the Quaification of Lecturers of the Southern Federal Institute and Institute of Social-Political Investigations of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Mesrop Mashtots University, Southern Russian Survey, Issue 77 “Social-Humanitarian Sciences”, Moscow-Rostov, 2013, p. 122-135.]
5. Акты, собранные Кавказской Археографической Комиссией (այսուհետև՝ АКАК), т. V, ч. II, Тифлис,1873, с. 579. [Records compiled by the Caucasus Archeographic Commission (RCAC), Volume 5, II, Tiflis, 1873, p. 579]
 6. Մաղալյան Ա.,Արցախի մելիքությունները և մելիքական տները XVII-XIX դդ., Երևան, 2007, էջ 99-100: [Artak Maghalyan. The Melikdoms of Artsakh and the Melik Houses in the 17th –19th centuries, Yerevan, 2007, p. 99-100]
 7. Բաստամեանց Ե., Բարոն Օ. Հակաստիաուզենի ճանապարհորդութենից մի գլուխ, «Կռունկ հայոց աշխարհի», թիւ Բ, փետրուար, 1862, էջ 107: [Bastamyants E., Baron O. Chapter from the Travels of Haksthauzen "Krunk of the Armenian Land", N B, February, 1862, p. 107]
 8. Մաղալյան Ա., նշվ. աշխ., էջ 114, [Maghalyan A., See the above-mentioned Work, p. 114]
 9. Մատենադարան, Կաթողիկոսական դիվան, թղթ. 62, վավ. 75: [The Matenadaran, Patriarchal Archives 62, doc. 75.]
 10. 1823 թ. մայիսի 2-ին Կովկասի կառավարչապետ Ա. Երմոլովին ներկայացվեց Պ. Մոգիլևսկու և Պ. Երմոլովի զեկույցը բնակչության թվի, հարկերի մասին: [On May 2, 1823 P. Mogilevsky and P. Ermolov's Report on the Population Number and Taxes was presented to the Caucasus governor A. Ermolov.]
 11. ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 93, ց. 1, գ. 163: Ցուցակագրությունների տվյալները շատ հաճախ չէին համապատասխանում իրականությանը, մասնավորապես, թաթար բնակչության թվի բարձր ցուցանիշները պայմանավորված էին նրանով, որ քոչվորական կենսակերպի հետևանքով վերջիններս հաշվառվում էին մի քանի անգամ:Մեկ այլ աղբյուրի համաձայն Ղարաբաղի գավառի ծխերի թիվը հասել էր 20546-ի՝ մոտավորապես 100 հազ. երկսեռ բնակչությամբ: Այս մասին տե՛ս - Մուսայելեան Հ., Ղարաբաղի նուաճման հարիւրամեակը (1813 թ. 12 հոկտ.-1913 թ. 12 հոկտ.), «Արարատ», թիւ Գ, 1914, էջ 254: [Armenian National Archive 93/1/163 The listings data very often did not correspond to the reality, in particular, high indicators of the number of Tatar population were grounded by the fact that they had been recorded several times because of their nomadic lifestyle.According to another source the number of the province՝s homes amounted to 20546, nearly 100,0 mixed population. See Musayelyan H., 100th anniversary of Karabagh՝s capture (October 12, 1813 – October 12, 1913), “Ararat”, N 3 (C), 1914, p 254.]
 12. Науменко Е.,Елисаветпольская губерния, Военно-статистическое описание, Тифлис,1903, часть 1, стр.280. [Naumenko E., Elisabethpol Province, Military-Statistical Description, Tiflis, 1903, Part 1, p. 280.]
 13. Իմացիր՝ թաթար. հատկանշական է, որ «Արևելակրվկասյան մուսուլմանական հանրապետությունը», որն առաջին անգամ իրանական Ատրպատականի ա-

- նունով պայմանականորեն կոչվեց «Ադրբեջան», որպես պետություն՝ պատմության ասպարեզում հայտնի է 1918 թվականից, հետևաբար, Արցախի պատմությունը սեփականելու հարցում արված ադրբեջանական արդի պատմագրության դատողությունները ընդունելի չեն ոչ միայն հայ, այլ նաև համաշխարհային պատմագրության կողմից: [See Tatar, it is distinctive, that "East-Caucasian Muslim Republic", which was conditionally called ‘‘Azerbaijan’’ for the first time after Iranian Atrpatakan. As a state it has been known in the historic field since 1918, therefore the judgements of the contemporary Azerbaijani historiography on the issue of privatizing the Artsakh history are not acceptable not only from the viewpoint of Armenian but international historiography.]
14. Гаджиева З., Гарабагское ханство: социально-экономические отношения и государственное устройство, Б., 2008 стр.7. [Hajieva Z., Karabagh Khanate: Social-Economic relations and state structure, Baku, 2008, p. 7.]
 15. Халилов Х., Из этнической истории Карабаха, <http://karabakh-dok.azerall.info/ru/-azerpeople/ap003.htm>, 4.10.2006. [Khalilov Kh., From the Ethnic History of karabagh, <http://Karabagh-dok.azerall.info/ru/azerpeople/ap003.htm>, 4/10/2006.]
 16. Քննարկվող խնդրի մասին առավել մանրամասն տե՛ս Բաղդասարյան Ն., Բաղդասար մետրոպոլիտ Հասան-Ջալալյանի դերը Ղարաբաղի հայության հասարակական-քաղաքական կյանքում, «Կրթությունը և գիտությունը Արցախում», թիվ 1-2, Երևան, 2009, էջ 164-168: [More detailed about the investigated issue see Baghdasaryan N., Baghdasar Metropolitan Hasan Jalalyan’s role in the social-political life of the Armenians of Karabagh, ‘‘Education and Science in Artsakh’’, N 1-2, Yerevan, 2009, pp. 164-168.]
 17. Լեօ, Պատմութիւն Ղարաբաղի Հայոց Թեմական հոգեւոր դպրոցի 1838-1913, Թիֆլիզ, 1914, էջ 114: [Leo, History of the Karabagh Diocese Spiritual School of 1838-1913, Tiflis, 1914, p. 114.]
 18. Րաֆֆի, Երկերի ժողովածու, հ. 9, էջ 569-574, [Raffi, Collected Works, V 9, p. 569-574.]
 19. Տէր-Յովհաննիսեանց Գ., Բաղտասար մետրապօլիտ Հասան-Ջալալեանցի համառօտ կենսագրութիւն, «Փորձ», թիւ 5, Տիֆլիս, 1880, էջ 159: [Ter-Hovhanniseants G., Concise Biography of Baghdasar Metropolitan, "Pordz", N 5, Tpkhis, 1880, p 159.]
 20. Ղեսյատին՝ հեկտարից քիչ ավելի: [Dessiatina (measure of land a bit more than hectare) .]
 21. «Մշակ», թիվ 94, Թիֆլիս, 1888: [“Mshak”, N 94, Tiflis, 1888.]
 22. Ղարաբաղի տարածքի շահարկման մասին առավել մանրամասն տե՛ս Ն. Բաղդասարյան, Գյուլիստանի պայմանագրի պատմական դասերից, Ազատ Արցախ, 17 օգոստոսի, 2013, էջ 6: [See more detailed information on speculating around the territory of Karabagh N. Baghdasaryan, Historic Lessons of the Treaty of Gulistan, Azat Artsakh, August 17, 2013, p. 6.]
 23. АКАК, т. VI, ч. II, Тифлис, 1875, док. 267, с. 122. [Acts of the Caucasus Archeographic Commission, Volume VI, Part II, Tiflis, 1875, doc. 267, p. 122.]
 24. Присоединение Восточной Армении к России, сборник документов, т. II, Ереван, 1978, стр. 23. [The Annexion of West Armenia to Russia, collected documents, Volume II, Yerevan, 1978, p. 23.]
 25. АКАК, т. VI, ч. II, док. 364, с. 194. [Acts of the Caucasus Archeographic Commission ,Volume VI, Part II, doc 364, p. 194.]
 26. Հովհաննիսյան Հ., Հայագիտությունը Ռուսաստանում (պատմագիտություն, XIX

- դար), Եր., 2004, էջ 183: [Hovhannisyanyan H., Armenian Studies in Russia (Historiography, 19th century), Y., 2004.]
27. Тунян В., Русская политика в Армении: мифы и реалии (конец XVIII-начало XX вв.), Ер., 1998, стр. 7-8. [Tunyan V., Russian Policy in Armenia: myths and realities (the end of the 18th – beginning of the 20th centuries), Yerevan, 1998, pp. 7-8.]
28. Մաղալյան Ա., նշվ. աշխ., էջ 198: [Maghalyan A., the mentioned work, p. 198.]
29. Նույն տեղում, էջ 111: [In the same place, p. 111.]
30. Նույն տեղում: [In the same place.]
31. Այս մասին տե՛ս ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 319, ց. 2, գ. 50, թ. 1-2, ց. 1, գ. 51, թ. 1-3, ց. 1, գ. 52, թ. 1-3, ց. 1, գ. 49, թ. 1-4, ց. 1, գ. 54, թ. 1-13, Մելիք-Դոլուխանյան տոհմի մելիքական անպաճույճ ապարանքը գտնվում է Վարանդա գավառի այժմ արդեն լքված Թուխնակալ գյուղում: Այս տոհմի շառավիղներից է տողերիս հեղինակը: Այս մասին տե՛ս Դուլյան Ա., Արցախի և Սյունիքի մելիքական ապարանքները, Երևան, 2001, էջ 106-108: [See about it in National Archive of Armenia, fund 319, list 2, case 50, paper 1-2, list 1, case 51, papers 1-3, list 1, case 52, papers 1-3, list 1, case 49, paper 1-4, list 1, case 54, papers 1-13, The modest castle of Melik-Dolukhanyans is situated in the province of Varanda, Tukhnakal village. One of the representatives of that clan is the author of those lines. See about it in Ghulyan A. Melik castles of Artsakh and Syunik, Yerevan, 201, pp. 106-108]
32. Թաղիադեանց Ս., Ճանապարհորդություն ի Հայս, հ. առաջին, Կալկաթա, 1847, [Taghiadeants M., Travelling to Armenia, v. 1, Calcata, 1847]
33. Մատենադարան, Լազարյանների արխիվ, թղթ. 105, գ. 13, documentary 192, էջ 1: [Matenadaran, archive of the Lazaryans, paper 105, case 13, p. 1]
34. It is noteworthy that the appointed commander of the military region of Karabagh, Shirvan and Shamakhi khanates, former governor of Georgia, Major-General F. Hakhverdov officially was not authorized to interfere in the internal affairs of local rulers. His duty was to establish “subtle control” over their activities.
35. Тунян В., Политика самодержавия России в Закавказье XIX-нач. XX вв. Часть первая, 1800-1826 гг., Ереван, 2006, с. 83 [Tunyan V., The policy of autocracy of Russia in Transcaucasia, early 19th and 20th centuries, Part 1, 1880-1826, Yerevan, 2006, p. 83]
36. Մատենադարան, Ներսես Աշտարակեցու արխիվ, թղթ. 164 ա, վավ. 285, թ. 21: [Matenadaran, archive of Nerses Ashtaraketsi, paper 164 a, documentary 285, paper 21]
37. Тунян В., Политика самодержавия России в Закавказье XIX-нач. XX вв. Часть первая, 1800-1826 гг., Ер., 2006, стр. 116. [Tunyan V., The policy of autocracy of Russia in Transcaucasia, early 19th and 20th centuries, Part 1, 1880-1826, Yerevan, 2006, p. 111]
38. Записки А. П. Ермолова, 1798-1826, М., 1991, стр. 290. [Letters of A.P. Yermolov, 1798-1826, M., 1991, p. 290]
39. Խանական վարչակարգի վերացման մասին առավել մանրամասն տե՛ս Багдасарян, Н., Политика царской России по отношению к ханскому режиму в Карабахе в первой четверти XIX века., «Армяне юга России: история, культура, общее будущее», материалы Всероссийской научной конференции, 30 мая – 2 июня 2012 г., Р-на-Д., 2012, стр. 38-43. Նույնի՝ Ղարաբաղի խանության վերացումը աղբյուրների լույսի ներքո, Մեսրոպ Մաշտոց Համալսարանի «Լրատու» (գիտական հոդվածների ժողովածու), 2013, 1/14, Ստեփ., 2013, էջ 20-28: [On the overthrow of the Khan's Regime see in details in Baghdasaryan N., The Policy of the

- Tsarist Russia towards the Khan's Regime in Karabagh, 1st quarter of the 19th century., §Armenians of the South of Russia: history, culture, common future, materials of the All-Russian Scientific Conference, 30th May – 2nd June, 2012, Rostov-on-Don, 2012, pp. 38-43. In the light of materials of the Karabagh Khanate overthrow, "Bulletin" (collection of scientific articles) of Mesrop Mashtots University, 2013, 1/14, Stepanakertm 2013, p. 20-38.]
40. Ռաֆֆի, Երկերի ժողովածու, հ. 9, էջ 582: [Raffi, Collection of Works, v. 9, p 582.]
 41. Լեո, Երկերի ժողովածու, հ. 4, էջ 398, Покровский М., Дипломатия и войны царской России в XIX столетии, сборник статей, М., 1923, стр. 186-187. [Léo, Collection of Works, v. 4, p. 398. Pokrovskiy M. Diplomacy and wars of the Tsarist Russia of the 19th century, collection of articles, Moscow, 1923, p. 186-187.]
 42. Присоединение Кавказа к России XIX век, СПб, 2005, с. 116. [Joining the Caucasus to Russia, 19th century, Saint Petersburg, 2005, p. 116]
 43. Բաղդասարյան Ն., Քաղաքական և սոցիալ-տնտեսական կացությունը Ղարաբաղում 1813-1867 թթ., Ատենախոսություն, Եր., 2010, էջ 71-90, Բաղդասարյան Ն., Ղարաբաղը՝ Ռուսական կայսրության վարչաքաղաքական բարեփոխումների նախագծերում և որոշումներում 1822- 1867 թթ., Հայագիտական հանդես, 1/2010, Ստ., 2010, էջ 49-59: [Baghdasaryan N., Political and Social-Economic Conditions in Karabagh in 1813-1867, dissertation, Yerevan, 2010, p. 71-90, Baghdasaryan N., Karabagh in the layouts of administrative reforms and decision of 1822-1867, Journal of Armenian Studies, 1/2010, Stepanakert, 2010, p. 49-59.]
 44. Тунян В., Административно-экономическая политика самодержавия России в Закавказье 1-й пол. XIX в., с. 63. [Tunyan V., Administrative-economic policy of autocracy of Russia in Transcaucasia, 1st quarter of the 19th century, p. 63.]
 45. Шахатунян А., Административный передел Закавказского края, Тифлис, 1918, с. 86-87. [Administrative redistribution of Transcaucasian region, Tiflis, 1918, p. 86-87]
 46. “Кавказский календарь” на 1849 г., Тифлис, 1848, с. 37-40. ["Caucasus Calendar" of 1849, Tiflis, 1848, pp. 37-40]
 47. «Մեղու Հայաստանի», թիվ 316, 1860, էջ 17: [“Bee of Armenia”,N 316, 1860, p. 17.]
 48. Отчет по главному управлению наместника Кавказского за первое десятилетие управления Кавказским и Закавказским краем е.и.в. князем Михаилом Николаевичем с декабря 1862-6 декабря 1872, Тифлис, 1873, стр. 50 [Report on the management of the main viceroy of the Caucasus, Duke Mikhail Nikolayevich, for the first decade of control over the Caucasus and Transcaucasia from the 6th December 1862 to 1872, Tiflis, 1873, p. 50]
 49. Հանգամանալից տե՛ս Բաղդասարյան Ն., Ցարական կառավարության կողմից ընդունված՝ 1840, 1846 և 1847 թվականների օրենքների արտահայտությունները Ղարաբաղում «Կրթությունը և գիտությունը համաշխարհայնացման դարաշրջանում» Մեսրոպ Մաշտոց Համալսարանի գործունեության 15-ամյակին նվիրված միջազգային գիտաժողովի նյութեր (Ստեփանակերտ, 3 նոյեմբերի , 2012թ.), Եր., 2012, էջ 131-136: [See in more details Baghdasaryan N. 1840, 1846 and 1847 law expressions passed by the Tsarist Government in Karabagh, "Education and Science in the era of globalization" , materials of international conference dedicated to Mesrop Mashtots University's 15th anniversary, (Stepanakert, 3 November, 2012), Yerevan, 2012, p. 131-136]
 50. Հայ ժողովրդի պատմություն, հ. 5, էջ 220, Свод материалов по изучению экономического быта государственных крестьян Закавказского края

ЎСМИЭБГКЗКѠ, т. II, Тифлис, 1887, стр. 77. [History of the Armenian nation, v. 5, p. 220., Collection of materials for the study of the economic life of the state peasants of Transcaucasian region, v. 2, Tiflis, 1887, p. 77.]

51. Ժամանակաշրջանը ընտրվել է դիտարկման համար: [The period is chosen for observation.]

SUMMARY

Consequences of the Gulistan Treaty in the Political Life of Karabagh Nelly Baghdasaryan

The article highlights the consequences of 1813 Gulistan Treaty in Karabakh political life. A more sophisticated treatment allows to clearly recognize that first of all the Treaty gave the Armenian people the opportunity of peaceful existence and entailed the repatriation of the Karabakh people, who left the country because of war.

The analysis of the political consequences of the Treaty also evinces the negative aspects. The Treaty wakened border issues between Russia and Persia with the Karabakh territory being one of the points touched upon. The peculiarities of the Tsarist policy in the sphere of administrative and local self-government are elucidated with reasonable facts.

РЕЗЮМЕ

Последствия Гюлистанского договора в политической жизни Карабаха Нелли Багдасарян

Ключевые слова: Русско-персидская война, Гюлистанский договор, Карабах, Арцах, Россия, Иран, Мелик-Шахназаряны, А. Ермолов, Арцахские меликства, административно-политическая, Закавказский комитет

В статье освещены последствия Гюлистанского договора 1813 г. в политической жизни Карабаха. Детальный анализ позволяет четко подчеркнуть, что договор, прежде всего, дал армянству Арцаха возможность мирного существования и повлек за собой репатриацию карабахского населения, покинувшего страну в результате войны.

Анализ политических последствий договора выявляет также отрицательные аспекты. Договор разжег пограничные споры между Россией и Персией; территория Карабаха была среди затронутых тем. Особенности царской политики в сфере административного и местного самоуправления освещены обоснованными фактами.

ԱՄՓՈՓԱԳԻՐ

**Գյուլիստանի պայմանագրի հետևանքերը Ղարաբաղի քաղաքական կյանքում
Նելլի Բաղդասարյան**

Բանալի բառեր՝ Ռուս-պարսկական պատերազմ, Գյուլիստանի պայմանագիր, Ղարաբաղ, Ռուսաստան, Արցախ, Պարսկաստան, Արցախի մելիքություններ, Մելիք-Շահնազարյաններ, Ա. Երմոլով, վարչաքաղաքական, Անդրկովկասյան Կոմիտե

Հոդվածում լուսաբանվել են 1813 թ. Գյուլիստանի պայմանագրի հետևանքները Ղարաբաղի քաղաքական կյանքում: Մանրամասն քննությունը թույլ է տալիս ընդգծել, որ պայմանագիրն առաջին հերթին հայության արցախյան հատվածին խաղաղ գոյատևման և հայրենադարձության հնարավորություն տվեց:

Պայմանագրի քաղաքական հետևանքների վերլուծությունը վերհանել է նաև բացասական հետևանքներ: Պայմանագիրը բորբոքել էր Ռուսաստանի և Պարսկաստանի միջսահմանային հարցերը. Ղարաբաղի տարածքը շահարկվող հարցերի թվում էր: Փաստական աղբյուրների հիմքի վրա ներկայացվել է ցարիզմի վարչատարարածքային և տեղական ինքնակառավարման քաղաքականությունը: