
POLITICAL SCIENCES AND INFORMATIONAL SECURITY

**AZERBAIJAN: THE HISTORY OF A DISEASE OR EXTERNAL FACTORS
OF THE FORMATION OF GENOCIDAL POLITICAL CULTURE OF
TRANSCAUCASIAN TURKS
(Multidimensionality of the problem)**

Alexander Manasyan
Corresponding Member of NAS RA

Abstract

In the article is discussed the policy of intolerance towards Armenians which started with the establishment of the Democratic Republic of Azerbaijan (1918-1920), later to be transformed into genocidal consciousness through further spiritual-political mutation. Stalin's project of the building of new Azerbaijani nation in practice was transformed into the project of ultimate formation of a new Turkified state and society – bearer of sophisticated forms of genocidal policy and behavior.

Keywords – *Caucasian Tatars, genocidal behavior, Stalin project of the building of Azerbaijani nation, policy of perestroika and glasnost, project of dismantling of the USSR into national republics, genocide of Armenians of Azerbaijan, external factors in the rise of genocidogenic culture*

The phenomenon of intolerance in interethnic relations, which is expressed first by means of the language of hatred, is one of the most dangerous social diseases of the modern civilization. The history testifies that the virus of intolerance can infect whole societies, become source for social cataclysms of historical scales. This virus is a root of many forms of social diseases – aggressive nationalism, Nazism, apartheid, segregation, racism.¹ In its extreme forms it is able to give birth to genocide - a crime against the whole human civilization. By its different forms, as a rule, intolerance exhibits itself as a part of expansionist policy, imperial chauvinism, hidden and apparent forms of colonialism. However, our vision of cultural, social-historical, political, and psychological motives for such activities are not enough for the diagnostics of the spiritual condition of states or societies which are prone to commit them, and for the preventive actions and treatment of these social diseases. In the condition when the spread of a virus of intolerance has a tendency to outgrow into pandemics, the concealment of genocidal acts by means of different falsifications, their rejection for reasons of political expediency, from whom it might come - is an indulgence to genocidal policy which pushes humanity to new disasters. Meanwhile, the practice of hiding and releasing criminals from responsibility are becoming humdrums of history, some sort of allowed norm of powerful peoples' behavior which transforms our civilization into jungle.

¹ Nazism, apartheid, chauvinism, Nazism – all these social viruses are grown up from the “leaven” of aggressive intolerance.

Genocidal acts of the XX century, particularly the genocide of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire and Republican Turkey sheds light on the matter. It lies in the politicization of these crimes, deliberate lowering of the “rank” of genocidal acts, their reduction into “regrettable tragic events” or incidents, which allegedly could not fall into the category of genocide. Extant facts of the hiding of evident genocidal acts in terms of common sense and spirit of justice are enough for scholars who realize their moral responsibility for that state of affairs to sound the alarm. The validity of in-depth understanding of the problem is evident. After all, currently are missing satisfactory answers to the next, it would seem, simple questions: a) why and how are accumulated impulses of intolerance and hatred to others by one or the other communities or actors on the international political ring, and b) how they appear in the behavior of the subjects - bearers of these mental-psychological qualities?

Of course, any of the mentioned social diseases has important specificity for its identification which is fixed in the definition of the phenomenon. Some of them are very significant in the context of the discussed problem. Hatred and intolerance, for example, could appear as mutual, reciprocal relations, while the discrimination, apartheid and genocide suppose the existence of sides unequal by power and status: usually the crime of genocide conduct more powerful peoples in regard to weaker ones.

The problem is multifaceted and we think that the main aspects of the “large topic” could be encompassed, speaking conventionally, through the outline plan consisting of the next points:

- a) Internal historical-cultural processes of the rise of aggressive intolerance and genocidal behavior;
- b) External factors which induce the forming of genocidogenic political culture;
- c) Reflection on the genocidal act by the criminal, victim, and international community;
- d) Punishment for the crime against humanity as a condition of extirpation of genocidal acts from political relations of peoples and states;
- e) Improvement of international legal, political and cognitive means of evaluation of acts of genocide as a condition for the elaboration of preventive mechanisms of such crimes and overcoming of their consequences.

This analysis mainly regards the point (b) mentioned above. The clarification of our approach further comes down to what that the problem of the genocidal behavior is considered not on the general theoretical principles and concepts for their applying to specific acts. We are trying to reveal the problem on concrete example, aiming at the extraction of generalizations from such analysis. just for general theoretical and philosophical conclusions.

As such example serves the contralateral state-like political formations which exist in the east of Transcaucasia in the XX century, in regard to which was embedded an unrelated toponym *Azerbaijan*, the name of the north-western Iranian province. The first

such state-like political formation named Democratic Republic of Azerbaijan (DRA)² in Transcaucasia appeared in 1918 as a result of the intervention into the region of Turkish army. The second one was established by the XI Red army in April 1920 in the form of Soviet Socialist Republic of Azerbaijan (Az. SSR). The third in this chain which came into existence in the course of the dissolution of the USSR and a member of UN since 1992 is the Republic of Azerbaijan (RA).

This example is chosen by us because it represents an anomalous case in the history of the XX century genocidal acts: despite the flashy evidence of the aforementioned genocidal behavior of all three formations, the fact remains unnoticed by the international community. It requests explanation, but already from the point of view of internal motivations of the subject of crime, and from the point of view of external actors who kept some relations with the criminal.

It is apparent that aggressive intolerance and hatred towards others, especially political behavior with such qualities does not emerge at once. The genesis and rise of these qualities, their rooting in the culture and in the specific forms of political behavior³ suppose not only historically established internal motives, but also external stimulus favoring that process. This circumstance brings together the problem of the formation of genocidogenic culture in the RA with the analysis of changes of the region's state-juridical status during the last two centuries which were undertaken by means of the interference of external forces. The problem which requires political and civilizational conceptualization is as follows. Did the external factors contribute to the formation of genocidal behavior of the modern RA, and if yes, then what are the motives? In this context are clearly distinguished the next periods of the rise of the society (and currently the state) – the bearers of that culture:

- From 1813 until 1918 (from the attachment of the region to the Russian empire until its disintegration; the period of the creation of non-ethnic community of Caucasian Tatars by the Empire),
- 1918-1920 (the period of chaos triggered by World War I and the disintegration of the Russian Empire),

² It was the first attempt of Turkey to create new Turkish states beyond their borders which predates the establishment of the Northern Cypriot Turkish Republic.

³ We should not touch upon more deep roots of aggressive nationalism in the modern Azerbaijani society and genocidal behavior of the Republic of Azerbaijan which are related, as we have formulated above, to internal historical-cultural roots of the formation of predisposition to these qualities among nomadic Turks who in the Middle ages, along with the Mongol-Tatar invasions appeared among sedentary peoples of Persia and Near East. As a possible precondition could be, for example, referred to the extensive form of management with which nomadic Turkish tribes were familiar in the steppes of Central Asia. The nomad who is accustomed to take ready products from the nature, among sedentary people did not lose this "attitude towards the world", which is manifested in the propensity to steal and loot. Nomad who had moved to a sedentary lifestyle, except the conquest of someone else's territory and applying brutal force and cruelty towards subordinated peoples, could not have neither cultural, nor economic leverages in the foundation of a state.

- 1920-1930 (from the rise of the Bolshevik scenario of the creation of the non-national Azerbaijani SSR as an outpost of “red revolution” in the East until the Stalin's program of the building of new socialist Azerbaijani nation),
- 1930-1988 (the advance of Stalin's program of Azerbaijanization of Caucasian Tatars and its further mutation),
- 1988-1992 (from punitive operations against the Karabagh movement and the genocide of Armenians of Azerbaijani SSR until the disintegration of the USSR),
- From 1992 until today (the West and the intensification of genocidal mentality of the Azerbaijani society in the post-Soviet period).

Below these periods should be studied by the order mentioned above. For all these periods exists numerous special studies. Our goal is not the detailed study of these periods but the highlighting of political subtexts and vectors of every period which throws light on the details, logics and results of these transitions.

1813-1918s: INITIAL LESSONS OF PERMISSIVENESS AND IMPUNITY. FIRST TRANS-ETHNIC MUTATION - FROM *PERSIANS* INTO *CAUCASIAN TATARS*

Immediately after the attachment of Transcaucasia to Russia in 1828 in line with promises given to Armenians of Karabagh by the Empire⁴ was formed the Armenian *oblast* which however did not include Karabagh. But soon after, in the course of territorial-administrative reorganization of the region Armenian *oblast* was abolished. The last such reorganization was undertaken in 1867. In Transcaucasia were organized five provinces (*gubernia*) – Kutaisi, Tiflis, Yerevan, Elizavetpol, and Baku. The territorial-administrative division of the region was carried out by the Empire in order to avoid the creation of independent national states, and it logically was in accordance with the Empire's policy. First of all it concerned Armenia and Georgia since exactly they had centuries old traditions of statehood. In the light of this it becomes clear the elimination of Armenian *oblast* and the fragmentation of Eastern Armenia, with their attachment to the Yerevan, Tiflis, and Elizavetpol *gubernias*.

Other tasks arose before the Empire in the multiethnic Eastern Transcaucasia where the local Muslim peoples live for centuries in the area of highly developed Persian culture and spiritually were leaning towards Iran as their motherland (*Vatane*). This is why the Empire undertook the policy of de-Iranization of the region, its spiritual-cultural alienation from Persia. It kept ignoring the Muslim nations and ethnic groups of the region which initially were called Persians⁵ and “collected” them under the general term “Muslims”. The multicolored ethnic patchwork of the region was presented by its confessional “two-toned portrait”: *Christians* - *Muslims*. But the policy of de-Iranization

⁴ See: From the order of F.A.Potyomkin to P.S.Potyomkin issued in April 3, 1783, in: Armenian-Russian relations 1990:239.

⁵ Precisely as *Persians* were identified the local “indigenous peoples” in the first descriptions of the Muslim population of Baku. See: Tagiev 1999: 44.

anyway rests upon the support of these nameless Muslim masses. As such the Empire had chosen the scanty community of anti-Persian oriented local Turks. It took them from the “brace” of the regional Muslim *umma*, renamed them “Caucasian Tatars”⁶ and, according to the logics of that policy, granted them with all possible privileges. According to the 1846 rescript, the Empire opened doors of civil services before the sons of Caucasian-Tatar Muslim aristocracy, actively contributing in the replenishment of their number. But the “ethnic-political *perestroika*” was not completed by this act. It turned out that the initial confessional line *Christians - Muslims* for separating the peoples of Eastern Transcaucasia did not secure the neutrality of the Russian community in future conflicts on which the Empire might rely upon while dealing with this complicated region in future. Christian Russians whose influx was permanently increased, involuntarily had to become acting side of conflicts, if the “confessional portrait” of the region would not be changed. Soon in the political usage was introduced a new, this time ethnic-confessional line of separation. Was chosen a new tandem of the concept *Muslims - Armenians* which fixed the main sides of future conflicts. Through a number of political reboots the terminological evolution took shape of a format acceptable for the Empire consisting of three key concepts – **Armenians, Muslims, Caucasian Tatars**. In this format were clearly designated the sides of future conflicts, in the Muslim mass was distinguished a reliance in the policy of de-Iranization, were driven into the zone of politically marginalized those peoples and ethnic groups who gravitate to Iran, and, finally, in the future conflicts was secured the neutrality of Russians living in the region.

The highlighting of “Caucasian Tatars” in the Muslim mass and granting them economic and other privileges attracted into this section of the society unnamed masses of migrants from Persia - *workers*⁷, whose influx was not hampered by the Empire, because of a need of working force in this rapidly developing region. In the mixer established by the Empire “Caucasian Tatars” (i.e. heterogeneous population of the region to which was attached this epithet) at the beginning of the XIX century although became the most populous in the Muslim mass, they did not gain ethnic identity. It was not an ethnic but statistical commonality. But precisely that faceless statistical

⁶ Here brackets are in place since it was clarified that this was not ethnic commonality but heterogeneous tribal groups who migrated from Persia to Russia *en masse* especially after the elimination of serfdom in 1861 and were nominated as such by imperial services.

⁷ A large part of nameless ethnic mass of migrants from Azerbaijan (north-western province of Persia) comprise Turkish-speaking “nomadic pastoralist and marauding tribes” which, as it is mentioned in the encyclopedic dictionary of Brockhaus and Efron, were settling down near the cities and were engaged in brigandage (See: Brockhaus and Efron, vol.I: 213). The number of migrants as to the last quarter of the XIX century, according to Russian services, was about one million people who replenished the army of laborers in industrial Apsheron peninsula and settled down in the fertile valleys of Kura and Araxes – in the areas most suitable for pastoralists. This influx of ethnically heterogeneous and mostly Turkish speaking mass of migrants, attributed to Caucasian Tatars by Russian administration had determined the turning point in the demographic situation of Eastern Transcaucasia in the sense of increase of the community named by the Russian administration as *Caucasian Tatars*.

commonality became suitable for services of the Empire in her political operations in the region. It was supposed that due to uncertainty of ethnic affiliation and almost complete illiteracy, in contrast to Armenians and Georgians, it would not pretend on the creation of national statehood, would not be involved into social movements and, therefore, could not represent political threat for the Empire. Perhaps, in the XIX century it became the main motivation for the Empire to favor them.⁸ But towards Armenians the attitude of the Empire at the end of the XIX and beginning of the XX centuries became markedly negative. Were closed Armenian schools, taken away monastic lands and property of churches which became reason for the growth of antimonarchic attitude among the Armenians. In response, in 1905-1907 the Tsarist secret police began to incite against Armenians Caucasian Tatars throughout whole Transcaucasia provoking them to organize massacres. The Empire already regarded Caucasian Tatars not only as the factor of de-Iranization but also a punitive power.⁹ Imperial services gave to massacres the name of “Armenian-Tatar clashes”, hiding the aggressive side of these “clashes”, and their sympathy to them.¹⁰ **Economic, administrative and other privileges of Caucasian Tatars in the 1905-1907 Armenian massacres outgrow into the privilege of robbery and violence. On the one hand still unfading nomadic habits of assigning someone else’s property and on the other hand the ethnic impersonality became the moral-psychological leaven, which triggered the transformation of granted social privileges into privileges of permissiveness and violence. In this way the masses of nomadic migrants which did not have ethnic identity, and had “become” Caucasian Tatars, received sanction on permissiveness in regard to Armenians and indigenous Islamic peoples.**

But at the end of the XIX century the imperial policy of de-Iranization brought to unforeseen results. The educated part of the new generation of “Caucasian Tatars” looked towards Istanbul and became bearer of the ideas of Pan-Turkism. In fact, the policy of Eastern Transcaucasia’s de-Iranization took the form of Turkification of this region. An apparent mistake in calculations to the benefit of numerous agents of Istanbul in the region. Turkish agents, better than the highest Russian administration, evaluated the perspectives of imperial policy of de-Iranization and acted in that direction. **Whatever it was, the output of implemented policy was not “the product” the Empire expected to receive. It cultivated a power hostile to her at the expense of peoples which were natural allies, at which had pointed count Illarion Ivanovich Vorontsov-Dashkov, the governor of the Caucasus.**¹¹

⁸ Probably, it was also assumed that by this mass could not appear social-economic pretensions in view of their undisputed privileges in those spheres of social life.

⁹ On the policy of mobilization of Caucasian Tatars by the Empire in order to punish Armenians points Vorovskij, one of the notable Bolsheviks, See: Vorovskij 1933: 106-107.

¹⁰ To these events is dedicated the book of Alexander Novikov, ex-governor of Baku (1902-1904)(Novikov2015).

¹¹ “Your Majesty is aware,- writes to Nicholas II the viceroy of the Caucasus,- that during the whole history of our relations with Turkey regarding Caucasus until the 1877-1878 war which ended with the attachment to our territory modern Batumi and Kars regions, the Russian policy permanently, beginning from Peter the Great rests on the

In such atmosphere at the Caucasus in 1917 the Russian empire was thrown into whirlpool of upheavals and disintegration. In November, just after Petrograd and Moscow, in the industrial Baku was established Soviet power. Armenians became the national support for Soviet power since they were afraid of the secession of the region from Russia due to the threat of Turkish invasion. Armenians who had important positions in the economy of the region were aware that by the Soviet power they could lose their property. But in that moment they made a choice not between Socialism and Capitalism but between genocidal Turkey and Soviet Russia.

1918-1920: FROM PERMISSIVENESS TO GENOCIDAL CONSCIOUSNESS AND BEHAVIOR DURING THE TURKISH INTERVENTION IN TRANSCAUCASIA

In March 1918, the deputies of the All-Russian Constituent Assembly from Transcaucasia who 'came back from Petrograd', formed Transcaucasian Seim in Tbilisi in order to establish a breakaway state -Transcaucasian Democratic Federative Republic (TDFR) which actually survived only about one month and was dissolved in May, 1918, due to the efforts of external forces (mostly Turkey). In May 26, Georgia announced about its exit from TDFR. In May 27, the Muslim fraction of Transcaucasian Seim adopted the text of the Declaration of the Democratic Republic of Azerbaijan (DRA), and in May 28, 1918, declared its independence the Republic of Armenia. Turks waited for the dissolution of TDFR expecting to put an end to Armenia and Armenians and at the same time give over the power in Baku to the government of DRA consisting mainly from the members of "Musavat" party.¹²

On the first day of its independence the Republic of Armenia defended his right to live in the battles at Sardarapat and Bash Aparan against invading Turkish army. Turks did not succeed to fulfill their goal of elimination of revived Armenian state. But they get a chance to continue intervention towards Baku, en route setting on fire dozens of Armenian settlements. In September 15, 1918, Baku was captured. Due to the bayonets of Turkish army and with the assist of the German expeditionary corpus the government of DRA "arrived" in Baku. During three days Turkish soldiers and the crowds of Caucasian Tatars organized a "bloody feast".Tens of thousands of Armenian civilians

friendly attitude towards Armenians who reciprocated with active assistance during military actions ... Only in 90s of the last century that original policy towards Armenians has been drastically changed during the Sassoun massacre when Armenians were categorically refused by the prince Lobanov-Rostovskij in intercession before Turkey. Your Majesty is well aware to what sad results brought the change of our policy, due to failed measures undertaken in regard to Armenian church in Russia, creating anti-Russian attitude of all Armenians in general including also Russian subjects who were thereby involved in revolutionary movement hostile to the Russian government ... I think, Sir, that now it is time to return to the original Russian policy of patronage of Turkish Armenians and it is absolutely necessary to find only those forms to which now it will turn into" (See: Red archive, № 1, (26) 1928: 118-120).

¹² Although the latter was not declared, probably "remained on the paper", unless the interference of Turkey into the ethnic-political processes of Transcaucasia.

fell victims to massacre.¹³ Handling with Baku Turkish army moved to Mountainous Karabagh (Artsakh) in order to execute the citadel of Armenians in the region. But in October 18, 1918, the Karabagh forces of self-defence crashed the Turks near the village of Mrmna. By the order of Entente the Turks who were defeated in World war left the region. But during that short period they had succeeded to change the ethnic-political situation in the region. It concerns not only the overthrowing of legitimate power in Baku and its transfer to the "imported government" of Musavatists. They involved Caucasian Tatars into the *pogroms* of Armenians, and this time not on the "economic jealousy" but ethnic hatred and aggressive intolerance. The Musavatist government continued its policy of extermination of Armenians in March 1920 in Shushi, the historical capital city of Artsakh setting on fire the city and organizing the massacre of more than 30.000 inhabitants of the city and nearby villages. **Fully infected by the virus of genocidal consciousness from the Turks in the course of Turkish intervention Caucasian Tatars passed through further spiritual-political mutation. Their diverse mass in the condition of the absence of own historical-cultural heritage as a basis for consolidation found commonality in the hatred towards their opponents in the ethnic-political problems of the region - towards Armenians and other indigenous nations - and began to identify himself on that basis.**

In 1919 DRA which was established by the Turkish army and had large territorial claims (from Baku to Batumi including also Armenian Mountainous Karabagh) applied for the membership of the League of Nations but was refused. In fact, DRA claims over the territories where it did not have neither administrative nor military and political presence. In April 28, 1920, DRA stepped off the stage of history without being recognized or actually undefined borders when the XI Red army of Soviet Russia entered Baku, deposed the Musavatist government appointed by the Turkish army and "established" the Soviet Socialist Republic of Azerbaijan (Az.SSR). Az.SSR was not the successor of DRA, but as further events show, inside the elite circles of the republic were preserved spiritual state of hatred towards Armenians and to all indigenous nations. After all, participants of recent massacres in Baku and those who burnt down Shushi joined communists.

1920-1930s: FROM PROMOTION UNTIL CLOSING OF THE PROJECT OF INTERNATIONAL AZ.SSR AS THE COMMON STATE OF ARMENIANS AND MUSLIMS

Still before coming to power the future Turkish leader Kemal Atatürk who promised Moscow to become the outpost of "red revolution" in the East, in 1921 succeeded in the incorporation of Armenian lands of Nakhijevan and Mountainous Karabagh into the limits of Azerbaijan. In the political background Armenian communists were calmed

¹³ The practice of creating new satellite-state by Turkey outside its borders as the consequence of intervention was used when in 1974 it "established" the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

down by saying that Soviet Azerbaijan should be the embodiment of the idea of fundamentally new solution of the national problem in the conditions of socialism. It was presaged the status of non-national (were current also such terms as *cosmopolitan*) republic, an international republic without the title nation. Moreover, the concept of *international* was understood not as a synonym to the concept of *multi-national* what actually was Eastern Transcaucasia. Political meaning of the concept "international Azerbaijan" exactly pointed on non-national character of the republic but on the common state for peoples inhabiting it. Two communities - Muslims and Armenians should comprise the main "human material" for the building of that non-national state. The inherited from the Russian empire perception of Eastern Transcaucasia as an Armenian-Muslim region represented through the tandem of the concept "Armenians - Muslims" stood until 1930s. In the official and non-official documents the concepts *Armenians* and *Muslims* constantly figure as a pair, stressing the unique legal-political character of Az.SSR as a new type of socialist cosmopolitan republic without title nation.¹⁴ It remains distinctive the wording which starts actually the unaccepted but realized decision of the Caucasian bureau dated to June 5, 1921, according to which Mountainous Karabagh against the will of its population was included into Az.SSR. The document begins with these words: "Because of the need of national peace between Muslims and Armenians..." which proves that precisely Armenians and Muslims were both sides of the ethnic-political dispute around the national-state organization of Az.SSR. Another "background argument" in the tearing away of Mountainous Karabagh and Nakhijevan from Armenia was the idea that in the unified union of the USSR which was going to be established, the borders of republics would be of no significance for the citizens of this great federation. At the beginning seemingly were maintained all formalities of the building of non-national Az.SSR. The autonomy was substantiated as a Soviet form of national-state formation, highlighting it in this status in separate allocation in its yearly economic reports.¹⁵ On the flag and emblem of the Autonomous Republic of Nakhijevan along with the Turkish name was written also in Armenian. Armenian was recognized as the language of relations with the Autonomous Republic of Mountainous Karabagh. In the preamble of the decree concerning the establishment of Armenian autonomy, while speaking about the events of 1905-1907, it was intentionally underlined that the goal of the Soviet power is to secure brotherly cooperation of peoples "in the unified state union".¹⁶ In the VI Congress of the Communist party of Azerbaijan its political leader S.M.Kirov had underlined that with the establishment of the Autonomous Republic of Mountainous Karabagh is ensured the "legal presence of Armenian people in the limits of Soviet Azerbaijan".¹⁷ During the first years it seems that

¹⁴ Precisely the phrase "strong cosmopolitan center and source of class revolution in the East" was used in the letter sent to Moscow in the summer of 1920 by outstanding peoples of different nationalities among whom also Nariman Narimanov, the leader of Azerbaijan, where was put forward this idea (See: Guliev 1989 (ed.): 39). <https://bit.ly/2whRzKP>

¹⁵ See: Guliev 1989: 273.

¹⁶ See: Collection of legalizations 1923: 384-385.

¹⁷ S.M.Kirov, Report on the VI congress of the C(b)PA. 05.05.1924, APD APA, coll. 1, l. 169, f. 249/11, p. 3.

political processes were in accordance with the creation of the common state for Armenians and Muslims in Az.SSR. But following actions of the Bolshevik center showed that the project of non-national (international) Azerbaijan was no more than cover for the looting of Armenian lands. Soon in Az.SSR, in the non-national Soviet republic, were undertaken measures on the implementation of political indigenization, ousting of the representatives of other nationalities from the state and party apparatus and implementation of Caucasian Tatars into these structures.¹⁸ The policy of indigenization in Az.SSR proceeded especially actively, although it was provided specifically for national republics but not for the international republic of Azerbaijan. The Lenin's cohort of Bolsheviks acts in accordance with the Turkish designed program of the establishment of new Turkish state in Eastern Transcaucasia. But at the end of 1920s and early 1930s Stalin decided to realize the building of new "Azerbaijani nation" instead of this "outpost of socialism in the East". He decided to correct the mistake of the Tsarist Russia and Bolsheviks in the national policy of the region which brought to the Turkification (exactly Turkification but not Türkification) of Caucasian Tatars.¹⁹

1930-1988s: MUTATION OF STALIN'S PROJECT OF AZERBAIJANI NATIONS' BUILDING. FURTHER METAMORPHOSIS WITH THE BAGGAGE OF GENOCIDOGIC CULTURE: FROM CAUCASIAN TATARS TO AZERBAIJANIANS

The idea laid on the basis of Stalin's project seems simple: "melting in one boiler" the Islamic peoples and other peoples of the republic and get a new nation which would be equally distinct from Persian and Turkish identities. The building of new nation was

¹⁸ The meaning of *political indigenization* lies in the preparing of national personnel in the national republics. More detailed on this see: Sventekhovskij, Russian governance, modernizing elites and the rise of national identity in Azerbaijan. http://www.sakharov-center.ru/publications/azrus/az_016.htm

¹⁹ The Turkish world is not homogeneous in genetic as well as in historical-cultural aspect. The map of Kazakhs' genetics proves the high percentage of Chingizids among them.

<http://xn--clacc6aafalc.xn--p1ai/?page%20id=349>

This is not true for the Transcaucasian and Ottoman Turks. Their linguistic communality with Kazakhs or Kirgizis are derived from historical circumstances. In the context of our topic is more important not so much the genetic but historical-cultural and psychological remoteness of the Turks from the rest of Turkish peoples. The nomadic Turk who appeared in the area of sedentary peoples and establishes an empire, faces a choice: either master the high culture of sedentary peoples and being assimilated into them, or assimilate these peoples by forcing them to adopt its own culture. Turks had chosen the second path, which in the course of centuries had developed in them aggressive forms of attitude towards enslaved peoples, leading to the genocide of Armenians, Greeks, and Assyrians. These cultural codes of Turks' behavior simply could not come into existence by Kazakhs or Turkmens. The remoteness of Turks from other peoples of the Turkish world in the sense of political culture gives reason to fix that difference in the concepts "Turk" and "Türk". Other Turkish peoples are not responsible in any way for the crimes committed by the Turks. But it appears that some Turks are trying to associate the whole Turkish world to the criminal conduct of Turks against humanity. For example, in the connection with the fact that in January 2012, the Senate of France had supported the bill which introduces criminal prosecution for the rejection of Armenian genocide in the Ottoman empire during World War I, the Azerbaijani filmmaker and screenwriter Rustam Ibrahimbekov stated: "The anti-Turkish tendency of the new law is evident. But in fact the representatives of the whole Turkish world are becoming its hostages ...". <https://novostink.net/politics/30554-velika-poterya-ibragimbekov-otkazalsya-ot-francuzskogo-ordena.html>

thought to be realized at the expense of the culture and history of non-Turkish indigenous peoples. And this is clear. The Turkish speaking tribes who had come from Persia and were called *Caucasian Tatars* by the Empire, did not have historical connections with this region and possess with necessary material and spiritual background for the realization of the program as well.²⁰ By Stalin, in this boiler Caucasian Tatars (already partly Turkified) who had become bearers of the history and cultural values of indigenous peoples would feel themselves not as Turks but just Azerbaijani nation.²¹ The great Persian poet Nizami Gyanjevi was declared as Azerbaijani poet, only on the grounds that he lived and worked in Gandzak (Gyanja). That fate was shared by those Iranian poets who at least once had visited "these places" or were born in the Iranian province of *Azerbaijan*.²² All this was accompanied with the persecution of indigenous non-Turkish peoples and their displacement from the ethnic map of the republic, looting of their history and culture for the benefit of the "nation under project". Should be remembered the notorious tax "Lezgi pul" regarding the teaching of mother tongue for indigenous nations. Only the parents of those schoolchildren were exempted from taxes who registered themselves as Azerbaijani. In the whirlpool of assimilating processes were involved actually all non-Turkish peoples of the republic, including Armenians. Are well known the attempts of Azerbaijanization of medieval Armenian historians and cultural figures such as Movses Kaghankatvatsi, Kirakos Gandzaketsi, Mkhitar Gosh etc. Were usurped monuments of Armenian culture on the territory of Az.SSR, including *khachkars*. Having failed in this attempt of robbery of the cultural heritage of other people, in 2005 in Baku was destroyed the biggest medieval cemetery of *khachkars* which was included in the list of non-material cultural heritage of the humanity. The authorities in Baku did not permit the representatives of UNESCO to the place of the crime which was characterized by the British "The Guardian" as "the worst cultural genocide of the XXI century".

Azerbaijanization of the republic was new Soviet imperial project and could not be subject for appeal.²³ Protesters were accused in nationalism.²⁴ Moscow remained

²⁰ Details of the nomination and promotion of the idea of a new nation named *Azerbaijanians* by Stalin has been thoroughly revealed by Aris Ghazinyan (Ghazinyan 2011).

²¹It has also a geopolitical idea. Turks named the state established by them in 1918 Azerbaijan, usurping it from the north-western Iranian province in order to create in the future Great Azerbaijan at his expense. Stalin was fine in the realization of the Turkish project of Great Azerbaijan at an appropriate moment but in the "Soviet execution". During World War II he was close to the realization of that idea. In the post-Soviet period it appears again in the folder of Turkish geopolitical plans.

²² To the looting of cultural values of other peoples by the newborn nation is dedicated the book by Asatryan and Gevorgyan 1990.

²³ Azerbaijanization of the republic which had started in 1930s, continues until today. The new nation had not come into existence yet. As a result of Azerbaijanization, instead of the conglomerate of Caucasian Tatars appeared the conglomerate of Azeris with the preservation of nucleus of political orientation on Turkey. In the post-Soviet conditions is in progress the process of returning of people to their ethnic roots, their exit from the national underground. By Lezgi, Talish and other peoples of Eastern Transcaucasia gains power the movement for the restoration of their ethnic identity. "Azerbaijanians" are statistical but not ethnic commonality, as were "Caucasian Tatars".

hostage of the forged Stalin project of the building of new Azerbaijani nation and after the death of the "peoples' father", although discrepancies between the initial vision and the results of its realization were evident. **Stalin's project of the building of new Azerbaijani nation in practice was transformed into the project of ultimate formation of a new Turkified state and society – bearer of sophisticated forms of genocidal policy and behavior.** After all, the informed participation in the looting and usurping of the history and culture of other peoples expects a man of special spiritual attitude. Much of the inner "kitchen" of this transformation has not been revealed yet. Has not been opened archives concerning the case of Baghirov – the first secretary of the Communist party of Azerbaijan who over 30 years drew the "party line" by the forced Azerbaijanization of indigenous non-Turkish peoples of the republic. Nonetheless, it could not be said that the project of Azerbaijanization of Islamic peoples of the republic was materialized. Indigenous peoples went into peculiar national underground and although to all them were given passports where was written "Azerbaijani", they know "by themselves" who was Turk and who not. Since in the post-Soviet conditions this "chimeric ethnos" immediately showed features of decomposition²⁵.

1988-1991: CENTER AND THE GENOCIDE OF ARMENIANS OF AZ.SSR

During the Soviet decades the problem of Mountainous Karabagh permanently emerged. The authorities of Soviet Armenia repeatedly raised the problem of correcting mistakes made in 1921. Highest authorities were "bothered" also by the people of Mountainous Karabagh who several times sent appeals to the Center demanding the restoration of historical truth and reunification of the region with Arm.SSR. Taking into account these appeals, in November 23, 1977, the Presidium of the Council of Ministers of the USSR gave its conclusion regarding the problem. Mentioning that "Mountainous Karabagh was artificially attached to Azerbaijan", the Presidium concluded: "Mountainous Karabagh ("Artsakh" in Armenian) must be attached to the Arm.SSR. By this everything should be in its legitimate place".²⁶ But this was not done. Hopes of joining with the motherland became more realistic when in 1985-1987 M.Gorbachev, the new leader of the USSR declared the "course of *perestroika* and *glasnost*". Peoples' delegations who visited the Central Committee of the Communist party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) brought back encouraging news saying that the Center favors "our requests and demands".²⁷ In institutions and meetings of the party people began to speak openly on that topic which was unthinkable before. With such prehistory in

²⁴ In reality, indigenous peoples did not disappear although they were partly Azerbaijanized. Many of them went into peculiar national underground. Harrassments and persecutions were especially cruel towards the main opponent to this policy – Armenians.

²⁵ «It would seem that the finally found identity (ethnonym, linguonym) suddenly began to split into regional components "Türks" - "non-Türks". See: Badalov 2001: 274.

²⁶ Barseghov 2008: 665.

²⁷ About this wrote Vazgen Manukyan, one of the leaders of Karabagh movement (Manukyan 2002: 36).

February 20, 1988, the Extraordinary session of the people's deputies of the regional Council of the Nagorno-Karabagh Autonomous Region (NKAO) appealed to the Supreme Councils of Az.SSR, Arm.SSR, and USSR to consider and positively decide the problem of the transfer of the *oblast* from Azerbaijan to Armenia. This problem was not considered. It was re-addressed to the crowd of Azeris who were replenished by criminals and which the next day after the decision of the Regional Council moved from Agdam towards Stepanakert to "bring order there". The crowd did not reach Stepanakert. On the Agdam-Stepanakert highway they were blocked by the residents of Askeran. The campaign to Stepanakert did not take place. By the end of the day it turned out that two young Azeris had been killed. One of them – Ali Gajiev was killed by an unknown Azeri policeman who was then taken away by another policeman from Agdam. This fact was proved by all people who were there.²⁸ Only a month later was opened a criminal case but it remained undisclosed. At these same days from Arm.SSR (from the city of Kapan) where to that date were not registered inter-ethnic disputes, the Azeri population began to leave in orderly fashion. The city authorities began to negotiate with the leaders of the neighboring Azerbaijani regions and they succeeded in persuading some to return to their houses. But they failed to convince all people. By reaching Baku they were re-directed to Sumgait where on the organized meetings they inflamed the crowd by means of false stories about violence against Azeris in Kapan. In this strained situation Katusev, the deputy Prosecutor-General of the USSR who came to the region, spoke on television saying in regard to the murder of two Azeris near Askeran in a manner which showed that they were killed by the Armenians. The provokers from Kapan and Katusev "worked synchronously" and directed the furious crowd against the Armenians. Only two days later in the city arrived actually unarmed cadets of the Interior Ministry of the USSR who were ordered "not to interfere!". Gorbachev, Secretary-general of CPSU (Communist party of the Soviet Union) on the session of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR held in June 18, 1988, strongly denied that the accident was genocidal act. He claimed the motives of the crime as being «hooliganism». His ominous question "Have you thought about Armenians of Baku?" addressed to the Armenian participants of the session of the Presidium of the Supreme Council, in fact, did have the sense of a sanction on the continuation of massacres. A single court case was divided into several unrelated processes. In Baku the position of the Center was understood appropriately and already in the Autumn of 1988 had begun meetings demanding to release the "heroes of Sumgait". Waves of massacres involved all Az.SSR.

Like in 1988, during the following two decades, in evaluating "events in the Mountainous Karabagh and around it" (from February 1988 exactly such a label was

²⁸ See: Vasilevskij 1988. The uncle of Ali Gajiev who worked at the Stepanakert motor depot, told his friends about this. As in Agdam, in Stepanakert all people know that detail regarding the incident. Katusev could not be unaware, especially given the fact that Henrich Poghosyan, the newly elected leader of the communist party organization of the *oblast* explicitly asked him to take into account that fact in his statements.

attached to the events), the behavior of the Center mainly is characterized by means of the categories of *hesitation*, *confusion*, *unprofessional*, *inability to manage conflicts* and similar concepts. In 1988-1991 perhaps Soviet analysts could not suppose other suggestion. In the higher political circles of post-Soviet Russia until now prevails a cautious *tabu* on the topic of the behavior of the Secretary-general and his Central Committee associates (Yakovlev, Yeltsin, Shevardnadze).²⁹ The problem is delicate. The contribution of Gorbachev into the dissolution of the USSR is highly estimated by the West which regards him as the main engineer in the dismantling of the "evil empire". It is no coincidence that in October 15, 1990, when in the country ruled by him were raged *pogroms* and massacres, he was awarded with the Nobel prize. Obviously, in Kremlin people fear that the West could take the criticism of Gorbachev as a proof of its intention to restore the USSR. Gorbachev's merit in the dissolution of the USSR is evaluated positively also in the newly created states on the post-Soviet space. After all, just he, destroying the USSR handed them independence. We refrain from historical-political evaluation of the project of the disintegration of the USSR in favor of Union republics and people who had materialized it. This topic needs special study. Meanwhile, actually every month in Russia (and not only in Russia) is published a book claiming that Gorbachev was a traitor.

The topic declared in the headline of our article in the context of the objective consideration of Gorbachev's team oriented on the elimination of the USSR is relevant in two aspects. The first is that in the actions of the Secretary-general of CPSU in any other sphere so evidently is exposed his intention to eliminate the USSR as in the conflict "around Mountainous Karabagh". The second aspect is connected with deeper penetration of Azerbaijani society into the mentality of aggressiveness, permissiveness, and impunity.

Above we had focused on the events of the first days of the conflict not coincidentally. The march of the crowd from Agdam on Stepanakert, not detaining the policeman who publicly killed Ali Gajiev and nondisclosure of that case, organized exit of Azeris from peaceful Kapan and their arrival in Sumgait for participation in meetings, a delay on almost three days of the army's entry into the city—all these could take place only with the knowledge of the Center. It wasn't about confusion or hesitation and even more so in the ability of highest USSR authorities. Center was able to stop these events, and it needs to have an idea about the might of the Soviet special services in order to doubt it. And therefore the events of 1988-1991 "in Mountainous Karabagh and around it" receive more reliable explanation in the context of other assumption, unthinkable in 1988: Gorbachev and his team worked towards the dismantling of the USSR into Union republics.

²⁹ In March 2011, D. Medvedev, the president of the Russian Federation awarded Gorbachev with the order of St. Andrew, mentioning that he sees it as a "symbol of respect to the state ... which was our common motherland – Soviet Union". After all, Medvedev was aware that precisely during Gorbachev USSR ceased to exist. Were these words ambiguous or not, is difficult to say. The fact is that Moscow still refrains from evaluation of the Secretary-general's and his command's acts directed upon the dismantling of the USSR. <https://ria.ru/20110302/341189157.html>

This political version we had tested in an article dealing with this goal and discovered that in the conflict around Mountainous Karabagh there is not a single event of 1988-1991 which could contradict to this statement.³⁰ Everything is becoming clear. The goal of dismantling of the USSR by the Union republics supposed to find most vulnerable point in that construction. All people know that it lies in inter-ethnic relations. Gorbachev also knows it. Why was chosen Mountainous Karabagh? Because its people during the Soviet period never condoned arbitrariness committed against him and was ready to "enter through the opened doors of *glasnost*", to reach the solution of the Karabagh problem based upon Truth and Right. It was believed that Gorbachev's declared course on democratization and *glasnost* gave people possibility to 'reach out to the top'. That possibility was granted. In 1987 under the petition addressed to the Central Committee of CPSU demanding to correct the historical mistake and give back Mountainous Karabagh to Soviet Armenia was signed actually by all adult population of the region. Unique referendum! Nobody was persecuted nobody was arrested like in the past in similar cases. People think that the course of *glasnost* handed them a chance for a fair solution of the problem. But soon after it became clear that *glasnost* was declared not for the fair solution of the problem. It was revealed immediately after the publication of the decision of NKAO *oblast* council requesting the administrative re-subordination of the *oblast*. In February 24 the newspaper "Pravda" informed that the Central Committee of CPSU examining that request evaluated it as the act conducted by "extremist individuals". Central Committee of CPSU concluded: "actions and demands directed on the revision of current national-territorial system contradict the interests of the working peoples of Azerbaijani and Armenian SSR and harms inter-ethnic relations". But only a month before the delegation of that same "extremist individuals" was given "pink hopes" in Moscow.³¹

With the provocation near Askeran and Sumgait massacre the petition of the NKAO *oblast* council to "*consider the problem*" was moved into the plane of bloody conflict, turning it into a detonator of explosive charge of national relations. Center was not interested how it could affect the fate of the peoples of the region. Keeping an eye

³⁰ Manasyan 2016.

³¹ That was another delegation of representatives of estimated intellectuals of NKAO and was received by P.N.Demichev, the candidate to the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of CPSU, V.A.Mikhailov, head of the department of inter-ethnic relations of Central Committee of CPSU, at the beginning of February – by A.A.Gromiko, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR. Precisely Mikhailov gave positive answer to the question of Karabagh leaders when asked if there exists hope on justly solution to the problem. After the delegation were back to home, in Stepanakert appeared leaflets evidently written under the impression of Moscow meeting: "People of Karabagh, the fate of our *oblast* depends only on us thanks to *perestroika*, *glasnost* and democracy. It is time to organize in principal facilities, collective farms and Soviet farms of the *oblast* overall party, labor union and *komsomol* meetings, and in the agenda should be introduced a problem of reunification with the Motherland. The spirit of *glasnost* and democracy should become an impulse for the open and sincere discussion of the problem. Extracts from the resolution of these meetings, certified by seals, should be sent to the Central Committee of CPSU" (See: "Black garden": how the downfall of the USSR started. https://www.bbc.com/russian/russia/2013/02/130131_karabakh_history.shtml).

on the rhythms of the conflict, by means of provocative articles (mostly in "Pravda") and telecasts by central TV the Center permanently adds fuel to the fire when protest movement declined.³² As justification of his policy the Center puts forward also legal arguments. They came down to the Article 78 of the Constitution of the USSR that without the approval of the republic the transfer of the *oblast* from Az.SSR to Arm.SSR is impossible.³³ As to the USSR, its history knows over twenty cases of the transfer of territories from one republic to other or the change of the status.³⁴ Could the Center enter the problem solving process into familiar course knowing that Mountainous Karabagh was attached to Az.SSR forcibly, that Armenians were displaced from Nakhijevan actually completely and that in relation to NKAO Baku pursues the same policy of de-Armenization. Indeed could! There was every reason for the positive answer on the petition of NKAO *oblast* council. But they didn't take even at the formal consideration of the problem. The negative answer was ready beforehand. Main argument of the Center was Article 78 of the Constitution according to which the territory of the Union republic could not be changed without his approval. This argument which attributed some integrity to the sovereignty of the republics, became crucial in the behavior of the Center. All its meaningful steps during 1988-1991 receive explanation exactly in the context of the dismantling of the USSR into Union republics, for which the Karabagh conflict (also other conflicts "emerged overnight") served as necessary background on the way of its realization. The Sumgait massacre, following acts of mass violence throughout all republic, bloody *pogroms* of Armenians in Baku in January 1990, the blockade of NKAO and Armenia by Azerbaijan, all these events might show the breaking down of the Soviet state system due to the conflicts between Union republics. But unbiased analysis of 1988-1991 events proves the reverse: inter-ethnic problems were transformed into the conflicts for the sake of the dismantling of the USSR into Union republics. From this it follows that **not the request of the NKAO *oblast* council on re-subordination of the *oblast* but the Sumgait massacre and following *pogroms* of Armenians³⁵ starts the process of USSR's decay, since just they**

³² From the mid-November, 1988, during the whole month in Baku were razed protest rallies against cutting of relic trees in the place Khachin tap for the building of a guest house there for the Yerevan plant of aluminum, while in that place never existed trees! The Center could dispel this false information and defuse the heat of passion by means of a single TV report. It just needed to say the truth. Aware of the truth the Center concealed it in the case of the Askeran incident, Sumgait massacre, the exit of Azeris from Kapan. Lie served as a flywheel in the promotion of the conflict.

³³ In the interview given to the TV channel ArmNews in August 2020, Paul Goble, as a response to the question concerning his plan of the Mountainous Karabagh conflict's regulation mentioned as being strange the circumstance that many experts were completely unaware that during the Soviet years happened numerous cases of the change of Union republic's borders. <https://bit.ly/32zMUzY>

³⁴ The bloody January 1990 in Baku revealed Gorbachev's falsity of the statement that the army was late in Sumgait only three hours. Survivors testify that the vandals were rioting in the city at least two days "without witnesses". As to the entry of army into Baku, it was impossible to conceal the truth. The army waited in the Baku airport almost a week until the rioters could finish their job.

³⁵ Massacres and *pogroms* of Armenians in DRA and Az.SSR were not limited with beating and looting. They were accompanied with mass killing of civilians and were acts of genocide.

showed that the Center which was able to stop the vandalism and secure physical safety of the unified state's citizens, took the side of the thugs. By the way, from Az.SSR came first call about the legal downfall of the USSR when in January 19, 1990, the Nakhijevan ASR declared of its independence and exit from the USSR. This act was preceded by *pogroms* of Armenians of Nakhijevan and destruction of the 700 km length state border with Iran. The USSR dismantling project could not be oriented on the civil solution of the existing inter-ethnic problem. Blood and a victim were needed. **On the altar of the downfall of the USSR became the Armenian population of Az.SSR which several decades before that was a target of sophisticated technology of "soft" pressure.**

In the bloody butchery of 1988-1991 had suffered genocide the people - co-founder of that Soviet republic. In the context of our topic is actual the conclusion resulting from that said above: Az.SSR and Caucasian Tatars who "became" Azeri concluded their residence in the USSR with deeper rooting of aggressive permissiveness in the public conscience and confidence in impunity for their crimes against humanity.

FEEDING OF GENOCIDAL BEHAVIOR OF AZERBAIJAN IN THE COURSE AND AFTER THE FALL OF THE USSR

Reminding the *pogroms* in Sumgait, by the November 19, 1989 Resolution the USA Congress obliged executive authorities to contribute to the achievement of the conflict around Mountainous Karabagh in the bilateral negotiations with the Soviet leadership "which could truly reflect opinion of the population of the region".³⁶ A whole list of documents accepted in the capital cities of Western states could be compiled which express concerns regarding the fate of Armenians, victims of mass violence in Az.SSR. All were aware of committed atrocities. But at the same time the West didn't hide his sympathies towards Gorbachev. Not without reason in October 15, 1990, when in the country ruled by him fires were burning he was awarded the Nobel prize for his "leading role in the peace process", as it was said in the statement of the Nobel committee. On this background statements and resolutions which condemn bloody *pogroms* of Armenians should have been arranged in the wording which bypasses the responsibility of the Secretary-general for the embedding into chaos 1/6 part of the planet towards such "peace process". For such large-scaled project of the USSR's dismantling the tortures to which were doomed Armenians of Az.SSR, probably were perceived by the authors of the project as regrettable but also as its inevitable details.³⁷

³⁶ <https://www.congress.gov/bill/101st-congress/senate-joint-resolution/178/text/es>

³⁷ Unlike states, the conscience of world community on behalf of leading philosophers, sociologists, rights defenders, and public figures of the XX century from Europe, Canada, and USA sent an Open letter addressed to the world community, calling things by their proper names. Authors of the letter perceived in the Armenian *pogroms* in Az.SSR continuation of the Armenian genocide in the Ottoman empire. The Open letter signed by 132 was published in the

Events of the February 1988 described in the last paragraph didn't leave room for doubt that the USSR's dismantling project through inter-ethnic hatred was in the working folders of the West already during the days of the Sumgait *pogrom*.

Who is the author of that project? It is probable that it was designed and initiated by the Secretary-general of CPSU himself and his command, and the new course of "*Perestroika* and *glasnost!*" served as cover. In this version the West had to support only the process of "democratization of the evil empire" launched by its new leader which was openly done. It is possible also that the hint on key ideas originated from the West which provided support to the Secretary-general of CPSU in the course of the process in the form of prompt expertise. Like in the first case, in the second also the conviction of *pogroms* should have been of declarative character and avoided to cross the line of formal complaints, which they actually were.

Whatever it was, the West was aware of Secretary-general's goal regarding the sovereignty of the Union republics and renovation of the USSR which could be seen in his activities and speeches. That goal was USSR's dismantling by Union republics. The formula was suitable for the West. After all, precisely the West took into account the willingness of political elites of many Union republics to such dismantling, which could secure the most realistic and cheapest plan for the realization of the dismantling. Yes, for the initiation of the process a conflict needed and in the role of such became the conflict around Mountainous Karabagh. But, having a historical chance to obtain full sovereignty, republics had to postpone "their own Karabaghs", which was easy to calculate.

The attitude of the West towards the project "Dismantling by Union republics" was announced in the critical moment of events, immediately after the declaration of Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus about the creation of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) in Belovezhskaya pushsha in December 8, 1991. By the decision of European Council (Maastricht, December 9-11, 1991)³⁸ in December 16, 1991, in Brussels the session of the EU at the level of foreign ministers announced about the criteria of EC for the recognition of new states in Eastern Europe and on the territory of the USSR.³⁹ Among the criteria of the official recognition of new states in Eastern Europe and on the territory of the USSR was also "respect for the inviolability of all borders which could not be changed unless peaceful means and common consent".

The states – members of EU as a requirement for the international recognition of the former Union republics put forward a demand of mutual respect of all borders. But even under such conditions among new states the Republic of Azerbaijan, like in the

newspaper NewYorkTimes, July 27, 1990 (the text of the letter see also in https://aga-tribunal.info/en/open_27-7-1990_en/).

³⁸ The date of the session of the Council of European Union on the next day of the Belovezhsk agreement speaks in favor of the suggestion that the project of the dismantling of the USSR into Union republics was already in the EU's folder, which hurried to announce about it in order to escape complications and for the sake of acceleration of legal registration of the downfall.

³⁹ https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/998_119#Text

past DRA and Az.SSR appear as special case. The Republic of Azerbaijan had already evaluated the Sovietization of Azerbaijan as annexation and, by refusing to be successor of Az.SSR declared the restoration of the DRA which existed in 1918-1920. The act of recognition of the Republic of Azerbaijan in the limits of Az.SSR turned out to be absolutely deprived of legal foundation, since the state whose successor the Republic of Azerbaijan had declared, was neither recognized nor actually had established borders. Europe did not notice these "details" and recognized the Republic of Azerbaijan in the borders of Az.SSR. Nonetheless, if we assume that Europe which has a custom of getting to the most insignificant details regarding other problems, could ignore this fact that does not fit the legal logic, a more striking fact contradicts not only the traditions of European legal culture but also to international law. The Republic of Azerbaijan could not have been recognized in the borders of former Az.SSR along with the Nakhijevan by virtue of the treaty of Kars of October 18, 1921, according to which it was put under the protection (but not sovereignty!) of Az.SSR.⁴⁰ If that treaty is to be recognized as legal nonsense from the very moment of its signing, then we have to go back to the status of Nakhijevan as the territory of Armenia recognized by Azerbaijan itself.⁴¹ Another legal obstacle against the recognition of the Republic of Azerbaijan in the borders of Az.SSR is the declaration of independence of Mountainous Karabagh in full compliance with all norms of international and internal laws of the USSR. It gave preference to Azerbaijan where before December 16, 1991, i.e. until the moment of EU's criterions was never occurred any act of self-determination (referendum) on the subject of sovereignty and on that grounds the establishment of legitimate borders!

Granting the Republic of Azerbaijan with illegitimate borders, Europe continue the line of Kemalist Turks and Bolsheviks, joining them post factum and had legalized the arbitrariness towards Armenians like it was in the session of the Caucasian Bureau of Russian Communist party(b)⁴², and also during the signing of the Kars treaty. In justifying Europe could be suggested an argument that cases of "Karabaghs" in the USSR were many and that in December 1991 Europe might have not considered "these details". Yes, similar problems existed, but nowhere the problem was connected with the genocide of a state-forming nation which were Armenians of Az.SSR, and violation of the existing treaty. Ignorance of this fact reveals also the motives why the continuous

⁴⁰ Precisely Nakhijevan was handed over to Az.SSR in the legal status of protectorate by the Young Turks and Bolsheviks by the Russian-Turkish treaty of Moscow in March 16, 1921, which already in December 1920 was recognized as an integral part of Soviet Armenia. In the treaty of Kars the status of protectorate was replaced by the status of patronage which usually is treated as being weaker form of the protectorate. The status of patronage (protectorate) means that the territory given to some state as protectorate is alien one, and legally does not belong to the protector state. Own territory could not be given to him under protection, and such legal nonsense is not registered in international practice.

⁴¹ By the way, that contradictory treaty had been second time violated in 1923 when was changed the status of Nakhijevan as a protectorate territory and «presented» to it the status of autonomous republic inside Az.SSR.

⁴² The decision of Caucasian Bureau of Russian Communist party(b) was not issued at all. It was regarded as "accepted" without discussion and voting.

mass *pogroms* of Armenians about four years throughout all Az.SSR had not been evaluated as acts of genocide by Europe. It was not just that such evaluation could cast shadow on Gorbachev who was responsible for the downfall of the USSR. The classification of bloody *pogroms* of the Az.SSR Armenians as acts of genocide could hinder the implementation of the principle of "Downfall by Union republics" on the final stage of the USSR's dismantling. Europe carefully avoided such classification of brutalities with respect to Armenians in Az.SSR, in order not to hold the side of a genocidal state while recognizing new states according to the principle "Downfall by Union republics". Already in February 1988, the Sumgait fanaticism against Armenians was not regarded as genocidal action. And in this lies indirect proof that already during those days of February 1988 the principle "Downfall by Union republics" was in the folders of the West.

But legally and morally unpleasant sides of the recognition of the Republic of Azerbaijan in the borders of Az.SSR are not limited to this. Such recognition not only released Baku from the burden of crime against humanity. By this act Europe provoked Baku to begin war against NKR in order to liberate "its" territories from Armenian "occupation". Hardly the West had considered the consequences of such attitude for the spiritual world of the Azerbaijani society when it opted for the principle of "Downfall by Union republics" for the sake of easy dismantling. It was not just a conspiracy of silence regarding the genocide of Armenians of Az.SSR. Europe granted the Republic of Azerbaijan with Armenian territories. And this could not be understood in Azerbaijan otherwise but encouragement of its behavior.

The consequences did not take long to wait. Ethnic cleanings were followed by persecution of half-breeds from mixed Armenian-Azeri marriages. Armenophobia became official ideology in the domestic and foreign policy. Propaganda of hatred towards Armenians reached to kindergartens and school textbooks. Baku started to supply Islamic fundamentalists with terrorists and financially support the Islamic state of ISIS.⁴³ Manifestation of the spiritual state of Azerbaijani society became national jubilation over the extradition of Ramil Safarov from Hungary,⁴⁴ who in 2004 killed in Budapest the Armenian officer Gurgen Margaryan while he sleeps, where they together were trained within the program of NATO "Partnership for peace".⁴⁵

⁴³ Hambaryan Gagik, The terrorist organization "Islamic state" and Azerbaijan. <https://bit.ly/3lxMxhT>

⁴⁴ In the Internet could be found numerous articles dedicated to that terrible story (see, for example, <https://lenta.ru/articles/2012/09/03/hero/>). Baku asked Budapest for the extradition of Safarov allegedly promising that he will be sentenced in Azerbaijan. But at the same day of his return to Baku Ilham Aliiev, the president of Azerbaijan not only signed a decree of his pardon but also raised his rank and donated him an apartment. The people cheered. The name of the murderer became very popular for the newborn children. That reminds of the cheering and fireworks in Baku in December 7, 1988, when in Armenia happen destructive earthquake of Spitak.

⁴⁵ Baku not only triumphantly received killers of Armenians. There exists a tradition to bury such "good guys" as national heroes. Still in 1967, with such honor was awarded Arshad Mamedov, the director of a school who committed a brutal cultic murder of an Armenian schoolboy Nelson Movsisyan. At the funeral attended top officials of the republic who promised to erect for the hero a worthy monument. For details see: <https://artsakhpress.am/rus/news/7332/>

The case of Safarov who was heroized for the murder of a sleeping man was iconic. With its habits Baku in the open went out on the international stage and, as before, got off with verbal demarches and "severe complaints". More adequate means for Baku were not found. Do not follow any sanctions for the perversion of European structures by "caviar diplomacy". Expanding the formats of self-realization and implantation of their own political-cultural standards on the international arena which had begun from the case of Safarov should have further development. Indeed, Baku had every reason for confidence that it gets away with it. In the summer of 2020, in Moscow Azeris launched the so-called "apricot war", trying to provoke Armenian-Azeri conflict on the Russian soil, well aware what kind of threat it resembles for the multi-ethnic Russia.

Typical manifestations of Azerbaijani political culture, beginning from education of children at schools, kindergartens in the spirit of Armenophobia, looting the history and culture of the peoples of the region, and until heroization of the sleeping Armenian officer, sponsoring ISIS and launching of the "apricot war" in Russia hardly could be imagined to be spontaneously or impulsively emerged phenomena. These are not actions of nomadic encampment where the alarm resonates from one tent to other and all tribe splash runs out to defend the encampment. The acts of Azeris outside Azerbaijan apparently are not manifestations of bygone instinctive solidarity. They are impossible without governing center (institution) of planning and coordination. Crimes which remained unpunished inspire Baku on new large-scaled terroristic acts on the international arena. Chronologically, the last message coming from external authors on the permission of the realization of accumulated potential of fascist aggressiveness became the silencing of the Az.SSR Armenians' genocide and recognition of the Republic of Azerbaijan along with Nakhijevan and Artsakh which legally do not belong to him. Whether they wanted it or not in western capital cities, but it became encouragement of genocidal behavior of the Republic of Azerbaijan, a stimulus for becoming one of the world centers of the ideology of aggressive nationalism and genocidal behavior. Evidence of this is its attempt to transfer Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict on the Russian soil in July 2020.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

DOCUMENTS

APD APA - Archive of political documents of administration by the president of Azerbaijani Republic (Baku).

Armenian-Russian relations in the XVIII century(Collection of documents, vol.IV), Yerevan, 1990 (ed. M.G.Nersisyan).

Collection of legalizations and orders of the Workers' and Peasants' Government of ASSR for 1923, Baku, 1923 (in Russian).