

SEVERAL EPISODES OF HISTORY FALSIFICATION IN SVANTE CORNELL'S WORK*

UDC 930.2(479.24)

DOI: 10.52063/25792652-2021.3-34

EDUARD ZOHRABYAN

Yerevan State University,
Chair of History of the Neighboring Countries of Armenia,
Ph.D. in History, Associate Professor,
Yerevan, Republic of Armenia
eduardzohrabyan@ysu.am

The aim of the article is to reveal the false and imaginary theses in S. Cornell's work under the influence of falsification of Azerbaijani historiography on the basis of reliable, accurate sources and facts, to show their lack of connection with reality.

The main objectives of the article are to present the general approaches to the interpretation of realities at the amateur level and Azerbaijani historiographical and informative falsification on a field detached from the history of S. Cornell's work, to reveal the essence of distorting the facts, events, concepts presented by Cornell, summarize the bankruptcy of the wish of S. Cornell to deliver the desired as a reality.

The author has used a number of scientific methods, in particular, analytical and historical comparative methods.

The author puts forward the premise that the false theories and theses in Cornell's work are bankrupt, unsubstantiated, that they can not contribute to the peaceful regulation of Armenian-Azerbaijani relations.

The author concludes that the falsification of history in general, and particularly by Azerbaijan and their foreign authors is rejected both in scientific and practical political means.

Key words. Artificial state, falsification of history - gerrymander, perpetuation of history, Turkic-speaking Muslims, localization of ethnic identity, historical homeland, region, newcomers, nomadic herdsmen, demography, ethnic unification, administrative-territorial changes.

Introduction

The falsification of Azerbaijani historiography and political thought is carried out by various methods. It is manifested in Azerbaijan both through anti-Armenianism and anti-Armenian propaganda of political, historiographical circles, as well as through the publication of falsifying works ordered to foreign authors abroad. Among the latter is the work of the Swedish scientist, politician Svante Cornell¹ titled "Small Nations and Great Powers. A Study of Ethnopolitical Conflict in the Caucasus", in which, in addition to the

* Հոդվածը ներկայացվել է 06.12.2021թ., գրախոսվել՝ 19.12.2021թ., տպագրության ընդունվել է՝ 25.12.2021թ.:

¹ Svante E. Cornell is a co-founder and director of the Institute for Security and Development Policy. He is the Research director of Central Asia-Caucasus Institute & Silk Road Studies Program, the Joint Center operated by ISDP in cooperation with the American Foreign Policy Council (AFPC).

problems of ethnic conflicts in the Caucasus region, in order to satisfy his clients, the author distorted the historical realities and touched upon some episodes of the so-called "history of the 18th century" in Azerbaijan. The intentionality and partiality of S. Cornell's theses and assertions about the latter are obvious, as they are not based on facts and are groundless, built exclusively by the methods of Azerbaijani propaganda.

There was no political-ethnic formation called Azerbaijan in the Eastern Transcaucasia until 1918. This fact is also confirmed by the Azerbaijani historian I. Bagirova, who is writing. "At the beginning of the 20th century, the revolutionary movement of the masses defending their class, social and civil rights coincided, stimulated the national movement in the suburbs, most of which had not yet completed the formation of a united nation. The process of formation of the national self-consciousness of the Azerbaijanis, its separation from pan-Turkism and pan-Muslimism began in the second half of the 19th century and ended in 1918. with the creation of a united nation-state" (Багирова 86).

With the creation of an artificial state in 1918, the Democratic Republic of Azerbaijan however, ended not the formation of national self-consciousness of Azerbaijanis but the localization of the ethnic identity of Turkic-speaking Muslims in the region, the search for the creation of a homeland, and the process of formation of the so-called Azerbaijani nation continues in our time. "Throughout the past century, there has been an ongoing crisis of ethnic identity among Azerbaijanis. On the one hand, the historical memory of the Azerbaijanis is not directly related to the current formation of their identity, on the other hand, the historical depth and geographical area of that memory are not clear (Խառնապետյան 301): Meanwhile, with the encouragement and direct instruction of the political leadership of Azerbaijan, the Azerbaijani historiography aims to make the history of Azerbaijan as old as possible through historical construction. That line, which started in 1918-1920 during the DRA years (Шнирельман 119-129), was consistently implemented in both Soviet and post-Soviet historical periods.

The process of "Azerbaijanization" and perpetuation of the history of Azerbaijan

In the Soviet period, in particular, by the first secretary of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan since the 1930s, Mirjafar Baghirov, under the direct auspices of the USSR leadership, the process of turning Turkic-speaking Muslims into a nation with the Azerbaijani ethnographic title began. It was on the basis of the Marian theory of the genealogy of the Azerbaijanis put forward by him that the process of the historical construction of the Azerbaijaniization of the history of Azerbaijan began. The criterion of forming a titular nation arising from political opportunism became the main, inviolable starting point of the history of the Republic of Azerbaijan. Particular attention was paid to the issue of writing the history of the republic, moreover, that history had to be written from the position of the title ethnos (Չոլլալի 33): In 1934 the Faculty of History of the Azerbaijan State University was founded, in 1940-1941 the Chair of History of Azerbaijan (Шнирельман 132-133), the first textbooks of the history of Azerbaijan were published: the first in 1939, the second in 1941 (Шнирельман 134): The process of Azerbaijaniization of history continues both in 1941-1945 and in the new textbooks of Azerbaijani history published in academic publications.

The contribution of Heydar Aliev, who was known as the real author of the idea of "Azerbaijaniization", is enormous in the unfinished work of "Azerbaijaniization" of the history and identity of Azerbaijan (Խառնապետյան 308):

The only way to implement this idea is the falsification and gerrymander of not only the history of Azerbaijan, but also the history of the region. Cornell chose that method and consciously made Azerbaijani falsification.

In order to properly understand the purpose of the publication of the work, its content, the true essence of the author's ideas, one can first explain the motivation for creating the book, the interests of its author and the source of their funding. This book, for example, was published with the financial support of the Allievs' Foundation of Azerbaijan and with the means of a Europe-Azerbaijani company founded in 2006. This fact speaks for itself; it indisputably testifies to the author's ordering, the intentionality of the work, the defense of the falsification of Azerbaijani historiography through the distortion of historical facts.

Many of the ideas expressed in the book are controversial, contradictory and obviously distorted, the purpose of which is to present the desired and order as a reality, to mislead the public, to misinform, and ultimately to justify Azerbaijani aggression against the Republic of Armenia and Artsakh through the terrorist war.

On page 18 of the work, the author begins with referring to ancient references as a proof argument, of course, without mentioning a specific source. Whereas elementary scientific ethics and logic requires unbiased, credible research based on reliable facts and sources, which was not obtained by the mentioned author.

Back in the 1940s, Z. Yampolski developed and circulated the concept of "ethnogenetic continuity in the territory of Azerbaijan" in official Azerbaijani historiography, the author of which sought to "substantiate" the Turks' settlement and permanent existence in modern Azerbaijan, based on the Aghwan theory of Azeri descent (Ямпольский). This theory was later developed by Z. Buniatov to a new level of falsification, introducing the so-called late Aghwan concept (Буниатов). G. Abdullayev, one of the Azerbaijani authors, using the well-known vicious methods of historical construction encouraged in Soviet Azerbaijan, in 1958 wrote that in the second half of the 18th century, the "political unification" of North-Eastern Azerbaijan took place within an ethnically homogeneous population (Azeris) The unification of Azerbaijani lands around Quba or another political center would contribute to the "creation of a national state" (Абдуллаев 12). None of these statements correspond to the real historical-ethno-political picture of the region.

In our time S. Cornell, having this false concept invented by the above-mentioned and other Azerbaijani authors, went further developing their minds.

S. Cornell writes, "The khanates in the north, that is in the present-day Azerbaijan, included Baku, Shirvan, Ganja, Nakhijevan, Karabakh, and Yerevan" (Cornell 18). The listed khanates, as it is known, were separate semi-independent administrative units subject to Persia; they could not be included in the "territory" of the non-existent state of Azerbaijan (Մխիթարյան). It is noticeable that S. Cornell repeats the theses of Azerbaijani forgers, further expanding the imaginary territorial understandings of "Azerbaijan" in the 18th century. This misunderstanding, skillfully used by the Azeri forgers and their foreign authors, is due to the fact that in the 16th and 17th centuries, all the states of the Transcaucasia were subjugated to the Persian royal court by the ruler of Atropatene, whose residence was Tabriz (Ансари 32-33): This whole territory was included in one financial-tax-military system, which was one of the four similar administrative-territorial units of Persia: Iraq, Fars, Azerbaijan and Khorasan. The use of one common tax-financial name, Azerbaijan, as correctly observed by P. Chobanyan, "left its mark on the emergence of new terminology, as well as on the further misunderstanding of ethno-religious processes and became a subject of political speculation" (Չոբանյան 32): Baba Khan (Shah of Fatali) wrote in his letter to King George XII of Georgia that "Georgia is the best country in Azerbaijan and the Persian rulers have always been friendly to the Georgian kings (Չոբանյան 36). It is obvious that the use of the common name Azerbaijan in relation to other territories of Georgia and other regions subjugated to Persia at that time had a purely symbolic nature, implying

their tax-financial subordination to Atropatene. The elimination of this factor of direct subordination from the middle of the 18th century gives rise to a new, purely territorial, but again symbolic perception of the so-called financial-administrative khanates of the Eastern Transcaucasia.

If we view by the same logic of Cornell, the administrative-political unit of Arminia with Dvin in the center formed in the early 8th century during the Arab rule, which included Armenia, Georgia, Aghwank (Azerbaijani people consider their historical homeland) and the Near Caspian regions, we can say for sure that Georgia and Aghwank were Armenia or Armenian territories. The mentioned author has a deliberate confusion of terms and place names.

The Falsification of the Ownership of Territories

S. Cornell names territories of Karabakh and Yerevan as part of the present-day Azerbaijan. Even if we consider Karabakh as a disputed territory from the perspective of the international law, how can the author include Yerevan, the capital of the Republic of Armenia, into the borders of Azerbaijan? It is hard to claim that it is just a mistake by the author as the intention to present the text the same way is seen in other parts of the book such as considering the Iranian khans of the region being "Azeris" (Cornell 18). In fact, S. Cornell's work uses the principle of a selective approach to historical memory inherent in Azerbaijani false historiography. In order to please his client, the political elite of Azerbaijan, S. Cornell builds the narrative of the book on unfounded, distorted facts, on the basis of which it can be assumed that "Armenia is not Armenia, Karabakh is Aghwan land, Armenians are newcomers, and the khanates of Yerevan and Nakhijevan are" Western Azerbaijan" (Тунян, Муса Гасымлы, Анатолия и Южный Кавказ в 1724-1920-е гг. 216)

On the same page 18, the author writes about the above-mentioned khanates the following claim: "This would mean that the regions would not be incorporated outright into the Russian empire; they would be under Russian rule but without the status of being part of Russia itself" (Cornell 18). Mr. Cornell maybe does not know the essence of the colonial policy of the Russian Empire in general; its main difference from the colonization led by the Western powers was to incorporate all the conquered territories into their empire with the use of administrative governance universal for the whole empire. In addition, all the conquered territories might have had direct borders through land; that is why maintaining a colony such as Alaska was not in their vision of long-term state administration.

On page 19, S. Cornell writes the following sentence: "After Peter the Great's abortive Persian expedition in 1722, the Ottoman and Persian empires concluded an alliance in 1727, recognising the threat from the north and the danger of allowing their mutual enmity to jeopardize the security of both empires" (Cornell 19). Here once again it is obvious that the author intentionally describes the events as if Russia enlarged its presence in the region, the regional powers opposed Russian presence. However, we have to pay attention to the fact that the Russian and Ottoman Empires concluded a treaty in 1724 in Constantinople (modern-day Istanbul) which legalized and allowed Russia to keep its conquests in the eastern costs of Caspian Sea whereas Russia would not oppose the Ottoman conquest of Eastern Armenia. Moreover, we have to ask the author of the book the following question: Which Iranian administration signed a treaty with the Ottomans in 1727? This is an important question because of the fact that the signatory side did not have power in Iran whereas in a few years later, in 1730, Nader (Iranian Shah in 1736-1747) started a war against the Ottomans in order to push them out from the Iranian borders which at that time included Eastern Armenia.

False Concepts of Azerbaijan's «Statehood» and «Arrival of Armenians»

It should be noted that when talking about the formation of a state called Azerbaijan in the Eastern Transcaucasia in the 18th century (Svante E. Cornell, p.18), S. Cornell involuntarily repeats the fictitious opinion of the traditions of ancient centuries of Azerbaijani statehood, and hence the next distorted thesis about the "arrival of Armenians" in the region rises.

One of the false concepts currently widely circulated in Azerbaijani historiography is that the proclamation of the Democratic Republic of Azerbaijan in 1918 restored the centuries-old traditions of the Azerbaijani statehood. In fact, this false concept is based on the consciously distorted assertions that the state of Azerbaijan has existed in the Eastern Transcaucasia since ancient times, as in the 18th century. But the facts prove the opposite. In the 18th century, there was no ethnic name or especially political formation under the name of Azerbaijan in Eastern Transcaucasia. The most obvious proof was presented by the first representative of the Turkic-speaking Muslim intelligentsia of the Eastern Transcaucasia, M. Shahtakhtinsky. In 1891 in his article "How to Call the Muslims of the Transcaucasia" he suggested to call the Turkic speakers of the Transcaucasia not "Tatar" or "Muslim" but "Azerbaijani" and the Turkic languages of the Transcaucasia Azerbaijani (Шахтактинский). In fact, he was the first to introduce the artificial terms "Azerbaijani" and "Azerbaijani", proposing to adopt that term instead of Tatar as the ethnonym of the Turkic-speaking Muslim population of the Transcaucasia. If in the late 19th century there was no Azeri ethnic community in the Transcaucasia, then there was no state formation of Azerbaijan, moreover in the 18th century it could not include administrative units such as Shaki, Shirvan, Ganja, Baku, Nakhijevan, Karabakh, Yerevan khanates mentioned by the falsifier historian. The above-mentioned khanates under the Iranian royal court passed to the Russian Empire according to the signed treaties of Gulistan 1813 and Turkmenchay 1828. Therefore, it is a falsification and downright the statement that there was an Azerbaijani state in the 18th Eastern Transcaucasia with a common territory, culture and language. In addition, in 1828 with the treaty of Turkmenchay the khanates of Yerevan and Nakhijevan passed to Russia and on the basis of the Ordubad mahal, by the decree of the tsar in 21.03.1828 there was formed an Armenian region. Unwillingly, a question arises as to why, according to Azeri historiography, and their favorite foreign writers, in the 18th century, instead of the supposedly existing Azerbaijani political formation, no Azerbaijani administrative unit or an Azeri region was created. In 1918, the name of Azerbaijan, a newly created state formation in the East Transcaucasia, was not chosen by chance. It pursued far-reaching political and strategic goals. In this regard, the Persian author Enaetollah Reza writes: "The naming of Aran and Shirvan in the Caucasus" as Azerbaijan "was done according to the policy and demand of the Turks" (Էնաեթոլլահ 151).

Another speculated view is closely related to the above mentioned question, according to which in the territory of Eastern Armenia, which passed to Russia in the 18-19th centuries, more Azeris lived than Armenians. This is one of the favorite topics of Azerbaijani President I. Aliiev, which he exploits on all occasions, consciously forgetting the fact that in the 18th and 19th centuries the Azerbaijani ethnic concept and society did not exist so they could not form a majority. Besides, it is necessary to explain why the number of Armenians in those territories decreased, how the process of de-Armenianization of Eastern Armenia took place and the Persians and partly Turkish-speaking Muslims settled here, etc. This is explained by the Turkish-Persian wars of the 16th-17th centuries, the desolation of settlements in Eastern Armenia, the resettlement of nomadic Turkish tribes, and the deportation of 300,000 Armenians from Armenia by Shah Abbas I in the early 17th century. Despite the deportation of the Armenian population to the depths of Persia from Shah Abbas I and the influx of foreign tribes, the Armenian

people were the main population of the Armenian Highlands, and both Armenians and many foreigners continued to use the name Armenia in all these states (Չոբախյան 32). Later, in the 18th century, King Heraclius II of Georgia deported the population of the Ararat Valley. After the unsuccessful attempt to capture Yerevan Fortress in 1804, Russian General P. Tsitsianov resettled 11,100 Armenian families from the territory of Eastern Armenia, more than 55-500 people in Georgia. Nevertheless, as P. Potyomkin wrote in the early 19th century, "most of the rule of Yerevan Khan consisted of Armenians" (Иоанисян 99).

Throughout its existence, the Safavid state pursued a policy of resettlement of the nomadic, semi-nomadic Turkish tribes belonging to the Shiite Islam in the Transcaucasia, in particular, in the plains of Karabakh (Բարախյան 21). Despite this fact, it should be noted that in 1823, according to Russian tax lists, 96.67% of the population of the five mahallas of Karabakh were Armenians, and 3.33% were Tatars (Բախխանյան 18). Turkic tribes appeared in Nagorno-Karabakh in the last thirties of the 18th century, until 1921, when Nagorno-Karabakh was illegally annexed to Soviet Azerbaijan they did not exceed 3-4% of the population (*История Азербайджана* 237).

According to another view of Azerbaijani historiography, Armenians appeared in Artsakh only after the Treaty of Turkmenchay in 1828, and because they were "newcomers" they could not constitute themselves in the territory of Artsakh. This view is refuted by the Azerbaijani author G. Abdullayev in a monograph published in Baku in 1965, where he wrote: "The Karabakh region included ... Five Armenian melikdoms, the owners of which, during the reign of Nader Shah, enjoyed all the privileges of the rulers in their territories; they had their own armed forces; By declaring himself a khan Panah Ali (1748-1760) tried to subdue the meliks by using mean methods and tricks" (Абдуллаев 90-92). This testimony of the Armenianness of Artsakh shows that Armenians lived in Artsakh since ancient times, until the Treaty of Turkmenchay in 1828. The imaginary thesis of the Azerbaijani authors about the arrival of Armenians in Artsakh is also denied by the fact that "General N. Abkhazov first accommodates Persian-Armenian immigrants to Karabakh in the city of Barda (Partav) or its surroundings with unfavorable climate. Due to the deplorable situation, 300 of the 750 families sent to Karabakh will soon leave. Only 450 families or 2,000 people remain, that is 1.6% of those who immigrated to the borders of the Russian Empire (Արքախանյան 223).

As for the "arrival" of Armenians in general, this concept was denied by Abbas Kuli-Agha Bakikhanov, who is considered to be the founder of Azerbaijani academic historiography in the 19th century. In his famous work "Gulistan-Iram" he writes . "Greek historians write that Darius (6th century BC -E.Z.) launched a campaign with a large number of troops, wanting to punish the Scythians for the desolation of Armenia and Azerbaijan" (Бакиханов 20). It is clear from what has been said that neither the Greek historians, nor Abbas Kuli-Agha Bakikhanov, who refers to their reliable information, can write their stories in accordance with the wishes of the future Azerbaijani falsifiers serving them. As it is commonly said, comments are unnecessary. In connection with the description of the Arab invasions, A. Bakikhanov writes. "The annals of Tabal, works of Guzid, Rauzat al-Asfa, and others state that the caliph Umar ibn al-Khattab/al-Farooq/ ordered Surak ibn Amr to obey Azerbaijan when he conquered Persia. He carried out the order of the caliph, then moved to Shirvan, sending before him Qukayra ibn Abdullah from Armina (Armenia), and Abd al-Rahman ibn Rabia from Mughan" (Бакиханов 27). These small parts of the work unequivocally testify to the continuity of the Armenians both in terms of their locality and in the historically unchanged homeland. The Azerbaijani historiography wants to present the opposite of this undeniable fact. However, only A. Bakikhanov's work, in fact, basically shows the bankruptcy of the concept of the "arrival of Armenians" of the foreign Azerbaijani forgers hired by them.

At the same time, it is clear from A. Bakikhanov's work that in the 7th century Azerbaijan (Atropatene-E.Z.) was one of the north-western regions of Persia, where the Turkish nomadic tribes settled in the following centuries. It is different from Shirvan in the Eastern Transcaucasia, on which the name Azerbaijan was spread only at the beginning of the 20th century.

According to the Treaty of Turkmenchay in 1828, the Armenians got the right to return, they lived in their historical homeland, from where they were deported in previous centuries, that is, they moved from one part of their historical homeland to another. The history of nations has always been characterized by both internal and external migration movements. Speaking about the resettlement of Armenians, Azerbaijani historiography deliberately avoid the facts of resettlement of Muslims. And they unequivocally prove that due to the resettlement policy pursued by the tsar's court, the Transcaucasia has not become Christianized, but the number of Turkic-speaking Muslim elements has increased to a greater extent. In the spring of 1828, the Russian treasury relocated 20,000 Chervonets, equivalent to 4 million rubles, for the resettlement of Muslims led by Agha-Mir-Feti Tabrizi, from the Iranian province of Azerbaijan to the Transcaucasia. At the same time, 16 000 Chervonets were relocated for the resettlement of 8249 Christian families - Armenians, Assyrians, Greeks - from Persia to the Ararat Valley. Moreover, out of 16,000 Chervonets, only 8,000 were spent on the resettlement of Christians, significantly less than the amount spent on Muslims. The mass resettlement of Tatar tribes from Iran forced the Russian Council of Ministers in 1832 to limit the settlement of Russian sectarians in Karabakh (Тунян, Карабахский конфликт 70, 71). Only the inhabitants of the 4 settlements of the village of Uzamchi and Gharadagh were allowed to settle in Karabakh, whose number was 700 people (Тунян, Муса Гасымлы, Анатолия и Южный Кавказ в 1724-1920-е гг. 215).

Only the inhabitants of the 4 settlements of the village of Uzamchi and Gharadagh were allowed to settle in Karabakh, whose number was 700 people (Тунян, Муса Гасымлы, Анатолия и Южный Кавказ в 1724-1920-е гг. 215).

As it can be seen from the above, due to the policy of the tsar's court to neutralize the Iranian influence in the region, the number of Turkic-speaking Muslims, willingly or unwillingly, increased through their relocation to the Transcaucasia. In other words, the thoughts on the arrival of Armenians do not speak in favor of Azerbaijanis at all. Moreover, the policy of mass resettlement of Tatar tribes in the territories from Iran to the Russian Empire was aimed at the process of deiranization in a geographically newly formed territory, which would objectively contribute to the unification of Turkism, the formulation of the pretense of acquirement of homeland.

Conclusion

The Turkish-speaking Muslims who invaded Transcaucasia in the 12th and 17th centuries and settled here were constantly displaced by the nomadic way of life. In the 19th century, the undisguised desire to prevent the formation of administrative divisions in Transcaucasia and the formation of mono-ethnic zones, the policy of inter-population settlement of tsarism created favorable conditions for the spread of nomadic Turkic-speaking Muslims, mainly for spreading in the region. This circumstance later, in the search for the homeland, became an occasion for Turkic-speaking Muslims to assert pretenses for the indigenous historical territories of all the peoples who had occupied it.

In the 19th century and at the beginning of the 20th century, all the above processes concerning Turkish-speaking Muslims took place not only as a result of the policy pursued by the Russian royal court, but often with its open encouragement. It can be asserted with absolute certainty that the process of ethnic unification of the Caucasian Tatars, the formation of their identity, the emergence of the preconditions for statehood

took place precisely because of the policy pursued by the Russian Empire and then by the Soviet government. Therefore, the strongly anti-Russian view expressed in the Azerbaijani historiography, according to which Russia is the cause of the misfortune of the Azerbaijani nation, that they were divided due to the Russian conquests to North and South Azerbaijan, is groundless and false. T. Svetokhovskiy, a Polish scholar, made a very correct observation, noting that the transformation of ethnic identity and the ethnification of Turkic-speakers in the Eastern Transcaucasia in the early 20th century was a result of changes in the framework of the Russian power, which was stimulated by a new type of Turkic intelligentsia and Literary Turkic language (Светоховский 8).

According to the Soviet census of 1920, 1923, 1926, which were also conducted in the Azerbaijani SSR, the term Azerbaijani was not used, despite the existence of that republic. The names of Turks or Tatars are mentioned in the mentioned censuses, which means that there was an Azerbaijani state, but there was no Azerbaijani people. Only in the 1937 census was the Azerbaijani ethnic first circulated and given citizenship. The Azerbaijani author Alekperov testifies to this, writing that "the Azerbaijani ethnonym has been widely used among the population only since 1936" (Алекперов 71). This is a fact that the artificiality of that society is not yet fully formed.

Thus, the small number of facts presented above even make the attempts to falsify history in Cornell's book even more obvious. Maybe Mr. S. Cornell would do a favor to study the Armenian monuments of tens of thousands of centuries-old material culture scattered in the territories he considers to be Azerbaijan, and then make new judgments about the affiliation of those territories.

Maybe he would ask himself and his Azeri colleagues why these monuments of Armenian material culture were built or how they appeared in the so-called "territory of Azerbaijan", why are these monuments, such as more than a thousand khachkars were barbarically destroyed by the Azerbaijanis in Jugha in Nakhijevan in order to eliminate the traces of Armenianness.

Օգտագործված գրականություն

1. Աբրահամյան Հ., Արցախը 18-19-րդ դարերում, Երևան 2015:
2. Բաբայան Դ., Ղարաբաղյան հակամարտություն, պատմական, իրավական և այլ ապակտներ, «21-րդ դար», թիվ 1(17), 2005:
3. Բալայան Վ., Ազատագրության և պետականության համար պայքարի պատմական և գաղափարական դրսևորումները Արցախում (17-րդ դարի երկրորդ կես-2007 թվական), դրկտորական ատենախոսության սեղմագիր, Երևան., 2013:
4. Չոլյան Ս., Ազգային քաղաքականությունը Խորհրդային ադրբեջանում և Լեռնային Ղարաբաղի խնդիրը, «21-րդ դար», թիվ 4(18), 2007:
5. Էնաեթոլլահ Ռեզա, Ազարբայջան և Առան, Երևան 1994:
6. Խառատեան Հ., «Ադրբեջանցիները», «Կովկասապետները» և «Իրանապետները». ինքնության զարգացումներն Ադրբեջանում, «Հանդես Ամսօրեայ», Վիեննա-Երեւան, Մխիթարյան տպ., 2012:
7. Մխիթարյան Գ., Արեւելյան Այսրկովկասի վարձաքաղաքական կազմավորումները ԺԸ դարի երկրորդ կեսին, Երեւան, 2018:
8. Չոբանյան Պ., Հայ-ռուս-վրացական փոխհարաբերությունները ԺԸ դարի երկրորդ կեսին, Էջմիածին, 2006:
9. Аббас-Кули-Ага Бакиханов, Гулистан-Ирам, Редакция, комментарии, примечания и указатели З. М. Буниятова, Баку 1991.
10. Абдуллаев Г., Из истории Северо-Восточного Азербайджана в 60-80 г.г. 18 в., Баку, Изд-во АН Аз. ССР, 1958.
11. Абдуллаев Г., Азербайджан в 18 веке и взаимоотношения его с Россией, Баку, 1965.,

12. Алекперов А. К., Исследование по археологии и этнографии Азербайджана, Баку, 1960.
13. Багирова И. С., Политические партии и организации Азербайджана в начале 20 века 1900-1917, «ЕЛМ», Баку, 1997, стр.86.
14. Буниятов З., Азербайджан в 7-9 вв., Изд. Академии Наук Азербайджанской ССР, Баку, 1965.
15. Иоанисян А., Россия и армянское освободительное движение, Ер. 1990.
16. *История Азербайджана*, под. ред. Сумбатзаде А, С., Гулиева А. Н., Изд. АН АЗ, ССР, Баку 1958.
17. Мухамид-Рафи Ансари. Дастурал Мулук, Ташкент, 1991.
18. Шахтагинский М., Как называть Закавказских мусульман, - «Каспий», № 93, Баку, 1891.
19. Шнирелман В., Войны памяти, . Мифы, идентичность и политика Закавказье, ИКЦ «Академкнига», Москва 2003.
20. Светоховский Т., Русское правление, модернизаторские элиты и становление национальной идентичности в Азербайджане,- Азербайджан и Россия: общества и государства, Вып. 4, Москва, 2001.
21. Тунян Валерий, Карабахский конфликт, Ереван, 1999.
22. Тунян Валерий, Муса Гасымлы, Анатолия и Южный Кавказ в 1724-1920-е гг.: в поисках исторической истины, Москва, «Инсан», 2014, 528 с., Հայադիտակազմի հարցեր, հավելու 1(7), ԵՊՀ հրատ:
23. Ямпольский З., Об этногенетической непрерывности на почве Азербайджана, «Вопросы истории Кавказской Албании», Баку, 1962.
24. Svante E. Cornell, Small Nations and Great Powers, A Study of Ethnopolitical Conflict in the Caucasus, 480 pp. Richmond: Curzon Caucasus World, 2001.

Works cited

1. Abrahamyan H., Arcaxh' 18-19-rd darerum, [Artsakh in the 18-19 centuries], Erevan, 2015.
2. Babayan D., Gharabaghyan hakamartut'yun, patmakan, iravakan ev ayl aspektner [The Karabakh Conflict, Historical, Legal and Other Aspects], «21rd DAR», N1(17), 2005.
3. Balayan V., Azatagrut'yan & petakanut'yan hamar payqari patmakan ev gaghap'arakan drsevorumner' Arcaxum (17-rd dari erkrord kes-2007 t'vakan), doktorakan atenaxosut'yan seghmagir, [Historical and Ideological Manifestations of the Struggle for Liberation and Statehood in Artsakh (the second half of the XVII-2007), abstract of the doctoral dissertation], Erevan., 2013.
4. Zolyan M., Azgayin qaghaqakanut'yuny' Xorhrdayin adrbejanowm ev Ler'nayin Gharabaghi xndiry', [National policy in Soviet Azerbaijan and the Problem of Nagorno-Karabakh] «21-rd DAR», N4(18), 2007.
5. E'naet'ollah R'eza, Azarbayjan ev Ar'an, [Azerbaijan and Aran] Erevan 1994.
6. Xar'atean H., «Adrbejancinery'», «kovkasalezunery'» ew «iranalezunery'». inqnut'yan zargacumnern Adrbejanum, «Handes Amsoreay», [“Azerbaijanis”, “kavkazalezu” and “iranalezu”: the Development of Identity in Azerbaijan], Vienna-Erevan, Mxit'aryan tp., 2012.
7. Mxit'aryan G., Arewelyan Aysrkovkasi var'aqaghaqakan kazmavorumner' JhY' dari erkrord kesin, [Military-political formations of the Eastern Transcaucasia in the second half of the X century], Erevan, 2018.
8. Chobanyan P., Hay-r'us-vracakan p'oxharaberut'yunnery' JhY' dari erkrord kesin, [Armenian-Russian-Georgian relations in the second half of the XV century], E'jmiac'in, 2006:

9. Abbas-Kuli-Aga Bakihanov, Gjulistan-Iram, Redakcija, komentarii, primechanija i ukazateli Z. M. Bunijatova, [Gulistan-Iram, Editorial Board, Comments, Notes and Indexes by Z. M. Buniyatov], Baku 1991.
10. Abdullaev G., Iz istorii Severo-Vostochnogo Azerbajdzhana v 60-80 g.g. 18 v., [From the history of North-Eastern Azerbaijan in the 60-80 years of the 18th century], Baku, Izd-vo AN Az. SSR, 1958.
11. Abdullaev G., Azerbajdzhan v 18 veke i vzaimootnoshenija ego s Rossiej, [Azerbaijan in the 18th century and his relationship with Russia], Baku, 1965.
12. Alekperov A. K., Issledovanie po arheologii i jetnografii Azerbajdzhana, [Study of archaeology and Ethnography of Azerbaijan], Baku, 1960.
13. Bagirova I. S., Politicheskie partii i organizacii Azerbajdzhana v nachale 20 veka 1900-1917, [Political Parties and Organizations of Azerbaijan in the early 20th century], «ELM», Baku, 1997, str.86.
14. Bunijatov Z., Azerbajdzhan v 7-9 vv., [Azerbaijan in the 7th-9th centuries], Izd. Akademii Nauk Azerbajdzhanskoj SSR, Baku, 1965.
15. Ioanisjan A., Rossija i armjanskoe osvoboditel'noe dvizhenie, [Russia and the Armenian Liberation Movement], Er. 1990.
16. Istorija Azerbajdzhana, [History of Azerbaijan], pod. red. Sumbatzade A, S., Gulieva A. N., Izd. AN AZ, SSR, Baku 1958.
17. Muhamid-Rafi Ansari. Dastural Muluk, [Dastural Muluk], Tashkent, 1991.
18. Shahtahtinskij M., Kak nazyvat' Zakavkazskih musul'man, [How to call Transcaucasian Muslims], «Kaspij», № 93, Baku, 1891.
19. Shnirelman V., Voyny pamjati, Mify, identichnost' i politika Zakavkaz'e, [Wars of Memory, Myths, Identity and Politics of Transcaucasia], IKC «Akademkniga», Moskva 2003.
20. Svetohovskij T., Russkoe pravlenie, modernizatorskie jelity i stanovlenie nacional'noj identichnosti v Azerbajdzhane,- Azerbajdzhan i Rossija: obshhestva i gosudarstva, [Russian Reign, Modernizing Elites and the Formation of National Identity in Azerbaijan - Azerbaijan and Russia: Societies and States], Vyp. 4, Moskva, 2001.
21. Tunjan Valery, Karabahskij konflikt, [Karabakh Conflict], Erevan, 1999.
22. Tunjan Valery, Musa Gasymlı, Anatolija i Juzhnij Kavkaz v 1724-1920-e gg.: v poiskah istoricheskoj istiny, [Anatolia and the Caucasus Jugni in 1724-1920-ies: in Search of Historical Truth], Moskva, «Insan», 2014, 528 s., Հայագիտություն հարցեր, հախնդ (Questions of Armenian Studies) 1(7), YSU PH.
23. Jampol'skij Z., Ob jetnogeneticheskoj nepreryvnosti na pochve Azerbajdzhana, «Voposy istorii Kavkazskoj Albanii», [On ethnogenetic continuity on the soil of Azerbaijan, "Epos of the history of Caucasian Albania"], Baku, 1962.
24. Svante E. Cornell, Small Nations and Great Powers, A Study of Ethnopolitical Conflict in the Caucasus, 480 pp. Richmond: Curzon Caucasus World, 2001.

ՊԱՏՄՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԿԵՂՃԱՐԱՐՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՄԻ ԶԱՆԻ ԴՐՎԱԳՆԵՐ ՍՎԱՆԹԵ ԶՈՐՆԵԼԼԻ ԱՇԽԱՏՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՄԵՋ

ԷՂՈՒԱՐԴ ՉՈՐԱԲՅԱՆ

*Երևանի պետական համալսարանի
Հայաստանի հարակից երկրների պատմության ամբիոնի վարիչի ժ/պ,
պատմական գիտությունների թեկնածու, դոցենտ,
ք.Երևան, Հայաստանի Հանրապետություն*

Հոդվածի նպատակն է հավաստի, ստույգ աղբյուրների և փաստերի հիման վրա բացահայտել Ս. Զորնեյի աշխատության մեջ աղբրեջանական պատմագրության կեղծարարության ազդեցությամբ տեղ գտած ստահող ու մտացածին թեզերը, ցույց տալ իրականության հետ դրանց առնչության բացակայությունը:

Հոդվածի հիմնական խնդիրներն են՝ ներկայացնել Ս. Զորնեյի աշխատության՝ պատմականությունից կտրված հարթության վրա, սիրողական մակարդակում իրողությունների մեկնաբանության և աղբրեջանական պատմագիտական ու տեղեկատվական կեղծարարության ընդհանրական մոտեցումները, բացահայտել պատմությունը նենգափոխելու՝ Ս. Զորնեյի կողմից ներկայացվող փաստերի, իրադարձությունների, հասկացությունների խեղաթյուրման եղանակները, ցանկալին որպես իրականություն մատուցելու ձգտման սևանկությունը:

Հեղինակն օգտագործել է մի շարք գիտական մեթոդներ, մասնավորապես՝ քննական-վերլուծական և պատմահամեմատական մեթոդները:

Հեղինակն առաջ է քաշում այն հիմնադրույթը, որ աղբրեջանական կեղծապատիր պատմագիտության հայեցակարգերի հիմքով Ս. Զորնեյի աշխատության մեջ տեղ գտած կեղծ դրույթներն ու թեզերը սևանկ են, փաստագրուկ և որևէ կերպ չեն կարող նպաստել Հայաստան-Աղբրեջան հարաբերությունների խաղաղ կարգավորմանը:

Հեղինակը եզրակացնում է, որ պատմության կեղծարարությունն առհասարակ և, մասնավորապես, աղբրեջանցի և նրանց ձայնափող օտար հեղինակների կողմից մերժելի է թե՛ գիտական և թե՛ գործնական-քաղաքական առումներով:

Հիմնաբառեր՝ *արհեստածին պետություն, պատմության կեղծարարություն և նենգափոխում, պատմության անընդհատականացում, թյուրըմբիստ մահմեդականներ, էթնիկ ինքնության տեղայնացում, պատմական հայրենիք, տարածաշրջան, եկվորներ, քոչվոր-անասնապահներ, ժողովրդագրություն, էթնոհամայնություն, վարչատարածքային փոփոխություններ:*

О НЕКОТОРЫХ ФАКТАХ ФАЛЬСИФИКАЦИИ ИСТОРИИ В КНИГЕ СВАНТЕ КОРНЕЛЛИ

ЭДУАРД ЗОГРАБЯН

*и/о зав. кафедрой истории сопредельных стран Армении
Ереванского государственного университета,
кандидат исторических наук, доцент
г.Ереван, Республика Армения*

Целью статьи является на основе достоверных источников и фактов опровергнуть лживые и вымышленные тезисы, которые нашли место в книге С.

Корнелли под влиянием азербайджанской историографии, показать, как в ней путем искажения фактов, в отрыве от историзма и на дилетантском уровне с позиции азербайджанской фальшивой историографии без выяснения глубинной сути представлены исторические факты.

В работе над статьей автор использовал ряд научных методов, в частности, аналитический и историко-культурный методы.

Мы подчеркиваем, что, потворствуя тенденциозным лжеисторикам, зарубежные авторы никоим образом не способствуют урегулированию конфликта и дальнейшему мирному сосуществованию двух соседствующих республик.

Автор, анализируя интерпретацию исторической действительности в книге С Корнелли, приходит к выводу о том, что академически необоснованные концепции, искажение и фальсификация истории со стороны как азербайджанских, так и зарубежных авторов неприемлемы с научной точки зрения. Подобный подход к теме также не имеет практической пользы и с политической точки зрения.

Ключевые слова: *искусственно рожденное государство, фальсификация и искажение истории, непрерывность истории, тюркоязычные мусульмане, локализация этнической идентичности, историческая родина, регион, приезжие, кочевники-животноводы, демография, этноконсолидация, административно-территориальные изменения.*