


GEVORG STEPANYAN*

Doctor of History, Professor

Institute of History NAS RA

sasun-07@mail.ru

0009-0000-7536-6777 

DOI: 10.54503/1829-4073-2024.2.5-27

THE NOMADIC ECONOMY AS A MEANS OF IMPLEMENTING A STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE AZERBAIJANI SSR

Abstract

While the “Greater Azerbaijan” movement has employed varying strategies over time, its ultimate political objective has remained consistent. Thus, considering it impossible to occupy the Armenian territories by military means during the years of the Soviet government, leadership of Azerbaijan adopted a novel strategy. This entailed a shift from massacres, persecutions, and forced displacement to a policy of ethnic cleansing, disenfranchisement, national discrimination, distortion of the ethnographic image through ethnographic factor, statistics, and fabricated data, Turkification of toponyms, cartographic distortions, and appropriation of cultural values. It should be noted that the appropriation of new Armenian territories under the false slogan of “proletarian internationalism and friendship of the peoples” under the guise of creating nomadic economies also constituted a significant aspect in the expansionist

* The article has been delivered on 04.06.2024, reviewed on 04.06.2024, accepted for publication on 30.08.2024.

The Nomadic Economy as a Means of Implementing a Strategic Plan...

agendas pursued by the governing bodies of the Azerbaijani SSR. According to Art. Abeghyan's accurate definition, "...red imperialism continues the policy of white imperialism in the Caucasus. It keeps the Tatar in the state of a nomadic herder, so that the latter, perched on the heights of the Armenian world for six months, continues to hang the sword of Damocles over the head of the Armenian peasant, in a state of obedience to the Muscovite government and its Caucasian representatives." At the same time, the author of the article emphasized that "The nomadic scourge of the past, which may be exemplified by the Armenian-Tatar conflicts of 1905–1906, brought numerous disasters to the Armenians, resulting in being the most effective weapon in the hands of the Tsarist regime".¹

Keywords: *"Greater Azerbaijan", Azerbaijani SSR, expansionism, pan-Turkism, nomadic economy, Central Executive Committee, demography.*

Introduction

It should be added that the Caucasian Tatars, who live a nomadic and semi-nomadic lifestyle faithful to their vagrant and wandering way of life, who arrived in the Caucasus from the distant Transaltai steppes in accordance with this herding custom, did not even give up this lifestyle during the years of the Soviet rule. The issue of the nomadic lifestyle appeared to be an unresolvable problem that perpetually exacerbated tensions between sedentary farming Armenians and nomadic Turkish herdsman.² R. Ter-Minasyan, referring to the issue of nomadism, rightly wrote: "But is it fair to sacrifice an entire country for nomadism to destroy the entire culture and work of a sedentary people? "Nomadism" itself is a backward habit; instead of civilizing the nomads, making them sedentary, instead of raising their culture and bringing them to a high level of economy and agriculture, is it worth encouraging their ancestral barbaric craft"?³

It is noteworthy that Vorontsov-Dashkov, Viceroy of the Caucasus in 1906, in the report sent to Nicholas II in the fall, reported to the emperor that he had identified a potential solution to the nomadic issue in the irrigation of the Turkish-populated steppes and the supporting of nomadic herders in their main place of residence.⁴

¹ Abeghyan 1928, 116.

² Simonyan 2003, 115.

³ Ruben 1926, 51.

⁴ Vorontsov-Dashkov 1910, 66.

The facts prove that the Azerbaijani SSR occupied the first place in the Caucasus in the area of pastures and grasslands. In terms of percentage calculations, little Armenia, which is not far behind with its mountains and plateaus, was not inferior in this matter either, with its 819,000 des. pastures. However, this constituted 49.8% of all its lands and 29%⁵ of useful, cultivable lands. For purposes of comparison, it is noteworthy that in 1924, as of April, Armenia had 573 des. spring pastures and 175 des. winter pastures. Azerbaijan had 909 des. of spring pasture and 407⁶ des. of winter pasture. It is notable that a similar pattern emerged with regard to the distribution of arable lands and forests. Azerbaijan had 494,018 des. of arable land and 750,000 des. of forest, while Armenia had 146,716 des. of arable land and 250,000 des.⁷ of forest. As emphasised by the Armenian SSR Land and Social Committee chief A. Yerznkian in the interview he gave to the "Martakoch" daily newspaper on 30 July 1923: "Armenia is a country that is severely land-poor".⁸

The Process of Establishing Nomadic Economies

As evidenced by the above data, as much as the Azerbaijani SSR endowed with extensive pastures, fertile arable lands, as well as steppes, nevertheless, the Azerbaijani side, with long-term goals, under the guise of creating nomadic economies set out to appropriate the grazing lands of the Armenian SSR at the expense of the territories of the Armenian SSR, a move that was facilitated by the Central Executive Committee of Transcaucasia. It should be noted that the seasonal movements of the nomadic Caucasian Tatar herders in the 20th century contributed to the Armenian territories, the realization of which had a strategic significance for Azerbaijan.

It is important to acknowledge that the establishment of nomadic economies in the Azerbaijani SSR was facilitated by the North-Caucasus Bureau of the Russian Communist Bolshevik Party as early as 1921. This was evidenced by the decision⁹ "on opening the free access of nomads to pastures in all republics,"

⁵ **Abeghean** 1928, 141.

⁶ Transcaucasia. Soviet Republics (Statistical-economic anthology), 177. "Martakoch" № 77 (03.04.1924).

⁷ Transcaucasia. Soviet Republics (Statistical-economic anthology), 159. 1928, № 7 (67), 140–141.

⁸ "Martakoch", № 131, 31.07.1923.

⁹ **Kharmandaryan** 1969, 139.

The Nomadic Economy as a Means of Implementing a Strategic Plan...

adopted at the plenum on June 3. It is a matter of historical record that the establishment of nomadic farms in Armenia was a pretext for the occupation of Armenian territories by the Azerbaijani Soviet Socialist Republic (SSR). Furthermore, the policy of "clarifying the borders of Armenia" was a deliberate and systematic strategy, as evidenced by the numerous facts, one which will be presented below. Thus, at the 1st congress of the Transcaucasian Soviets convened on December 11–13, 1922, S. Orjonikidze, addressing the issue of nomadic economies in his speech violating the vital rights of the inhabitants of the Armenian border villages, with the unwaveringness of the herald messenger, declared that some mountainous regions with abundant water and grassland should be allocated from the Armenian SSR to the Azerbaijani SSR, because "this issue is a matter of life and death for the existence of the Azerbaijani peasantry".¹⁰ In the same speech, Ordzhonikidze testified that he was in the committee on the demarcation of the border between the Armenian SSR and the Azerbaijani SSR, according to which 500 des. forest area was joined to Tovuz¹¹ and Ghazakh¹² provinces of Azerbaijan SSR.¹³

It is regrettable that, as in the case of administrative demarcations and border delineations, the Central Executive Committee of the USSR did not take the necessary and decisive action due to the absolutisation of internal interests. Not wanting to deviate from the motto of "proletarian internationalism and friendship of peoples", it made the decision not to impede the process, which was of vital and strategic importance to Armenia. "The most obedient," writes L. Mkrtchyan, "and those who did not show any resistance were the Armenian communists." Just as a tired and sleepless night traveller is ready to lie down in a random corner, even in the mud, so the Armenian communists agreed to everything, they were ready for any order from Moscow".¹⁴ In the vivid words of

¹⁰ The Education of the USSR. Collection of Documents. 1917–1924, 316.

¹¹ The administrative unit of Tovuz being, the Turk- Oghuz distorted pronunciation of "Tavush" toponym was formed in 1930. The area of the region corresponds to the provinces of Verin and Nerkin Zagam. It borders on the province of Tavush in the Republic of Armenia (Karapetyan 2004, 277).

¹² The administrative unit of Ghazakh was formed in 1930. The area of the region corresponds to the western part of Utik in historical Greater Armenia. It borders on the province of Tavush in the Republic of Armenia (ibid).

¹³ Education of the USSR. Collection of Documents, 1917–1924, 316.

¹⁴ Mkrtchyan 1971, № 21 (71), 344.

American Armenian philologist, journalist and national figure Minas (Veradsin) Gasapyan. "Bolshevik Armenians of Yerevan, on whose mouth apples drop from the Moscow tree",¹⁵ knowing well that in the event of a confrontation, under the control of the all-powerful All-Russian Extraordinary Commission, they would be labeled as so-called "national-deviationist"¹⁶ with unpredictable consequences, they avoided taking decisive steps. Indeed, there was no viable alternative for the Armenian side. It is also noteworthy that in response to Azerbaijan's actions that encroached upon Armenia's territorial integrity, the authorities in the central and border regions of Armenia expressed their discontent, but their objections were met with severe criticism and ultimately ignored.¹⁷ For example, the official newspaper of the Armenian SSR, Soviet Armenia, republished an article from the December 18, 1923 edition of "Zarya Vostoka", the official newspaper of the Central Executive Committee of the USSR, in its own issue. The article, entitled "The Problem of Pastures in Transcaucasia," raised a legal question regarding the re-examination of land relations in the Caucasus. In the event of Armenia being separated and a portion of their pastures being annexed by Georgia and Azerbaijan, it is evident that a portion of the arable lands from Georgia and Azerbaijan should be transferred to Armenia".¹⁸

However, the Central Executive Committee of Transcaucasia did not take into account that just proposal, leaving it without consequence, thus, failing to return the pastures taken from Armenia. Nevertheless, this afforded the Caucasian Tatars the chance to appropriate new territories with their characteristic cynicism.

It is important to highlight that in response to the aforementioned decisions imposed on Armenia by the party elite, the Caucasian Tatar leaders, showed their false kindness towards the Armenians. In 1922 N. Narimanov in the newspaper

¹⁵ **Gasapyan** 1928, № 480.

¹⁶ The group designated as national deviationist (orientation towards nationalism) by Stalin (S. Kavtaradze, K. Tcintcadze, etc.) was led by B. Mdivani, who held the view that the alliance of Transcaucasia was premature. They sought to achieve greater autonomy for the republics (**Khatisean** 1927, № 4526; (II), № 4527 (III); № 4528; (IV), № 4529; (V), № 4530. B. Mdivani and his supporters were expelled from the party and subsequently subjected to physical extermination (**Sahakyan** 2013, 95–96). In 1936, the first deputy of the head of the Council of People's Commissars, B. Mdivani, was arrested and subsequently executed by shooting on 9 July 1937.

¹⁷ **Grigorya** 1994, № 184 (1048), 3.

¹⁸ "Soviet Armenia", № 282, 05.12.1923.

The Nomadic Economy as a Means of Implementing a Strategic Plan...

"Zarya Vostoka" in the issue of July 13, wrote an article entitled "We and them". "Every summer, Armenia cedes its pastures to Azerbaijanis engaged in animal husbandry".¹⁹ Similarly, H. Musabekov, Chairman of Council of People's Commissars of the Azerbaijani SSR, proclaimed at the 2nd Congress of All-Azerbaijan Councils, convened in May 1922, that the issue of nomads was solved in a favorable way with fraternal Soviet Armenia. Armenia now allows our nomads to graze their livestock in summer pastures".²⁰

The issue, which was of "life and death" importance to the Caucasian Tatars, led to the introduction of the aforementioned ridiculous "justifications" by the party superiors, who allegedly cited the prospect of developing cattle breeding in Artsakh as a reason for the region's forced incorporation into the Azerbaijani SSR. In this context, S. Vratsyan presented a satirical commentary: "Why?" Because, they say, the livestock of the Azerbaijani plains will perish unless the Karabakh pastures are under Azerbaijani control". Continuing his thought, he added: "It is known that in the Soviet world cattle are more valuable than people. But is it not possible to ensure such conditions that the sheep of Azerbaijani shepherds graze peacefully in the pastures of Karabakh belonging to Armenia, as, for example, they graze in the Zangezur mountains located within the borders of Armenia? Undoubtedly, Azerbaijan's cattle are not guilty of the fact the territory of Karabakh, contrary to the will of its inhabitants, is maintained under the control of Azerbaijan".²¹

It is also established that the demographic factor played a pivotal role in the formation of the country's borders. To provide a more comprehensive overview, it is necessary to present the facts in their own right. Accordingly, the official newspaper, the "Soviet Armenia," published an article entitled "Usage of Armenia's Summer Pastures in 1926." This article presented a table illustrating the distribution of allocated areas to local residents and nomads in the mountain alpine pastures of Armenia.²²

¹⁹ **Narimanov** 1922, № 21.

²⁰ **Kharmandaryan** 1969, 277.

²¹ **Vratsean** 1960, № 8910.

²² "Soviet Armenia", 1926, № 275 (1626), 6, see also **Simel Sag** [Simon Vratsean], 1927, № 4 (52), 150–151.

Stepanyan G.

| Province | The area allocated to the local residents (desyatin) | The area allocated to nomads (square desyatin) |
|-------------|--|--|
| Yerevan | 20.500 | 9.700 |
| Etchmiadzin | 21.400 | - |
| Leninakan | 19.700 | 16.600 |
| Nor Bayazed | 44.700 | 15.800 |
| Lori Pambak | 19.200 | 20.100 |
| Dilijan | 27.000 | 29.000 |
| Daralagyaz | 9.500 | 33.800 |
| Zangezour | 19.200 | 80.800 |
| Meghri | 4.550 | 980 |

Summing up the mentioned figures it turns out that more than half of the summer pastures amounting to 392,530 des. of the Armenian SSR, 206,780 tithes were used by the Caucasian Tatar nomads, and 185,750 tithes by the local population. It is noteworthy that the number of nomads consistently increased during the summer months. As, for example, in 1926, from 69 Azerbaijani villages to Dilijan province of Armenia, the number of people settled there reached 59,762 people.²³ "And that crowd," writes S. Vratsyan brought with him 105,504 large horned cattle, 7,401 horses and donkeys, 151,903 sheep from Ghazakh, Shamkor and Gandzak provinces, only 265,808 heads of livestock".²⁴

Thoroughly studying and analyzing these statistical numbers, R. Ter-Minasyan records with alarm: "These data indicate that the territories of Armenia are utilized to a significant extent by the people of Azerbaijan, even exceeding the usage by the native Armenian population".²⁵ In the same way, Art. Abeghyan recorded that "...half of Armenia's 750,000 desiatin pastures, and a little more, is the actual property of nomadic herdsmen of our neighboring countries today. This is due to the fact that Armenia's pastures are used by these herdsmen on an equal basis".²⁶

It is also noteworthy that these land relations, and in particular the privileges granted to the Turkic-speaking population, have their origins in the period of tsarist rule. In his work, Armenian novelist and public figure Atrpet (Sargis

²³ "Soviet Armenia", 1926, № 184, 15, 3.

²⁴ **Vratsean** 1927, № 4, 100.

²⁵ **Ruben** 1927, № 8 (56), 8.

²⁶ **Abeghean** 1928, № 10 (70), 114.

The Nomadic Economy as a Means of Implementing a Strategic Plan...

Mubayajyan) draws upon the example of the Kars province writing: "The Turkish, the Tarakeamas and the Garapapakhs have been found to have four to five hectares of land per person. In contrast, many Armenian villages are devoid of mountain pastures and lack any pasture within their borders. Ghsir-dagh is used by the Mughan Valley people, etc."²⁷

The Consequences of Nomadic Economies

Referring again to the issue of the area under the control of nomadic agricultural enterprises in the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic, it is relevant to make the following observation: The data presented in the table clearly demonstrate that the figures were particularly elevated in the provinces of Daralagyaz, Zangezur and Meghri, which border Nakhichevan. Furthermore, an examination of the data reveals that the nomadic population occupied a significant portion of the territory within Zangezur province, particularly in Sisian region. S. Vratsyan wrote in Boston's Hayrenik magazine under the title "Armenian life" (monthly review): "And look at those numbers, four-thirds of the least fertile Zangezur pastures have been appropriated from the Armenian villagers and allocated to the Azerbaijani Tatars".²⁸

This is what the deputy of the Land and Economic Committee V. Mamikonian reported to the Central Executive Committee of the Armenian SSR on July 15, 1930. "The practice of voluntary usurpation of pastures was observed exclusively in Zangezur province, where the Azerbaijani nomads, predominantly the affluent segment, appropriated a number of Soyuzmyaso dairies and plots of land allotted to local villages and utilized them for unauthorized grazing. Furthermore, some of the nomads demolished the structures in their pastures in the villages of Zangezur Uz (present-day Uits), Gharakilisa and Angeghakot."²⁹ In order to address the

²⁷ **Atrpet** 1906, 34.

²⁸ **Simel Sag [Simon Vratsean]**, 1927, № 4 (52), 151.

²⁹ Gharakilisa is the same as famous and ancient settlement Syunik-Sisian of Syunyats Tsughk Province. It is situated in the vast and scenic valley of the Vorotan. It is mentioned in "Ashkharacuys" under the name of Syuink, which used to be a fortress in the early Middle Ages (**Yeremyan** 1963, 80, see also **Hasratyan** 1985, 129): According to the Georgian unknown historian the settlement under the name of Sisian is referenced in the invasion that the Armenian led by Zakare Zakarian undertook from Ani to Ardabil in 1207. They gathered in Ani moved to Ardabil passing through Gegharkuni (now Gherakunik G.S.), descending to Sisian (**Kiknadze** 1980, 74–75). In the primary sources from the 15th and 16th centuries, and

situation, the administrative bodies of Zangezur province took the necessary measures, which should continue from now on".³⁰

Analyzing these and similar facts, let's record that the Azerbaijani SSR, artificially creating new villages in Syunik under the guise of creating nomadic economies, consistently tried to conquer new living areas from Armenia, the proliferation and expansion of which to Nakhichevan would become a connecting link of the Azerbaijani SSR to join Turkey, thus surrounding Armenia with a Turkish-Tatar enemy circle. According to R. Ter-Minasyan's right observation, "...Azerbaijan is the most favored and overly flattered country by the Soviets. The Transcaucasian cart under the guise of confederation is gradually progressing towards the objective of pan-Turanism, which ultimately entails the elimination of Armenia (emphasis is ours – G.S.)".³¹

As previously stated, Nakhichevan held a distinct importance from the perspective of pan-Turkism. This evidence demonstrates that, pursuing the expansionist agenda of the Young Turks and Kemalists, the leadership of the Azerbaijani SSR sought to assume control of the strategically vital Zangezur-Nakhichevan route. These alarming events, which should have had a devastating effect on Armenia and the Armenian people, prompted S. Vratsyan to conclude that "Turkish and Azeri nationalists, taking advantage of the benevolence of the Soviet establishment, are seeking to increase the number of Muslim residents in Armenia through various means. Furthermore, they are attempting to settle Turks in locations of military and scientific significance for Armenia's self-defense, which

Sisajan mahal Syunik-Sisian settlement is referenced among the villages belonging to Tatev Monastery under the name Gharakilisa (see The Persian documents at the Matenadaran, Declarations, vol. A, 15th – 16th centuries compiled by **H. Papazyan** 1956, 48; see also the Persian Document of the Matenadaran Vol. B, Deeds of Purchase vol. A, 14th – 16th centuries compiled by **H. Papazyan**, 1968, 102, 113). The foreign name given to the settlement is linked to the principal Church of St Grigor Lusavorich of Syunik monastery, situated on the precipice. During the period of Turkish-speaking nomadic tribes, the settlement was also known as "Gharakilisa" (derived from "ghara", meaning "black", and "kilisa", meaning "church" in the local language). Over time the name was also ascribed to the settlement and Syunik-Sisian is replaced by Gharakilisa. In Ghevond Alishan's interpretation, the village is large and Garakilise (Black Church) is named thus because of the stone colour of the old church, which indicates its antiquity (**Alishan** 1893, 213). In 1935 Gharakilisa is renamed Sisavan, while in 1940 Sisian.

³⁰ **National Archive of Armenia**, fund 112, list 1, work 551, page 4.

³¹ **Ruben** 1926, № 4, 107–108, 110.

The Nomadic Economy as a Means of Implementing a Strategic Plan...

serve as vital communication routes between various regions of Armenia, including Mili Dzor, Selim Pass, Basar-Gechar, Zangibasar, and others".³²

The aforementioned processes effectively created a favourable environment for Azerbaijan by gradually fragmenting Armenia, subjugating the remainder of Syunik and separating it from Ararat region for a better part of its territory, which once again testifies to Azerbaijan's pan-Turkic plans.³³ The aforementioned evidences that the "soft invasion" into Syunik and its subsequent "peaceful" conquest from Armenians constituted a pivotal aspect of Azerbaijan's foreign policy. Historian Rozhent Grigoryan correctly asserts: "The territorial aspirations of the Azerbaijani government towards Soviet Armenia, its traditional invasive policy are driven by a pan-Turkish ideology and represent a more explicit manifestation of this ideology than the desire to acquire vital space for the Azerbaijani peasantry".³⁴

Now we'll examine the adverse effects of expansive nomadic farming enterprises on Armenia. It is a well-established fact that one of the principal sectors of the economy of the Armenian SSR, as has been throughout its history, is agriculture. The population in the regions of the Republic was predominantly engaged in agricultural activities, which constituted the primary source of livelihood for them. Consequently, the gradual expansion of nomadic households and the conversion of arable lands to pastures resulted in the direct deprivation of land among the local population. Therefore, in order to avoid land deprivation, the Armenian peasant in many cases abandons farming and instead engages in animal husbandry.³⁵ In this regard noteworthy are D. Ananun's insightful observations. In his analysis of the dispossession of Armenian peasant land, the social roots of their migration, and the usurpation of Armenian pastures, the author addresses the prevailing situation with great concern, writing: "On the other hand, the Armenian villager cannot use the summer pastures to the desired extent, since the steppe Turk has not finally become sedentary, so he has not given up wandering stockbreeding. However, the Turkish plan wants to sanctify the vagrant stock-breeding it does not come to terms with the idea that the steppe Turk can ever give up summer pastures. Thus, a situation rises when somebody

³² **Vratsean** 1927, № 4, 101–102.

³³ **Vardanyan** 1989, № 224, 3.

³⁴ **Grigoryan** 1994, № 183 (1047), 3.

³⁵ **D.A. [Davit Ananun]**, 1917, № 11–12, 206.

prosper and has a place for shelter, showing no concern for the foreign neighbor to enjoy the same advantages".³⁶ On the other hand, the peasants suffering from landlessness in the mountainous and foothill regions of Armenia as a consequence of the reduction in arable land, were compelled to migrate en masse from their homeland. V. Hovsepyan, Head of the Central Statistical Administration of the Armenian SSR, indicated that a significant proportion of emigrants were seeking employment opportunities in the industrial and commercial centres of Transcaucasia and the North Caucasus.³⁷ Vratsian, who was preoccupied with the prevailing circumstances and acutely conscious of the traumatic legacy of the national catastrophe, expressed his feelings with a profound yearning for his homeland. Another assumption about the emigrants from Armenia being exclusively Armenians is also typical. Turks, for example, not only do not migrate, but also it is clear that their number is even gradually increasing... They migrate to Zangezur, Nor-Bayazet, Akhta, Abaran, that is, to indiscriminate Armenian-inhabited places. What is the reason for this phenomenon, why are Armenians leaving Armenia and Turks coming to Armenia? If economic reasons compell an Armenian peasant to leave his home and resort to migration, do the same reasons not exist for Turks as well? Is it not correct to suppose that an invisible hand prompts Armenians to depart from Armenia and Turks to take up residence there. A hand that operates in the dark, for which the Armenian communists have become an instrument, whether knowingly or unknowingly. The Armenian communists, who soar in the clouds with their blissful dreaminess, while their neighbouring friends are skilfully ordering the sinful deeds of a sinful world in their favour".³⁸

In his subsequent remarks on the causes of emigration, Vratsyan makes the following observation: "What is the reason for this destructive exodus? The answer is simple – the scarcity of land. And the lack of land in Armenia is a consequence of not only narrow borders, but also the discriminatory and anti-Armenian policies enacted by the Soviet government".³⁹ The alarming events in Armenia reached the Diaspora Armenian population, prompting political, public figures to present a multitude of facts in order to highlight the arbitrary practices,

³⁶ **Ibid.**

³⁷ **Hovsepyan** 1927, № 26 (1679), 2.

³⁸ **Vratsean** 1927, № 4, 101.

³⁹ **Ibid.**

The Nomadic Economy as a Means of Implementing a Strategic Plan...

self-serving objectives and far-reaching political plans of the leaders of Azerbaijan SSR, who were becoming increasingly self-assured under the auspices of Moscow in their publications. R. Ter- Minasian rightly pointed out: "The national question merged with the economic one and gave more strength and momentum to the idea of destroying Armenia".⁴⁰

And so, every year, from May onwards, the Caucasian Tatar nomadic shepherds left their winter pastures and moved with their tens of thousands of flocks to the Armenian mountains, where they fed their cattle on the alpine pastures⁴¹ until the beginning of September, almost free of charge. Only in some cases, from July to September, was the so-called "nomad tax" or "travel tax"⁴² applied. In S. Vratsian's words: "What does Armenia get from it in return? Just a misery. And these pennies go to the coffers of the government and not to the peasantry".⁴³

The report by Garnik Ghazaryan, secretary of the Zangezur Provincial Party Committee, published in June 1923, on the general activities of the Zangezur Provincial Party Committee, says "Since 15 May, people from neighbouring Azerbaijan have been arriving. The number of animals that have climbed the mountains this year is 90,000, 20 percent higher than last year".⁴⁴

In a short space of time, the fields of lush alpine vegetation were transformed into barren steppes. As a result, the agricultural land was reduced to a nomadic lifestyle of shepherds and pastoralists. At the same time, the Caucasian Tartars, who led a herdsman's life, were a real menace to the sedentary, mainly agricultural Armenian settlements living in the neighbourhood; in winter they often attacked to rob the Armenians of their property and their cattle.

At the regular session of the Central Executive Committee held on 9 February, the co-chairman of the Central Executive Committee, the chairman of the Council of People's Commissars, S. Hambardzumyan, in his report, referring

⁴⁰ **Ruben** 1982, 187.

⁴¹ **Shakhatunyan** 1918, 44, see also **Hovsepyan** 1927, № 26 (1679), 2, see also **Ghulyan** 2008, № 2 (112), 225.

⁴² "Soviet Armenia" 1923, № 160, "Soviet Armenia" 1923, № 238: According to the established regulation, for the first quality the tax was 3 rubles per desiatin, for the second quality 2 rubles and the third only 1 rouble. Moreover, the nomad tax was paid both in money and produce (fat, meat, grain). **Hasrat** 1922, № 4.

⁴³ **Simel Sag [Simon Vratsean]**, 1926, № 54 (52), 151.

⁴⁴ **National Archive of Armenia**, f. 1, l. 3, w. 91, p. 12:

to the issue of migration, stated that in the same year 63% of the mountain pastures in Armenia were occupied by Caucasian Tatar nomads.⁴⁵ Aghamali Oghli, a Caucasian Tatar member of the Presidium of the Inter-Central Affairs Committee, who participated in the session, immediately countered S. Hambardzumyan, forcing false ideas with regard to intellectual and moral reforms in the Turkish society, stating: "The issue of migration cannot be resolved through administrative means alone, it will take time. Before embarking on a discussion of the aforementioned issue, it is imperative to establish connections between the nomadic population and various cultural initiatives and ways of life"⁴⁶. The official newspaper of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation "Droshak", referring to the clarification of the issues discussed at this session, considered nomadism as an evil, and the lack of pastures as one of the main reasons for the migration of the Armenian population from rural areas, criticised the statement of Aghamali Oghli, in particular, for insufficiently approaching the issue of the education of nomadic Turks, and expressed its reservations on this issue. In an editorial published in Yerevan, the Central Executive Committee of Transcaucasia posed a pertinent question: "Therefore, the Armenian people, constrained by a scarcity of land, must endure hardship for the sake of communism. They must remain hungry until the people of Mughan advance culturally and cease their nomadic lifestyle. Until then, they must use the mountain pastures of Armenia..."⁴⁷. Actually, the goal of the Azerbaijani authorities was different. D. Ananun writes that "the leaders of the Caucasian defenders of the existence of Azerbaijan, want to use the backwardness of their people as a weapon against the neighboring Armenia and keep the national struggle burning"⁴⁸ (emphasis – G.S.).

From this perspective, Raffi's warning of the impending national catastrophe, as evidenced by centuries of historical experience, is of particular significance. The renowned novelist, anticipating malevolent intentions lurking beneath the surface of the Turks' nationalistic sentiments, elucidates the deceptive practices perpetrated against the Armenian people in the novel "Sparks", posing a question "What is a Turk", and regarding delusional the idea that, "barbarism and tyranny will end the day when the Turk will be civilized. Exposing the criminal essence of

⁴⁵ "Droshak", 1926, № 4, 159.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid

⁴⁸ **Ananun** 1920, № 17, 15.09.1920, 689.

the Turk he rightly points out, **"Today, Turk is an uneducated barbarian, but after becoming civilized, he will become an educated bandit, then he will become more dangerous. – We have a history, 850 years of history of how Turks have treated us. His whole legacy is smeared with blood and tears. The one who reneges the history is the first to be sentenced at court. Can yesterday's beast become an angel today?"**⁴⁹ (emphasis – G.S.).

We should add to the irrefutable evidence that, apart from the economic factor, the leaders of the Azerbaijani SSR, using the migration as an excuse to implement their tyrannical plans, consistently sought to seize the mountainous regions of Armenia by jointly exploiting the border pastures, to create Tatar-inhabited villages, compelling the nomads to settle down. Therefore, the Caucasian Tatar nomads in the nomadic farms established in the mountain pastures of Armenia, deliberately changed their lifestyle under the guidance of the Azerbaijani authorities, and gradually transformed the dugout earthen huts and tents (oba) of the seasonal settlements into diverse stone structures. Consequently, a number of Tatar peasant settlements, bearing Turkic toponyms with their respective infrastructures (such as post offices and schools), sprouted up in the purely Armenian territories, often in close proximity to existing Armenian settlements, as a result of the creeping expansion.

In addition, the camps of nomads mostly passed through Armenian-owned arable lands, spoiling the crops, resulting in the destruction of crops and the emergence of frequent disputes and conflicts.⁵⁰ D. Ananun, who was profoundly concerned about the calamity that befell the Armenian peasantry, observed that "the Turk shepherds trampled the crops and meadows of the Armenian villages on the road, broke the trees, and mixed the lost Armenian cattle with their own herds. This is followed by instances of conflict, discord, homicide, and enmity".⁵¹

Moreover, the latter, in addition to jointly using the border pastures, began to use the Armenian pastures and arable lands without any restrictions, in parallel, destroying and desecrating the ancient Armenian historical and cultural monuments of the surroundings in line with the deliberate policy of erasing Armenian traces pursued by Baku government.

⁴⁹ Raffi 1964, 271–272.

⁵⁰ Mkrtumyan 1963, № 7, 93.

⁵¹ Ananun 1920, № 17, 15.09.1920, 689.

Continuing the process of seizing new territories from the Armenian SSR under the pretext of creating new arable land for nomadic farms, the Azerbaijani SSR introduced a new issue of demarcation at the end of the 1930s. This was in regard to the plot of land known as Tarakyamazar, which is located between the villages of Baghanis in Ijevan region and Baghanis-Ayrum in Ghazakh region of the Azerbaijani SSR. The commission, established by the two republics in 1937, on 13 September resolved to transfer the disputed 30 ha area to Baghanis village of Ijevan and to allocate 120 ha of Ijevan region's forest pastures to Baghanis-Ayrum⁵² village of Ghazakh. It is evident that the Armenian side was once again adversely affected in this instance.

Conclusion

Thus, under the guise of the creation of state-planned "nomadic economies", Tatar-inhabited villages sprouted up in a number of living areas of Armenia, as well as more than half of the pastures with sub-alpine and alpine vegetation were donated to the Azerbaijani SSR.⁵³ This gave the latter an opportunity to advance into the territory of Armenia like a wedge and to gain control over vital transportation routes and strategic infrastructure. From the above observations it becomes evident that one of the constituents of Soviet Azerbaijan's expansionist policy was the occupation of Armenian territories that was facilitated by the Soviet government's lenient stance on the matter, posing serious threats to Armenia from a strategic and demographic standpoint.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Աբեղեան Արտ. 1928, Մենք եւ մեր հարեանները (ազգային քաղաքականութեան խնդիրներ), «Հայրենիք», Պոսթըն, № 7 (67), էջ 132–144: (*Abeghean Art. 1928, Menk yev mer harevannery (azgayin kaghakakanutean khndirner), "Hayrenik", Postyn, № 7 (67), ej 132–144). Abeghean Art. We and Our Neighbours (issues of National policy), "Hayrenik", № 7 (67), Boston, 1928, pp. 132–144 (in Armenian).*

Աբեղեան Արտ. 1928, Մենք եւ մեր հարեանները (ազգային քաղաքականութեան խնդիրներ), «Հայրենիք», Պոսթըն, № 10 (70), էջ 109–126: (*Abeghean Art. 1928, Menk yev mer harevannery (azgayin kaghak'akanut'ean khndirner), "Hayrenik", Postyn, № 10 (70), ej 109–126). Abeghean Art. We and Our Neighbours (issues of National policy), "Hayrenik", № 10 (70), Boston, 1928, pp. 109–126 (in Armenian).*

⁵² NAA, f. 112, l. 3, w. 328, p. 2.

⁵³ Harutyunyan 1992, № 135.

The Nomadic Economy as a Means of Implementing a Strategic Plan...

Ալիշան Ղ. 1893, Սիսական: Տեղագրություն Սինեաց աշխարհի, Վենետիկ, Ս. Ղազար, 563 էջ: (**Alishan GH.** 1893, *Sisikan: Teghagrut'wn Siwneats' ashkharhi, Venetik, S. Ghazar, 563 ej*). **Alishan Gh.** *Sisikan. Topography of Syunik Region, Venice, 1893 Saint Lazurus Island, pp. 563 (in Armenian).*

Անանուն Դ., Ղարաբաղ, «Հայաստանի կոօպերացիա», Երևան, 1920, սեպտեմբերի 15, № 17, էջ 684–690: (**Ananun D.**, *Gharabagh, "Hayastani kooperatsia", Yerevan, 1920, septemperi 15, № 17, ej 684–690*). **Ananun D.** *Karabakh, "The cooperation of Armenia", 1920, № 17, 09.15, Yerevan, pp. 684–690 (in Armenian).*

Անդրկովկասի հողփոխակցների համագումարը, «Մարտակոչ», Թիֆլիս, 1924, ապրիլի 3, № 77: (**Andrkovkasi hoghzhoghkomneri hamagumary, "Martakoch", T'iflis, 1924, aprili 3, № 77). *The Congress of People's Commissariat for Agriculture of Transcaucasia, "Martakoch", № 77, 03.04.1924, Tiflis p. 77 (in Armenian).***

Անդ. Կենտ. Գործկոմը Երևանում, «Դրոշակ», Փարիզ, 1926, մայիս, № 5, էջ 159–160: (**And. Kent. Gortscomy Yerevanum, "Droshak", Pariz, 1926, mayis, № 5, ej 159–160). *The Central Executive Committee of Transcaucasia in Yerevan, "Droshak" № 5, 05. 1926, Paris, pp. 159–160 (in Armenian).***

Արոտատեղերի խնդիրն Անդրկովկասում, «Խորհրդային Հայաստան», Երևան, 1923, դեկտեմբերի 18, № 282. (**Arotategheri khndirn Andrkovkasum, "Khorhrdayin Hayastan", Yerevan, 1923, dektem-beri 18, № 282). *The Issue of Pasture in Transcaucasia, "Soviet Armenia", Yerevan, № 282, 18.05.1923 (in Armenian).***

Ատրպետ 1906. Հողատիրությունը Կովկասում. հետազոտություն, Ալեքսանդրապոլ, «Շիրակ», 36 էջ: (**Atrpet 1906. Hoghatirut'wny Kovkasum. hetazotut'wn, Alesandrapol, "Shirak", 36 ej). **Atrpet**, *"Land Ownership in the Caucasus: A Study, 1906, Alexandrapol, "Shirak", p. 36 (in Armenian).***

Գավառներում, «Խորհրդային Հայաստան», Երևան, 1926, օգոստոսի 11, № 184, էջ 3: (**Gavarrnerum, "Khorhrdayin Hayastan", Yerevan, 1926, ogostosi 11, № 184, ej 3). *In the Provinces, "Soviet Armenia", № 184, 11.08.1926, Yerevan, p. 3 (in Armenian).***

Գրիգորյան Ռ. 1994, Հայկական տարածքների նոր կորուստ՝ «պրոլետարական ինտերնացիոնալիզմի ու ժողովուրդների բարեկամության դրոշի» ներքո: Ինչ են ասում փաստաթղթերը Խորհրդային Ադրբեջանի կողմից Խորհրդային Հայաստանի սահմանամերձ տարածքների հափշտակման մասին 1920–1930-ական թվականներին», «Հայաստանի Հանրապետություն», Երևան, սեպտեմբերի 23, № 184 (1048), էջ 3: (**Grigoryan R.** 1994, *Haykakan taratsk'neri nor korust, "proletarakan interna-t'sionlizm u zhoghovurdneri barekamut'yan droshi» nerkvo: Inch yen asum pastatghtery Khorhrdayin Adrbejani koghmits Khorhrdayin Hayastani sahmanamerdz taratskneri hapshtakman masin 1920–1930-akan tvakannerin", "Hayastani Hanrapetutyun", Yerevan, septemperi 23, № 184 (1048), ej 3*). **Grigoryan R.** *"A New Loss of Armenian Territories under the Banner of Proletariat Internationalism and Friendship among Peoples" What do the Documents Evidence about the Seizure of Armenian Border Land in the 1920s and 30s", "Republic of Armenia", № 184 (1048), 23.09.1994, p. 3 (in Armenian).*

Գրիգորյան Ռ. 1994, Հայկական տարածքների նոր կորուստ՝ «պրոլետարական ինտերնացիոնալիզմի ու ժողովուրդների բարեկամության դրոշի» ներքո: Ինչ են ասում փաս-

տաթղթերը Խորհրդային Ադրբեջանի կողմից Խորհրդային Հայաստանի սահմանամերձ տարածքների հափշտակման մասին 1920–1930-ական թվականներին», «Հայաստանի Հանրապետություն», Երևան, սեպտեմբերի 22, № 183 (1047), էջ 3: (**Grigoryan R.** 1994, *Haykakan taratskneri nor korust, "proletarakan interna-ts'ionalizmi u zhoghovurdneri barekamutyany droshi» nerkvo: Inch yen asum pastatghery Khorhrdayin Aderbejani koghmits Khorhrdayin Hayastani sahmanamerdz taratsk'neri hapshtakman masin 1920–1930-akan t'vakannerin*”, “*Hayastani Hanrapetutyun*”, Yerevan, septemperi 22, № 183 (1047), ej 3). **Grigoryan R.** “A New Loss of Armenian Territories under the Banner of Proletariat Internationalism and Friendship among Peoples” What do the Documents Evidence about the Seizure of Armenian Border Land in the 1920s and 30s”, “*Republic of Armenia*”, № 183 (1047), 22. 09.1994, p. 3 (in Armenian).

Դ.Ա. [Դավիթ Անանուն]. 1917, Դարձեալ Անդրկովկասի վարչական բաժանումը, «Գործ», Բագու, նոյեմբեր-դեկտեմբեր, № 11–12, էջ 200–207. (**D.A. [Davit Ananun].** 1917, *Dardzeal Andrkovkasi varchakan bazhanumy, “Gorts”, Bagu, noyember-dektember, № 11–12, ej 200–207*). **D.A. [Davit Ananun]** Again the Administrative Division of Transcaucasia, “*Work*”, № 11–12, 1917, Baku, pp. 200–207 (in Armenian).

Երեմյան Ս. 1963, Հայաստանը ըստ «Աշխարհացոյց»-ի (փորձ VII դարի հայկական քարտեզի վերակազմության ժամանակակից քարտեզագրական հիմքի վրա), Երևան, «ՀՍՍՌ ԳԱ հրատ», 154 էջ: (**Yeremyan S.** 1963, *Hayastany yst «Ashkharhatsvoyts»-i (pvordz VII dari haykakan k'ar-tezi verakazmutyan zhamanakakits kartezagrakan himki vra)*, Yerevan, “HSSRR GA hrat”, 154 ej). **Yeremyan S.**, *Armenia according to Ashkharcuytc, (an Attempt of Reconstructing the Map of the 7th Century on the Basis of Modern Cartography)*, Yerevan, 1963, pub. National Academy of Sciences of Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic, p. 154 (in Armenian).

Չանգեզուրում: Քոչահարկը, «Խորհրդային Հայաստան», Երևան, 1923, հուլիսի 25, № 160: (*Zangezurum: Kvachaharky, “Khorhrdayin Hayastan”, Yerevan, 1923, hulis 25, № 160*). *The Nomad Tax in Zangezur, “Soviet Armenia”, № 160 25.07.1923, Yerevan (in Armenian)*.

Դարալագյազի գավառում: Քոչատուրքը, «Խորհրդային Հայաստան», Երևան, 1923, հոկտեմբերի 25, № 238: (*Daralagyazi gavarrum: Kvachaturky, “Khorhrdayin Hayastan”, Yerevan, 1923, hoktemperi 25, № 238*). *The Nomad Tax in the Province of Daralagyaz, “Soviet Armenia”, № 238, 25.10. 1923, Yerevan (in Armenian)*.

Զրույց Հոդժոդկոմ ընկ. Ա. Երզնկյանի հետ, «Մարտակոչ», Թիֆլիս, 1923, հուլիսի 31, № 131: (*Zruyts Hoghzhoghkom ynk. A. Yerznkyani het, “Martakoch”, T'iflis, 1923, hulis 31, № 131*). *A Talk with Armenian SSR Land and Social Committee chief A. Yerznkyan, “Martakoch”, № 131, 31. 07. 1923, Tiflis (in Armenian)*.

Խատիսեան Ա. 1927, Կովկասեան հանրապետութիւնների համադաշնակցութիւնը (I), «Հայրենիք» (օրաթերթ), Պոսթըն, մարտ 22, № 4526; (II), մարտ 23, № 4527; (III), մարտ 24, № 4528; (IV), մարտ 25, № 4529; (V), մարտ 26, № 4530: (**Khatisean AI.** 1927, *Kovkasean hanrapetutiwnneri hamadashnaksutiwny (I), “Hayrenik” (oratert), Postyn, mart 22, № 4526; (II), mart 23, № 4527; (III), mart 24, № 4528; (IV, mart 25, № 4529; (V), mart 26, № 4530*). **Khatisean AI.** *The Confederation of Caucasian Countries, “Hayrenik”, № 4526; (II), Boston, 22.*

The Nomadic Economy as a Means of Implementing a Strategic Plan...

03. 1927, № 4527; (III), 23. 03. 1927, Boston, № 4528; (IV) 25. 03. 1927, Boston, № 4529; (V), 26. 03. 1927, Boston (in Armenian).

Կարապետյան Ս. 2004, Հյուսիսային Արցախ: Գիրք Զ, Երևան, «Գիտություն», 616 էջ: (**Karapetyan S.** 2004, *Hyusisayin Artsakh: Girk Z*, Yerevan, «Gitutyun», 616 ej). **Karapetyan S.**, Northern Artsakh, vol. 6, Yerevan, 2004, "Gitutyun", p. 616 (in Armenian).

Հայաստանի ամառային արոտավայրերի օգտագործումը 1926 թ., «Խորհրդային Հայաստան», Երևան, 1926, նոյեմբերի 28, № 275 (1626), էջ 6: (*Hayastani amarrayin arotavayreri ogtagortsumy 1926 t.*, "Khorhrdayin Hayastan", Yerevan, 1926, noyemberi 28, № 275 (1626), ej 6). *The Exploitation of Summer Pasture of Armenia*, "Soviet Armenia", № 275 (1626), 28. 11. 1926, Yerevan, p. 6 (in Armenian).

Հայաստանի ազգային արխիվ, ֆ. 1, ց. 3, գ. 91, թ. 12: (*Hayastani azgajin arkhiv*, f. 1, c. 3, g. 97, t. 12): *National Archives of Armenia*, f. 1, l. 3, w. 91, p. 12:

Հայաստանի ազգային արխիվ, ֆ. 112, ց. 1, գ. 551, թ. 4: (*Hayastani azgajin arkhiv*, f. 112, c. 1, g. 551, t. 4): *National Archives of Armenia*, f. 112, l. 1, w. 551, p. 4 (in Armenian).

Հայաստանի ազգային արխիվ, ֆ. 112, ց. 3, գ. 328, թ. 2: (*Hayastani azgajin arkhiv*, f. 112, c. 3, g. 328, t. 2) *National Archives of Armenia*, f. 112, l. 3, w. 328, p. 2 (in Armenian).

Հասրաթ. 1922, Քոչատուրք, «Մաճկալ», Երևան, հունիսի 14, № 4: (**Hasrat.** 1922, *Kvochaturk*, "Machkal", Yerevan, hunisi 14, № 4). **Hasrat**, *Nomad Tax*, "Machkal", № 4, 14.06.1922, Yerevan (in Armenian).

Հասրաթյան Մ. 1985, Պատմա-հնագիտական ուսումնասիրություններ, Երևան, «ՀՍՍՀ ԳԱ հրատ», 278 էջ: (**Hasratian M.** 1985, *Patma-hnagitakan usumnasirutyunner*, Yerevan, "HSSH GA hrat", 278 ej). **Hasratyan M.**, *Historico-Archeological Studies*, 1985, Yerevan, pub. National Academy of Sciences of Armenian Soviet Socialist Republi, p. 278 (in Armenian).

Հարությունյան Կ. 1992, Թե ինչպես Անդրֆեդերացիայի Կենտգործկոմը 1929 թ. Խորհրդային Հայաստանի 34.539 քառ. կմ տարածքից 4.739 քառ. կմ նվիրաբերեց «եղբայրական Ադրբեջանին», «Երկիր», Երևան, հուլիսի 17, № 135: (**Harut'yunyan K.** 1992, *T'e inchpes Andrfederatsiayi Kentgortskomy 1929 t. Khorhrdayin Hayastani 34.539 karr. km taratskits 4.739 karr. km nviraberets "yeghbayrakan Adrbejanin"*, "Yerkir", Yerevan, hulis 17, № 135). **Harutyunyan K.**, *How the Central Executive Committee of Transcaucasia in 1929 of 34,539 square kilometres of Soviet Armenia. 4,739 sq. km. donated to "brotherly Azerbaijan"*, Yerkir, № 135, 17.07.1992, Yerevan (in Armenian).

Հովսեփյան Վ. 1927, Դարձյալ մարդահամարի նախնական արդյունքների մասին (Ոչ թե 870.000 է, այլ 930.000), «Խորհրդային Հայաստան», Երևան, փետրվարի 3, № 26 (1679), էջ 2: (**Hovsepyan V.** 1927, *Dardzyal mardahamari nakhnakan ardyunkneri masin* (Voch te 870.000 e, ayl 930.000), "Khorhrdayin Hayastan", Yerevan, petrvari 3, № 26 (1679), ej 2). **Hovsepyan V.**, *More on the Preliminary Results of the Census (It is not 870.000 but 930.000)*, "Soviet Armenia", № 26 (1679), 3. 02. 1927, Yerevan, p. 2 (in Armenian).

Ղուկյան Յու. 2008, Մի քանի հարցեր հայ-ադրբեջանական հարաբերություններից (քոչի խնդիրը 1919 թ.), ԲՀԱ, Երևան, № 2 (112), էջ 225–234: (**Ghulyan Yu.** 2008, *Mi k'ani hartser hay-adrbejanakan haraberut'yunnerits* (kvochi khndiry 1919 t'), BHA, Yerevan, № 2

(112), ej 225–234). **Ghulyan Yu.** *Some Issues on the Armenian-Azerbaijani Relations (the issue of nomads. 1919)*, *Bulletin of the Armenian Archives*, № 2 (112), Yerevan, pp. 225–234 (in Armenian).

Մեղու Շնորհալի [Մինաս Գասապյան], Պզտիկ նոթեր «Հայրենիք» (օրաթերթ), Պոսթըն, 1928, փետրուար 17, № 4803: (*Meghu Shnorhali [Minas Gasapyan], Pztik noer "Hayrenik" (orater), Postyn, 1928, petruar 17, № 4803*). **Meghu Shnorhali [Minas Gasapyan]** *Small Notes, "Hayrenik"*, № 4803, 17. 02. 1928, Boston (in Armenian).

Մկրտչեան Լ. 1971, Անդրկովկասեան դաշնակցութեան ձեւաւորման պատմութիւնը, «Ազդակ Շաբաթօրեակ-Դրօշակ», Պէյրութ, Բ տարի, 11 ապրիլ, № 21 (71), էջ 341–345: (*Mkrtch'ean L. 1971, Andrkovkasean dashnaks'ut'ean dzevaworman patmut'wny, "Azdak Shabatoryeak-Droshak", Peyrut', B tari, 11 april, № 21 (71), ej 341–345*). **Mkrtchean L.**, *The History of the Formation of Transcaucasian Alliance, "Azdak weekly, Droshak"*, № 21 (71), 11. 04. 1971, Beirut, pp. 341–345 (in Armenian).

Մկրտումյան Յու., Հյուսիս-արեւելյան Հայաստանի հայերի տարեկան անասնապահական ցիկլը նախահեղափոխական շրջանում, «Տեղեկագիր» ՀՍՍՀ ԳԱ (հաս. գիտ.), Երևան, 1963, № 7, էջ 87–100: (*Mkrtumyan Yu., Hyusis-arevelyan Hayastani hayeri tarekan anasnapahakan tsikly nakhaheghapvokhakan shrjanum, "Teghekagir" HSSH GA (has. git.), Yerevan, 1963, № 7, ej 87–100*). **Mkrtumyan Yu.**, *The Annual Cattle Cycle of the Armenians of North-Eastern Armenia in the Pre-Revolutionary Period, Bulletin № 7, 1963, National Academy of Sciences of Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic*, pp. 87–100 (in Armenian).

Ռուբէն 1926, Գանձակ-Դարաբաղի վէճը, «Դրօշակ», Փարիզ, փետրուար, № 2, էջ 46–52: (**Ruben** 1926, *Gandzak-Gharabaghi vechy, "Droshak", P'ariz, p'etruar, № 2, ej 46–52*). **Ruben**, *The Dispute over Gandzak-Karabakh, "Droshak" 02.1926, Paris, pp. 46–52* (in Armenian).

Ռուբէն 1927, Հայաստան եւ Ատրպէճան, «Հայրենիք», Պոսթըն, Ե տարի, յունիս, № 8 (56), էջ 72–85: (**Ruben** 1927, *Hayastan yev Atrpechan, "Hayrenik", Post'yn, Ye tari, yunis, № 8 (56), ej 72–85*). **Ruben**, *Armenia and Azerbaijan, "Hayrenik"*, № 8 (56), 06. 1927, Boston, pp. 72–85 (in Armenian).

Ռուբէն 1926, Հայաստանը Անդրկովկասեան դաշնակցութեան մէջ, «Դրօշակ», Փարիզ, ապրիլ, № 4, էջ 105–110: (**Ruben** 1926, *Hayastany Andrkovkasean dashnaksutean mej, "Droshak", Pariz, ap-ril, № 4, ej 105–110*). **Ruben**, *Armenia in Transcaucasian Alliance, "Droshak" № 4, 04. c1926, Paris, pp. 105–110* (in Armenian).

Ռուբէն 1982, Հայ յեղափոխականի մը յիշատակները, Է. Է. Թեհրան, 363 էջ: (**Ruben** 1982, *Hay yeghap'vokhakani my yishatakneri, h. E, Tehran, 363 ej*). **Ruben** *Memoir of an Armenian Revolutionary, 1982, vol. 7, Tehran p. 363* (in Armenian).

Սահակյան Ա. 2003, Հայաստանը Անդրկովկասյան Դաշնության կազմում: Խանդավառ միավորումից մինչև անաղմուկ բաժանում, Վանաձոր, «Սիս տպագրատուն», 273 էջ: (**Sahakyan A.**, 2003, *Hayastany Andrkovkasyan Dashnutyan kazmum: Khandavarr miavorumits' minch'ev anagh muk bazhanum, Vanadzor, "Sis tpagratun", 273 ej*). **Sahakyan A.**, *Armenia in the Transcaucasian Alliance. From Enthusiastic Union to Quiet Separation, Vanadzor, 2003, "Mis" publishing house, p. 273* (in Armenian).

The Nomadic Economy as a Means of Implementing a Strategic Plan...

Սիմել Սէգ [Սիմոն Վրացյան] 1927, Հայ կեանքը (ամսական տեսութիւն), «Հայրենիք», Պոսթըն, Ե տարի, փետրուար, № 4 (52), էջ 144–158: (*Simel Seg [Simon Vrats'yan]* 1927, *Hay keanky (amsakan tesutiwn)*, “Hayrenik”, *Post'yn, Ye tari, petruar*, № 4 (52), ej 144–158). *Simel Sag [Simon Vratsean]* *Armenian Life (a monthly review)*, *Hayrenik*, № 4 (52), 02. 1927, Boston, pp. 144–158 (in Armenian).

Սիմոնյան Հր. 2003, Ազատագրական պայքարի ուղիներում: Գիրք Բ, Երևան, «Հայագիակ», 760 էջ: (*Simonyan Hr.* 2003, *Azatagrakan paykari ughinerum: Girk' B*, Yerevan, “Hayagiak”, 760 ej). *Simonyan Hr.*, *On the Paths of the Struggle for Liberation*, vol. 2 Yerevan, 2003, “Hayagitak”, p. 760 (in Armenian).

Վարդանյան Ս. 1989, Առեղծված, ոչ, զավթված հողեր, «Խորհրդային Հայաստան», Երևան, հոկտեմբերի 18, № 224, էջ 3: (*Vardanyan S.* 1989, *Arreghtsvats?, voch, zavtvats hogher*, “Khorhrdayin Hayastan”, Yerevan, *hoktemberi 18*, № 224, ej 3). *Vardanyan S.*, *A Mystery? No, Seized Land*, “Soviet Armenia”, № 224, 18.10.1989, Yerevan, p. 3 (in Armenian).

Վրացեան Ս. 1960, Ղարաբաղ, Ախալքալաք եւ Նախիջեւան՝ Հայաստանին, «Յանաջ», Փարիզ, սեպտեմբերի 27, № 8910: (*Vrats'ean S.* 1960, *Gharabagh, Akhalkalak yev Nakhijevan, Hayastanin*, “Yarraj”, *Pariz, septemberi 27*, № 8910). *Vratsean S.* *Karabakh, Akhalkalak and Nakhichevan*, “Yaraj”, № 8910 27.09.1960, Paris (in Armenian).

Վրացեան Ս. 1927, Ճերմակ ջարդը, «Դրոշակ», Փարիզ, ապրիլ, № 4, էջ 98–102: (*Vrats'ean S.* 1927, *CHermak jardy*, “Droshak”, *Pariz, april*, № 4, ej 98–102. *Vratsean S.*, *The White Massacre*, “Droshak”, № 4, 04. 1927, Paris, pp. 98–102) (in Armenian).

Րաֆֆի. 1964, Երկերի ժողովածու, հ. 9, Երևան, «Հայպետհրատ», 505 էջ: Raffi. 1964, *Yerkeri zhoghovatsu*, h. 9, Yerevan, «Haypethrat», 505 ej. *Raffi*, *Anthology of Works*, vol. 9, Yerevan, 1964, “Haypethrat”, p. 505 (in Armenian).

Փափազյան Հ. 1956, Մատենադարանի պարսկերեն վավերագրերը, հ. Ա: Հրովարտակներ, պրակ Ա (ԺԵ–ԺԶ դդ.), Երևան, «ՀՍՍՌ ԳԱ հրատ», 316 էջ: (*Papazyan H.* 1956, *Matenadarani parskeren vaveragrery*, h. A. *Hrovartakner, prak A (15th–16th dd.)*, Yerevan, “HSSRR GA hrat”, 316 ej. *Papazyan H.*, *The Persian Documents at the Matenadaran, Declarations, (15th–16th centuries)*, vol. A, Yerevan, 1956, pub. National Academy of Sciences of Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic, p. 316) (in Armenian).

Փափազյան Հ. 1968, Մատենադարանի պարսկերեն վավերագրերը, հ. Բ: Կալվածագրեր, պրակ Ա (ԺԴ–ԺԶ դդ.), Երևան, «ՀՍՍՌ ԳԱ հրատ», 594 էջ: (*Papazyan H.* 1968, *Matenadarani parskeren vaveragrery*, h. B: *Kalvatsagrer, prak A (ZHD-ZHZ dd.)*, Yerevan, “HSSRR GA hrat”, 594 ej). *Papazyan H.*, *The Persian Documents at the Matenadaran*, vol. B, *Deeds of Purchase*, Yerevan, vol. A, Yerevan, 1968, pub. National Academy of Sciences of Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic (in Armenian).

Всеподданныйший отчетъ за пятилетіе управления Кавказом генераль-адъютанта графа **Воронцова-Дашкова**, СПб., «Государственная типография», 1910, 60 с. (*The Report for the Five years of Governance of the Caucasus by your humble subject Adjutant General Count Vorontsov-Dashkov*, SPb, 1910, “State Printing House”, p. 60) (in Russian).

Закавказье. Советские республики (Статистико-экономический сборник), Тифлис, «Высший экономический совет ЗСФСР», 1925, 560 с. (*Transcaucasia. Soviet Republics*

(Statistical-economic Collection), Tiflis, "Supreme Economic Council of the Transcaucasian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic", 1925, p. 560) (in Russian).

Нариманов Н. 1922, «Мы и они», «Заря Востока», Тифлис, 13 июля, № 21. (*Narimanov N., Us and them, "Zarya Vostoka", № 21, 13.07.1922, Tiflis*) (in Russian).

Кикнадзе Р. 1980, Очерки по источниковедению истории Грузии: Парсадан Горгиджанидзе и «Картлис Цховреба», Тбилиси, «Мецниереба», 201 с. (*Kiknadze R., Essays on the sources of the history of Georgia: Parsadan Gorgidzhaniдзе and Kartlis Tskhovreba, Tbilisi, 1980, "Medniereba", p. 201*) (in Russian).

Шахатунянь А. 1918, Административный передел Закавказского края, «Ашхатавор», Тифлис, 206 с. (*Shakhtunyan A., Administrative Redistribution of the Transcaucasian Region, Tiflis, 1918, "Ashkhatavor", p. 206*) (in Russian).

Хармандарян С. 1969, Ленин и становление Закавказской федерации 1921–1923, Ереван, «Հայաստան», 456 с. (*Kharmandaryan S., Lenin and the Formation of the Transcaucasian Federation 1921–1923, Yerevan, 1969, "Hayastan", p. 456*) (in Russian).

Образование СССР. Сборник документов, 1917–1924. Под ред. **Генкина Э.**, Москва-Ленинград, 1949, изд. Академии наук СССР, 474 с. (*Education of the USSR. Collection of documents, 1917–1924. Edited by Genkin, E., M.-L., published by the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1949, p. 474*) (in Russian).

ՔՈՉՎՈՐԱԿԱՆ ՏՆՏԵՍՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ՝ ԱԴԻԲԵՋԱՆԱԿԱՆ ԽՍՀ-Ի ԾԱՎԱԼԱԴԱՇՏԱԿԱՆ ԾՐԱԳՐԻ ԻՐԱԳՈՐԾՄԱՆ ՄԻՋՈՑ

ԳԵՎՈՐԳ ՍՏԵՓԱՆՅԱՆ

Ամփոփում

Թեև ժամանակ առ ժամանակ փոխվել է «Մեծ Ադրբեջան» ծրագրի մարտավարությունը, այսուհանդերձ, քաղաքական նպատակը մնացել է նույնը: Խորհրդային իշխանության տարիներին անհնարին համարելով ռազմական ճանապարհով հայկական տարածքների բռնազավթումը, Ադրբեջանի ղեկավարությունը դիմեց նոր մարտավարության. կոտորածներին, հալածանքներին ու բռնի տեղահանություններին փոխարինելու եկան էթնիկ զտման, իրավազրկման, ազգային խտրականության, վիճակագրական հորինված տվյալների միջոցով էթնոժողովրդագրական պատկերի խեղման, տեղանունների թյուրբականացման, քարտեզագրական խեղաթյուրումների, քաղաքակրթական արժեքների յուրացման քաղաքականությունը: Ընդամին, Ադրբեջանա-

կան ԽՍՀ կառավարող շրջանների ծավալապաշտական ծրագրերի մեջ կարևոր տեղ էր զբաղեցնում նաև քոչվորական տնտեսությունների ստեղծման քողի տակ «պրոլետարական ինտերնացիոնալիզմի ու ժողովուրդների բարեկամության» կեղծ կարգախոսով հայկական նորանոր տարածքների յուրացումը: Ադրբեջանական ԽՍՀ-ը քոչվորական տնտեսությունների համար նոր արոտավայրերի ստեղծման պատրվակով շարունակում էր Հայկական ԽՍՀ-ից տարածքների բռնագավթման գործընթացը: Այսպիսով, պետականորեն ծրագրված «քոչվորական տնտեսությունների» ստեղծման քողի տակ Հայաստանի մի շարք կենսատարածքներում բուսեցին թաթարաբնակ գյուղեր, ինչպես նաև մերձալպյան և ալպյան արոտավայրերի կեսից ավելին նվիրաբերվեցին Ադրբեջանական ԽՍՀ-ին, ինչը վերջինիս հնարավորություն տվեց Հայաստանի տարածքի մեջ սեպի պես խրվել և ճանապարհների ու ռազմավարական ենթակառուցվածքների նկատմամբ վերահսկողություն սահմանել: Ակներև է, որ Ադրբեջանական ԽՍՀ-ի ծավալապաշտական քաղաքականության բաղադրիչ մասն էր կազմում խորհրդային բարձրագույն ղեկավարության թողտվության պայմաններում քոչվորական տնտեսությունների քողի տակ Հայկական ԽՍՀ-ից նորանոր տարածքների բռնագավթումը, որը ռազմավարական և ժողովրդագրական տեսակետից Հայաստանի համար լուրջ վտանգներ էր պարունակում:

***Քանալի բառեր՝** «Մեծ Ադրբեջան», Ադրբեջանական ԽՍՀ, ծավալապաշտություն, համաթյուրքականություն, քոչվորական տնտեսություն, Անդրկենտրոն-ծկոմ, ժողովրդագրություն:*

КОЧЕВОЕ ХОЗЯЙСТВО КАК СРЕДСТВО РЕАЛИЗАЦИИ ЭКСПАНСИОНИСТСКОЙ ПРОГРАММЫ АЗЕРБАЙДЖАНСКОЙ ССР

ГЕВОРГ СТЕПАНЯН

Резюме

Хотя тактика программы «Великий Азербайджан» периодически менялась, ее политические цели оставались неизменными. Исходя из невозможности в годы советской власти военным путем оккупировать армянские

территории, азербайджанское руководство прибегло к новой тактике – на смену погромам, гонениям и насильственной депортации пришли новые методы – этническая чистка, лишение всех прав, национальная дискриминация, искажение этнодемографической картины региона на основе вымышленных данных, тюркизация топонимов, картографические фальсификации, политика присвоения цивилизационных ценностей.

В экспансионистских планах правивших кругов Азербайджанской ССР важное место занимал – под маской создания кочевых хозяйств – захват новых армянских территорий под лживым девизом «пролетарского интернационализма и дружбы народов». Под предлогом обретения новых пастбищ для кочевого хозяйства Азербайджанская ССР продолжала вести политику захвата новых армянских территорий. Таким образом, благодаря созданию запланированного на государственном уровне «кочевого хозяйства» на ряде территорий АрмССР появились населенные кавказскими татарами села, помимо этого, больше половины приальпийских и альпийских пастбищ были «преподнесены» в дар АзССР, что дало возможность азербайджанской республике вклиниться на территорию Армении и контролировать дороги и стратегические инфраструктуры. Очевидно, что составной частью азербайджанской экспансионистской политики является захват – с попустительства высшего советского руководства – территорий АрмССР под предлогом создания кочевых хозяйств, что со стратегической и демографической точки зрения представляло серьезную опасность для Армении.

Ключевые слова: *«Великий Азербайджан», Азербайджанская ССР, экспансионистский, пантюркизм, кочевое хозяйство, Закцентрисполком, демография.*